During June and July 2017, we carried out an independent, strategic review of the continuum of support, services and provision for children and young people, aged from birth to 25, with special educational needs and disability (SEND) in the East Riding. We engaged and gathered feedback from a broad range of stakeholders – young people, parents / carers and professionals across education, health and care services – through workshops, interviews and online surveys. We have triangulated the evidence we gathered with analysis of published and internal data to shape the review’s findings. We are grateful to all colleagues who have contributed their experiences, ideas and time to this review.

In this report, we have set out three overarching findings.

1. Local authority (LA) leaders and providers have a shared sense of strengths, challenges and strategic direction of the local SEND system. Partnership working between the LA, partner agencies and professionals are seen to be strong.

2. The local continuum of SEND support, services and provision has been pro-actively developed to offer a range of universal support, targeted services and local specialist provision. Our review suggests there would be value in rearticulating how the different parts of the continuum fit together. Our review has also identified some specific gaps in provision that are not currently being met by local provision, specifically for children with complex social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs and high-functioning autism. We also suggest that some core, underpinning systems and processes – identification and assessment of need, recording of data, placement decision-making – need to be strengthened.

3. Where services can be accessed in straightforward and timely ways, and services are able to work with professionals and parents to share skills, build understanding and embed strategies, there is positive feedback on their quality. There are, however, concerns regarding the capacity, accessibility and availability of some key services. Many parents we engaged described difficult experiences accessing support. There is agreement on the need to strengthen both strategic and individual relationships, ensuring they are based on co-production and partnership.
We have set out our findings under eight specific themes across the continuum of SEND support, services and provision. A summary of our findings, reflecting both what is seen to be working well and where there are challenges to be identified, and recommendations under each of these eight themes is set out on the next page.

In this report, we have set out 19 specific recommendations. These fall into three broad categories:

1. rearticulating the strategic vision so that there is broad understanding of the local SEND continuum and roles of individual services within that;
2. strengthening core systems and processes, including identification and assessment of need, effective recording and use of data, placement decision-making and planning processes, and communications; and
3. building on and strengthening aspects of practice or provision in a specific area of the continuum, including continuing to analyse and respond to specific areas of need that are not being met by local services and provision.

In the concluding section of the report, we identify what we suggest should be the immediate next steps under each of these three categories, based on our overall recommendations. We recognise that work to self-evaluate and address some of these challenges is already underway. Furthermore, we recognise that the desire to take forward this review’s findings and recommendations has been a strong theme throughout this review. As such, these suggested next steps are offered as suggestions, to be considered alongside action plans and work already in train, and to be explored and discussed between the partners – the LA and strategic partner agencies, professionals and providers, and parents, carers and young people – who have been involved in this review. In the conclusion, we have sought to highlight specific opportunities for co-production with parents and professionals. There are different ways in which these recommendations could be enacted, and we would advise that a first step following this review is to share its findings and engage parents, young people and professionals in shaping how those findings can be put into effect.
### Executive summary: Key findings and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>What is working well?</th>
<th>What are the challenges?</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification &amp; assessment</td>
<td>Valuable mechanisms for early identification and support – Early years Inclusion Service, portage. Some positive examples of the EHC process, valued by schools and families.</td>
<td>“Less obvious” needs not always identified early and accurately. EHCP process, annual reviews can still feel adversarial. Autism assessment pathway a concern.</td>
<td>Strengthen consistency of identification; develop a clear autism assessment pathway; refine the EHC process with clear expectations for parents and professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; access</td>
<td>KIDS and SENDIASS highly-regarded by parents / carers. FISH could provide valuable “front door” – opportunities to improve information about support.</td>
<td>Local offer not seen as useful or fit-for-purpose by parents, professionals. Confusion about respective roles of KIDS and SENDIASS. Concerns about slow access to some support.</td>
<td>Develop the local offer as a practical tool for parents and professionals; develop routes for accessing swift support; clarify the respective roles of KIDS and SENDIASS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream support</td>
<td>Some very positive examples described by parents and young people. Encouraging that schools are thinking about SEND as whole-school. SENCO networks highly valued.</td>
<td>Also some very negative experiences described – exclusions, placement breakdowns. Comprehensive support offer needed for SENCOs + whole-school inclusion.</td>
<td>Revisit and define expectations of effective mainstream practice (identification, inclusion, support). Link this to programme of support for SENCOs + whole-school inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted services</td>
<td>Positive feedback on LA central SEND services and EHaSH. Where access straightforward and timely, positive feedback on quality and ways of working.</td>
<td>Gaps in children’s therapy support for those without significant health needs. Strong concerns about access to mental health support, and Disabled Children’s Service.</td>
<td>Strengthen consistency and capacity of central SEND services; ensure clear offer and criteria for Disabled Children’s Service; address gaps in targeted health support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced resourced provisions</td>
<td>Recognition that LA has been pro-active in commissioning these provisions to meet need locally. Consensus on future priorities (primary SEMH, secondary autism).</td>
<td>Need to clarify purpose of the provisions – needs met, purpose (e.g. reintegration). This strategic clarity needed to inform day-to-day placement decisions.</td>
<td>Continue to develop ERPs in priority areas, based on evidence of need; revisit and clarify purpose and role, and ensure this is understood by professionals and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special school provision</td>
<td>Some very highly-valued provision – fulsome praise for specific schools. Schools value relationship with LA, and are keen to work collaboratively to meet needs locally.</td>
<td>Some questions about how certain needs will be met under the area special school model. Need a process for enabling LA and special schools to meet more needs locally.</td>
<td>Clarify how certain needs (MLD, SEMH high-functioning autism) are to be met within local provision; develop collaborative model for meeting more complex needs locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for adulthood</td>
<td>Consensus that this is a priority, that it is not currently well-developed, and about what is needed to address this – and willingness to work in partnership to do so.</td>
<td>Concerns about planning (not yet pro-active enough for individuals or at strategic level), about lack of pathways and options. Opportunity for LA to be leading the way.</td>
<td>Agree good practice guidelines and routines for transition reviews for individual young people; develop partnership-based approach to develop new 16-25 pathways and options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion and support</td>
<td>Some positive networks and activities for young people – often based around their school or college.</td>
<td>Some young people very isolated, both within and beyond school / college – need peer-group. Concerns about SEND awareness in community facilities.</td>
<td>Develop creative solutions that will foster peer networks for young people; raise awareness of SEND and how to ensure equity of access in community facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction: Background and aims of the review

Background
Many local areas, supported by a recent government grant, are undertaking reviews of their local high-needs and SEND provision. In May 2017, the East Riding of Yorkshire Council commissioned Isos Partnership to carry out an independent, strategic review of the continuum of universal support, targeted services and specialist provision for children and young people with SEND aged from birth to 25 in the East Riding. The review took place during June and July 2017.

The review had three main aims
1. To gather evidence about trends in current needs and future demand for services and provision.
2. To gather feedback on what is working well and where there are gaps in terms of current services and provision.
3. To work collaboratively to shape options for arranging services and provision to meet current and future needs.

Our approach
We have sought to triangulate in-depth, formative and iterative engagements with a wide range of partners and stakeholders with published and internal data and documents to inform our overall evidence base and findings. During the review, we have engaged:

• children & young people – workshops in nine settings (primary, secondary, special schools and post-16) and representatives from The Young Leaders of East Riding (TYLER);
• parents & carers (referred to as ‘parents’ for brevity in this report) – up to 101 have engaged through workshops (25), an online survey (97 responses, some of whom also attended the workshops) and telephone interviews;
• professionals – visits / interviews with 15 providers (ERPs, special schools, colleges, targeted services), an online survey (99 responses – majority from early years settings and primary schools), and workshops (24 attendees); and
• LA leaders, officers and partners – through a series of 1-to-1, small group and workshop discussions.

We are grateful to all who have given contributed to this review. We found not only broad consensus on what should be built upon and what needs to be developed, but also a willingness to work collaboratively and in a spirit of co-production to improve support and outcomes for young people with SEND. We hope the review helps to achieve those aims.
Introduction: SEND in the East Riding

The East Riding of Yorkshire is an unitary, county local authority formed in 1996. The county borders the North Sea to the east, the Humber estuary to the south, and North Yorkshire to the north and west. It also borders York to the west, and Kingston-upon-Hull, Doncaster and North Lincolnshire to the south.

The 2011 census estimated the population of the East Riding to have been 334,179 – 22% were aged 0-19 (24% nationally) and 5% aged 22-24 (7% nationally). According to the Index of Multiple Deprivation, the East Riding is the 118th most deprived in England. The 2017 school census data show that 2.4% of school-age children in the East Riding have a statement of SEND or education, health and care plan (EHCP). This is lower than the national rate (2.8%), but the East Riding rate has been rising by 0.1% annually since 2012. In 2017, 10.5% of school-age children in the East Riding were identified as needing SEN support (formerly school action / plus). This has dropped from 14.4% in 2012, mirroring the national trend (down from 17% in 2012 to 11.6% in 2016 and 2017).

Information & advice – available through the local offer and the Families Information Service Hub (FISH). Impartial advice and independent support is provided by SENDIASS (SEND Information, Advice and Support Service) and KIDS. The parent carer forum, East Riding Voices in Partnership (ERVIP), offer workshops and advice.

Support in mainstream education – this is provided in a large number of private, voluntary and independent early years settings, 4 nursery schools, 123 primary schools and 18 secondary schools across the county.

Targeted services – a range of targeted SEND services – education psychology, hearing, visual and physical disabilities, behaviour support (primary) and autism outreach, and a Children’s Disability Service. In addition, there is a range of targeted early years support, and both commissioned and voluntary groups providing targeted support for children and young people with SEND. The Clinical Commissioning Group commissions children’s therapy services and child & adolescent mental health (CAMHS).

Enhanced resource provisions (ERPs) – there are currently four autism ERPs (one primary, three secondary) and three for social, emotional and mental health needs (SEMH, all secondary). One of the second autism ERPs is due to close. Under a new model, the Hub will bring together alternative provision and most SEMH ERP places.

Special school provision – provided through three area special schools (in Goole, Brough and Driffield), with placements in a range of independent and non-maintained special schools (INMSSs).

Preparation for adulthood – pathways including East Riding College, Hull College, Bishop Burton College.
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Part 1: The eight themes we have explored through the review

We have set out our findings under eight specific themes across the continuum of SEND universal support, targeted services and specialist provision. Under each theme, we bring together the feedback, data analysis and survey responses we have gathered. The full breakdown of survey responses can be found at annex B (pp.45-48). Please note that, while we have used publicly-available data, there are some concerns about the accuracy of the underlying East Riding data that has informed the ‘Statements of SEN and EHC plans in England 2017’ (SEN2) data, which should be treated with caution.

1. **Identification and assessment** – how effectively needs are identified and assessed
2. **Information and access** – the clarity of information about and access to support
3. **Support in mainstream education early settings and schools**
4. **Targeted services** – including targeted education, health and care services
5. **Enhanced resourced provisions** – more specialist support in mainstream settings
6. **Special school provision** – current provision, trends and future demands
7. **Preparation for adulthood** – post-16 and post-19 pathways
8. **Social inclusion & support** – access to social activities for young people with SEND

---

For brevity, throughout the report we have used abbreviations and acronyms (e.g. SEND, LA etc.). A glossary of all abbreviations used can be found at annex A (p.44).
Part 1: Three overarching messages

1. Strategy and relationships
   Among the LA, strategic partner agencies and other professionals working across the SEND continuum, there was a shared sense of the strengths, challenges facing the local system, and the strategic vision for children and young people with SEND. Strategic partnership working between agencies, and relationships between the LA and providers, are generally seen to be strong, and have been pro-actively developed. Parent groups and LA leaders agreed about the need and opportunities to strengthen strategic partnership working.

2. The continuum of local SEND support, services and provision
   The continuum of SEND support, services and provision has been pro-actively developed, and comprises options ranging from support in mainstream, a broad offer of additional targeted support, ERPs for autism and SEMH, and a new model of three area special schools providing a consistent offer across the county. Our review suggests, however, that the way in which the different parts of the continuum are designed to fit together and the respective roles of each part should be revisited and rearticulated to ensure broad understanding. Our review also suggests that there are some specific needs of children and young people that are not being met currently by local services and provision. Lastly, our review identified some areas where the core systems and processes necessary for an effective SEND continuum could be strengthened – identification and assessment, effective oversight of placement decisions, recording of data, and communications.

3. Quality and accessibility of support and services
   There was positive feedback on local SEND services, particularly when they could be accessed in a straightforward and timely way, and involved expert professionals sharing strategies and building capacity to be inclusive. There were, however, concerns regarding the capacity, accessibility and availability of some key services. Many of the parents we engaged described more difficult experiences of accessing support. Many perceived the system to be defensive, adversarial and lacking in empathy. Parents and LA leaders agreed about the need to strengthen co-production to improve support for young people and families.
**Theme 1: Identification and assessment**

Colleagues reported that there are some valued means of early identification – parents were positive about portage services, while the Early Years Inclusion Service is seen as a valuable means for providing early support. Concerns were raised that “less obvious needs” (autism, SEMH and speech, language and communication needs, or SLCN) were not always identified early and accurately. Colleagues described how needs could be “sticking-plastered” early in a child’s education rather than being addressed swiftly, or how underlying causes were not identified until a child hit “crisis-point”. Some professionals reported instances where a child’s primary need as written on paper did not reflect their professional judgement about the actual primary need, and argued that clearer information about needs on key paperwork would improve assessment, data accuracy and strategic planning.

The data show a profile of need in the East Riding that is not in line with similar LAs or the national picture. There is little evidence to suggest this reflects fundamental differences in the underlying need locally. As such, this raises questions about the accuracy and consistency of identification and recording of need. The left-hand chart below shows that, in 2016, among pupils with identified SEN in East Riding mainstream schools (primary on the left, secondary on the right of the chart), there was a higher proportion with moderate learning difficulties (MLD) identified as their primary need, and a smaller proportion of pupils with SEMH, SLCN and autism than among similar LAs and nationally. The right-hand chart shows that, among pupils in East Riding special schools, a higher proportion have severe learning difficulties (SLD) as their primary need, and a lower proportion have SEMH and autism, than among similar LAs and nationally. Similar trends are evident in the data from previous years.
**Theme 1: Identification and assessment**

It is important to explore whether any inaccuracies in the profile of primary need as shown by the data are the result of inconsistencies in the core *processes* for recording and updating data on need (data being recorded inconsistently or incompletely, delays in completing assessments etc.), or in *practice* and *judgements* about needs (whether needs are being misidentified or not spotted at all in some instances). Our findings suggest that a combination of both could be at play here.

**A. Process factors** – professionals argued that a child’s identified primary need is not revisited consistently through annual reviews (and in some cases is not stated sufficiently clearly for professionals to review and update this). Given the delays in the autism assessment process, as well as the agreed need to develop a clearer diagnostic pathway for autism, noted by both parents and professionals, this may account for lower rates of autism according to the primary need data. Our analysis suggests that proportionately fewer EHCPs with autism as a primary need have been issued during the past three years compared to statements issued over four years ago. Professionals suggested that an autistic child’s primary need may, therefore, be recorded as something else before the received an autism diagnosis, and then not updated.

**B. Practice factors** – professionals, and to some extent parents and young people, described inconsistent approaches to identification of need in mainstream schools. For example, a large proportion of the pupils identified with MLD in mainstream schools are at SEN support. This means the primary need is reported by the school and not subject to external moderation. There was concern about whether mainstream schools had a consistent understanding of MLD and whether some were using the label inappropriately. We heard some examples of MLD being used as a catch-all label for children who were behind in their learning or being used incorrectly as “multiple learning difficulties”. This may also be masking other, underlying needs.

In making these points, we are not advocating a focus on “labelling” over effective assessment and meeting of needs. Rather, we are emphasising the need for both rich, holistic information to plan support for individual children while at the same time having accurate data on which to base strategic planning. The aspiration for the local system should be to have both, and for these to be mutually reinforcing.

‘Portage was our rock for everything.’ (Parent)

‘Portage – fabulous service. Early intervention from this service has improved my daughter’s long-term outcomes. … We felt extremely supported and cared for.’ (Parent)

‘We don’t always see the primary need on paperwork as being what we think of as the actual primary need.’ (Special school HT)

‘Lots of children on the autism spectrum do not have autism as a primary need, the autism cohort seems small. We have made huge strides in early diagnosis, but there are issues about labels sticking inappropriately.’ (Special school HT)
**Theme 1: Identification and assessment**

There was mixed feedback on the statutory assessment process – from professionals, there were some very positive comments on the work of EHCP Co-ordinators. Some particularly valued planning meetings and the engagement of parents and pupils.

**This feedback was not, however, consistent.** Some schools and settings argued that initial planning meetings duplicated work already done and were not a good use of time. Partner agencies described that communication about EHC planning meetings and reviews was inconsistent – late or no notice, no feedback on actions, and updated EHCPs not being shared routinely. Some parents described frustrating experiences, such as poor quality of plans, reports lost or not taken into account, delayed communication of draft / final plans and review outcomes, delayed EHCP transfers. The chart below shows that while the proportion of EHCPs completed within 20 weeks remains above the average for similar LAs, it has dropped from 88% in 2015 to 67% in 2016. Some parents argued they felt they were the ones battling to hold the planning process together, rather than professionals working seamlessly to support the child and family. Some recognised the pressure on the EHCP Co-ordinators in juggling the statutory process and ongoing casework – the LA has recognised this and is planning to separate these roles. It is important to note, however, that while some of the issues described by parents relate to capacity, some also relate to culture.

Concerns were raised about the long waiting-times for autism assessments. The current pathway was not seen to be understood consistently by professionals and parents. Work is currently underway to develop a clearer pathway for autism referral, assessment and support.

‘Our lives are in their hands ... a bit of empathy would not go amiss.’ (Parent)

‘There is no communication ... trying to get through to the SEN team is exhausting. On the rare occasions the switchboard answers they take messages which are barely returned.’ (Parent)

‘The SEN team are not parent-orientated at all and have little empathy with families who are on a daily basis at the end of their tether. A more open attitude to forming relationships with parents would help.’ (Parent)

‘The EHCP process is not easy ... we have to chase, constantly chase. The caseworkers are fantastic when they come in – involving parents, holistic meetings. It is getting to that point that is so frustrating.’ (Primary SENCO)

---

Data source: Statements of SEN and EHC plans, England, 2017 (DfE); East Riding figures have been updated to reflect internal data – the published figures are erroneous.
Theme 2: Information about and access to support

We found broad consensus about the need to redevelop the local offer as a more practical, interactive, visual tool – and less of a static directory – to help parents and professionals navigate the system. In 2013, the local offer was co-constructed with parents and children and young people. Professionals recognised the value of having a local offer, and welcomed the work to bring together information about SEND support and services, but argued this could be improved. Many parents expressed strong views that, as currently configured, the local offer specifically and information about support more broadly, did not meet their needs. Professionals and parents would prefer to see a local offer that provided a broad overview of the SEND continuum, support pathways (including universal, targeted and special support) for different types of needs, and details and how and when to engage those services. LA officers and partners agree, and are planning work to strengthen the local offer.

We also heard very positive feedback on the provision of impartial advice and support to parents. We heard many extremely positive comments from parents about the support they had received from KIDS or SENDIASS. Parents clearly value not only the advice provided, but also its quality and the way those organisations work with families. There was, however, some confusion about the respective roles of KIDS and SENDIASS, which need to be made clearer to parents and professionals. Some schools commented that they found the approach of KIDS and SENDIASS overly challenging and antagonistic. There was positive feedback on ERVIP workshops and information, but also comments on the need to increase membership and inclusivity. The LA has a service-level agreement with and funds ERVIP to increase its membership.

We asked both parents and professionals if there was clear information about support. The responses were very different. Only 2 in 10 parents agreed: over 8 in 10 strongly / disagreed (82%).

Among professionals, just under 8 in 10 (77%) strongly / agreed. The pattern of responses were very similar across primary schools and early years.

‘I find the local offer website very useful, and also the SEND team are very helpful.’ (EY leader)
‘It's been very hard to access support. Most things we have to find for ourselves, or through asking other parents.’ (Parent)
‘Having the area SENCO is very helpful for information and support. ... The local offer is a useful tool, however, it needs to be better laid out and easier to find information and support.’ (EY SENCO)
‘You only know where to go when you are dropped in at the deep end. You have to find it yourself. You stumble across things, you get lucky.’ (Parent)
‘I would like to have clearer guidance about the support that is available for different areas of need and clear signposting about how to access this support.’ (Secondary SENCO)

‘ERVIP has provided useful seminars and are a good point of contact. The support from SENDIASS – especially in getting the EHCP under way – has been absolutely invaluable.’ (Parent)
‘The provision of independent supporters from KIDS was excellent.’ (Parent)
‘The local offer is a useful tool, however, it needs to be better laid out and easier to find information and support.’ (EY SENCO)

Among professionals, just under 8 in 10 (77%) strongly / agreed. The pattern of responses were very similar across primary schools and early years.
Theme 2: Information about and access to support

In terms of access to support, we have highlighted some message from parents in relation to their overall experience of accessing support. Overall, many parents commented on difficulties getting hold of services and professionals. Some recognised that those teams are stretched – and indeed some commented positively on the support they had had from individual EHCP Coordinators – but also how they felt they had to chase to get information and support.

These views were echoed by professionals. Overall, many professionals argued that the local system could be reactive, slow to respond, adversarial (having one’s professional judgement questioned, having to prove a child was at crisis-point before support was considered), bureaucratic (turning down requests because a form had been filled out incorrectly), and lacking in dialogue, understanding and a spirit of co-production. Mainstream early years settings and schools perceived that some services adopted a “wait-and-see” approach – they recognised the value of a graduated response, but also argued that there was often a need for a more flexible, swift response in some circumstances, including quicker access to professional advice, training, and potentially short-term funding. They also argued for a more flexible approach to top-up funding to meet a wider range of needs in mainstream settings and schools. Early years settings were concerned that there was a lack of clarity about who was responsible for paying for the cost of additional support for children who accessed more than the free entitlement. Special schools argued that they would welcome more dialogue and a more strategic, less “ad hoc”, approach to placements and admissions.

We asked parents and professionals about the process for accessing support. Again, we found over 8 in 10 strongly / disagreed (84%).

Among professionals, just over half (54%) strongly / agreed. Primary schools were more likely to disagree, than early years: 47% of primary schools strongly / agreed, while 50% strongly / disagreed.

‘Services are now extremely hard to get hold of and usually slow to respond. I am forever chasing many services up. It is easy to slip out of the system.’ (Parent)

‘Very little support until you activity hunt it down and grab it! Or pester people constantly.’ (Parent)

‘Our worker has been helpful and worked tirelessly on our draft EHCP.’ (Parent)

‘It is often difficult to know which service to access and who works for what service.’ (Primary HT)

‘Communication is a massive issue in the whole of SEND ... I really like the leaders. I will send an email and they will signpost. But we then ring others and they are not there or don’t get back to you.’ (Secondary SEND lead)
Theme 3: Support in mainstream education early years settings and schools

Parents and young people described some very positive examples of support they had received in mainstream early years settings and schools. In particular, they valued (a) an inclusive leadership and ethos (‘we found a headteacher who really does make sure “every child matters”’); (b) well-trained staff or those willing to develop their understanding; (c) small, practical adjustments; and (d) two-way dialogue about how home and school could support one another. Young people valued being listened to and feeling like teachers and staff cared about them, as well good, imaginative, and suitably differentiated teaching.

Equally, the feedback we gathered suggests this is not a consistent picture across the local area. Parents described examples of a lack of understanding and flexibility, isolation, reduced timetables, exclusion (formal and informal), and a lack of willingness to meet a child’s needs. Young people were concerned about isolation (both educational and social), bullying, restraints and fighting. Transitions, particularly primary-to-secondary but pre-school and post-16 as well, were highlighted as an area for development. Many of these comments relate to schools; there were relatively few comments about early years specifically.

As the chart below shows, the East Riding places a higher proportion of pupils with new EHCPs in mainstream schools than similar LAs and the national average. This reflects a commitment to inclusion, but also places a premium on ensuring accurate identification and consistently effective support in mainstream schools. Our analysis indicates that, over the last three years, a higher proportion of EHCPs have been issued for MLD, SEMH and SLCN. Over 70% of children with these needs are placed in mainstream school, which indicates that building capacity to support these needs in mainstream schools should be a priority.

Data source: Statements of SEN and EHC plans, England, 2017 (DfE)
Theme 3: Support in mainstream education early years settings and schools

Colleagues value the SENCO networks and want these to be sustained and developed. SENCOs argued that the networks are a key opportunity to bring SEND professionals together to enhance practice. They consider, however, that these meetings could be more strategically planned and more practice-focused – they recognise (and indeed welcome) the fact some work on this has started already. We note that parents can also inform SENCO meetings through ERVIP’s feedback. SENCOs would value a forward planner, setting out the themes for meetings across the year. Using meetings to focus on a national development, item of research, form of need or support strategy, with a clear focus on building capacity and enhancing practice. They would also value more deliberate planning of the aspects of meetings that would benefit from cross-phase or phase-specific working.

At the same time, colleagues argued that there needed to be a comprehensive, rolling programme of SEND training and support. Some SENCOs, including those who had worked recently in other local areas, commented that there was a less well-developed offer for SENCOs in the East Riding. Such a programme could include SENCO induction, strengthening identification and practice enhancement around specific needs (as noted on the previous page, particularly MLD, SLCN and SEMH, as well as autism), support strategies (drawing on practice within the East Riding system and beyond), and facilitated peer-to-peer / cluster / action research projects. There are also opportunities to involve parents in developing and running this training – such as inclusion quality-marks, effective work with families, effective planning and review processes. Equally, however, a strong message was that the focus of this support should be not only on SENCOs, but also on whole-school inclusion and improvement.

In our online survey, we asked professionals whether there was currently the right offer of support in mainstream education settings and schools. Responses were split.

Of the 99 respondents, just over half strongly / agreed (52%, shown in blue), a quarter strongly / disagreed (25%, shown in grey), and 2 in 10 (orange) could not say. Primary schools were more likely to agree (58%) but also more likely to disagree (34%); 51% of early years agreed, 41% replied ‘cannot say’.

‘Lots of the support goes through SENCOs, but there is not training for those staff working with pupils in the classroom. We need to shift the assumption that SEND is someone else’s responsibility.’ (Primary HT)

‘SENCO networks generally disseminate information, but are not practice-focused. They are trying more, asking us what we need.’ (Primary SENCO)

‘[We need] training for school staff to intervene in mental health issues in school, but give diagnostic tools to move a child quickly to the next stage when required.’ (Primary HT)

‘In the mainstream school, I had to write all plans, plan all reviews, I was in school every day (mainly around his support). It was a constant battle. I felt he was this hot potato that no-one knew what to do with. I was having to look for information myself, then telling the SENCO what they should be doing. There is not enough information and support given to mainstream staff. I couldn’t wait to get him out.’ (Parent)
Theme 4: Targeted services

Where professionals felt access to LA targeted services was straightforward and timely, they were positive about the quality of support. It is noteworthy that the East Riding, despite being a low-funded LA, invests a higher proportion of its high needs block in central SEND services than similar LAs. The fact that the feedback under this theme has been more positive than we have found in similar reviews in other areas reflects the fact the professionals recognise the investment in sustaining these services. The caveat, however, is ease and speed of access – where concerns were raised, these related to capacity, availability, speed of access and consistency. Where access was straightforward and timely, the feedback was positive on both the quality of support but also the ways of working with settings and schools – specifically on the knowledge, skills and ability to build capacity and expertise, rather than simply writing reports. In particular, there was very positive feedback from professionals on the sensory & physical teaching service (SaPTS), behaviour support, and educational psychology.

In terms of social care, professionals were positive about the Early Help and Safeguarding Hub (EHaSH), but there were challenging messages from parents about access to support from the Disabled Children’s Service. The EHaSH process and offer of support was viewed positively by professionals, although a small number requested greater clarity on what was available. Several parents shared more challenging messages about the Disabled Children’s Service, including a perceived lack of clarity about whether their child met the criteria for support, which parents argued was proving very stressful for some families.

In our survey of professionals, we asked if there was currently the right offer of targeted services. The responses were mixed. Overall, 4 in 10 of the 99 professionals who responded to our survey strongly agreed (3%) or agreed (37%), as shown in blue; but the same proportion also disagreed (39%) or strongly disagreed (2%), shown in grey. Just under 2 in 10 (18%) could not say, shown in orange.

- ‘The support given by the staff of the SaPTS was outstanding … the first time anyone had really taken the time to get to know my child’s needs. It has made a fantastic improvement.’ (Parent)
- ‘The tier of behaviour support is outstanding. They are there when we need them and support us in school as required. They are reliable and extremely knowledgeable.’ (Primary HT)
- ‘There are lots of services to access and the right people are then used to support the pupils and families.’ (Primary HT)
- ‘I have sadly found nothing easy or well managed about accessing support [from the Disabled Children’s Service] … I genuinely think this will push some parents to the brink.’ (Parent)
- ‘School educational psychologist is effective in offering guidance and signposting to other services.’ (Secondary SENCO)
- ‘The support we have received has always been very constructive. Our difficulties, however, have been the delay in accessing services.’ (EY SENCO)

Universal support | Targeted services | Specialist provision
Theme 4: Targeted services

There was positive feedback on the quality of some targeted health services, such as children’s therapy services and, in some instances, CAMHS. This was, however, in the context of concerns about availability and access. Two specific gaps were highlighted.

First, there is a lack of support from therapy services (occupational, physio and speech & language) for children who do not have significant physical difficulties or who are aged 19-25. These services are not commissioned, and therefore not available, locally. This gap was highlighted from professionals from these therapy services, who find that they are asked to provide this support as additional, ad hoc work, for example when related to Tribunal cases, but rely on the good will of their staff to complete this in addition to their commissioned work. It has also been highlighted by parents, frustrated that these services are not available.

Second, parents and professionals raised strong concerns about access to mental health support. This is a theme we often encounter in other local areas, and we recognise the mismatch between demand for and capacity within local CAMHS. Some concerns raised in the East Riding reflected issues of capacity – long waiting-times, a lack of support before a child reached crisis-point. Equally, however, parents described a lack of clarity about pathways, being passed between different branches of CAMHS, feeling they were being blamed rather than being listened to, and generic parenting courses that did not meet their needs. Our findings suggest that there would be value in plotting out the whole SEMH continuum, and working with professionals and parents to address these issues. We know that work focusing on pre-CAMHS support and overall SEMH continuum is underway.

Parents and professionals, from both education and health services, also commented on a lack of join-up between education and health services – specifically in relation to involvement in EHC assessments and reviews, and core systems and processes.

Our survey asked if there was currently the right offer of targeted support in the local area. Responses from early years and primary schools were markedly different. Among early years, the most common response (43%) was ‘cannot say’ – many had not accessed targeted support. Among primary schools, as shown in the graphic below, half (50%) disagreed and 45% agreed. Where they disagreed, the most common reasons given were concerns about access to CAMHS and speech & language therapy (SaLT).

- ‘What works well?’ The model of support adopted by the SaLT service.’ (EY SENCO)
- ‘When we get access to physical therapists and SaLT, this is very good … it’s simply insufficient.’ (Primary HT)
- ‘Physio is impossible to get and when you do receive it you are quickly discharged … OT is now non-existent, but they provide an absolutely invaluable, practical service. Same for SaLT.’ (Parent)
- ‘Accessing CAMHS has been very difficult – 10 referrals were sent in a 12-month period, but we received very little help and at times were given some appalling advice. However, when my child hit crisis-point last year, we were allocated to a different worker who referred to a psychiatrist, which has been positive.’ (Parent)
- ‘Another gap is CAMHS. Communications is terrible, parents are constantly having to chase. We need more, more than CAMHS. We have made two referrals, but heard nothing. They then came in, did some assessments, but there was no feedback to us.’ (Primary HT)
Theme 5: Enhanced resource provisions

There is broad support for and recognition of the value of establishing ERPs. Professionals recognise that the LA has been proactive in establishing ERPs, and that they play an important role in the local SEND continuum. There is also broad consensus that the ERPs have been established with the right areas of focus, autism and SEMH, given young people with these needs have often had to be placed out-of-county. There is support from professionals for establishing more ERPs, particularly more secondary autism and primary SEMH provision. Published data suggest that the East Riding makes proportionately less use of ERPs and similar provision than similar LAs. This may reflect a previous lack of local ERP provision.

There is the need to ensure the role and purpose of the ERPs are understood consistently. Different models of provision can go under the title of “unit” or “resourced provision”. It is vital that there is a clear and consistent understanding between strategic leaders, commissioners, those taking placement decisions and professionals in the ERPs about the strategic purpose, needs catered for, support capacity (including any outreach role), day-to-day practice, CPD requirements, and fit with the rest of the SEND continuum. Our evidence suggests that there would be value in rearticulating these aspects of the ERPs role and practice, to ensure that the ERPs are in a position to meet local needs effectively, as well as increasing awareness of the ERPs among parents and professionals to inform choice and placement decisions. It would also be worth considering formally registering the ERPs and funding them on a place-plus-top-up basis, to formalise these arrangements and improve transparency.

We asked professionals if there was the right offer of specialist (both ERP and special school) provision in the East Riding. Overall, a quarter (25%) strongly / agreed, just under half (45%) strongly / disagreed, and just under a third (29%) could not say.

Primary schools were more likely to disagree than other respondents – 7 in 10 disagreed (50%) or strongly disagreed (18%), with 13% agreeing and 18% unable to say. Those who disagreed cited the gap between mainstream and special school provision.

‘Instead of treating you as a piece of paper, a student to pass through the class, they get to know you [here], what you are getting on with. They have more experience of children like us. At my old school, they used to say “if you misbehave, we’ll call SEND or SLT”. They didn’t understand how to deal with you.’ (ERP pupil)

‘I get more education here. In my old school, I was in an empty room with no support.’ (ERP pupil)

‘There is no nurture support locally and schools are daily dealing with incredibly challenging situations where children and adults are at risk.’ (Primary HT)

‘There is a large gap between the offer of a special school and secondary setting without any “in between” support.’ (Secondary SENCO)

‘I don’t feel as a headteacher that they share the vision with us. … … There could be a bit more of a strategic view on placement decisions.’ (HT of school that hosts an ERP)
**Theme 6: Special school provision**

We heard some very positive feedback on the current offer of local special school provision. As the quotes below illustrate, the provision offered by the three special schools in the East Riding is valued highly by parents, who commented positively not only on the education and social activities offered by the special schools, but also on how their support for and communication with families and the wider community. Overall, there was broad support for the move to an area special school model, in terms of ensuring an equitable offer across all parts of the county and avoiding the need for children to travel long distances to reach school. This is a model that has been developed successfully in other, largely rural local areas.

There were also, however, questions raised about how certain forms of needs would be met by local special school provision. This was not a criticism of the existing provision, but rather a question of how certain combinations of needs could be met within the local special school. Two areas were highlighted. First, while the majority of professionals understood the rationale for the redesignation of Riverside (from a MLD school to an area special school focusing on more complex needs), they argued there needed to be greater clarity about how the capacity would be built up in mainstream schools to support these needs. There was some concern voiced by both parents and professionals about this transition. Internal data, as shown in the chart below, suggest that the LA has issued a higher proportion of EHCPs in the last three with MLD as the primary need when compared with statements issued four or more years ago. (This is also the case for SEMH and SLCN.) Given that a high proportion of children with new EHCPs are placed in mainstream schools, compared to similar LAs and the national picture, this underscores the importance of taking a pro-active approach to build the capacity of mainstream settings to meet these needs, and of giving parents confidence about this. The second area that was highlighted is described on the next page.

'The school has played a very important part in enhancing [my son’s] personality. There is not a single day when he doesn’t want to go to school.’ (Parent)

'The teachers and the staff help because they want me to learn, they want me to do things.’ (Young person)

'This was like banging your head against a wall with the LA due to the total lack of provision for children like my son ... I have not been able to access the right support in the East Riding for my son’s education, and he has had to travel out-of-county.’ (Parent)

'The three special schools provide excellent provision and offer support to families and other settings. There are some valuable and effective support networks for children and their families.’ (Special school HT)
The second area highlighted were the needs of children who were currently being placed out-of-county. The two main areas where gaps were highlighted by professionals and parents were SEMH and high-functioning autism. We have used this feedback and tested it against the available data. Given some of the concerns raised about some of the data on primary need, as described earlier in this report, we considered that this triangulation between the fieldwork and the data would provide the most useful way of identifying possible gaps and future priorities for reshaping and commissioning provision.

The data shows that a higher proportion of children and young people with EHCPs placed out-of-county have SEMH and autism as their primary need than those placed in local provision. This is summarised in the chart on the left. Comparisons between in-county special schools, other LA special schools and independent / non-maintained special schools (INMSSs) are shown in the chart on the right. These charts provide support for the message we heard from professionals and parents that there were gaps in provision for children with SEMH and high-functioning autism. (Interestingly, the same trend is also seen in the mainstream sector – children with EHCPs placed in mainstream schools in other LAs are more likely to have SEMH and autism as their primary need.) We recognise that some East Riding children attend schools in other LAs that are closer to where they live, and also that placements in the INMSS sector can be the right placement for an individual child. What we wanted to explore, however, was whether there are children who have to be placed in out-of-county provision because their needs are not being met by local specialist provision. Our evidence suggests gaps in provision for complex SEMH and, to a lesser extent, high-functioning autism.

**Comparison of primary need - in-county vs. out-of-county placements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autism</th>
<th>SEMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-county</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-county</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of primary need of pupils placed in special schools, in and out of county**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All INMSS</th>
<th>Other LA special</th>
<th>In-county special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMH</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other needs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: LA data
Theme 6: Special school provision

The evidence suggests that there are two groups of children with EHCPs who need specialist provision, but whose needs are not being met by local provision: children with SEMH and autism. Of the 81 children placed in INMSSs, 29 have SEMH and 19 have autism (a further 11 have SLCN) as their primary need. The fieldwork suggested that these are children with complex SEMH, often with other communication and learning needs, and those with high-functioning autism. From the data available to us, we cannot draw further conclusions about their needs or the appropriate form of provision – e.g. whether this could met through The Hub’s new offer, the ERPs or other provision. We hope, however, that this provides the focus for further analysis to inform how children with similar needs could be supported locally in the future. We do know, as shown by the chart below, that the majority of these children are secondary-age – 72% with SEMH, 68% of those with autism. (The other two needs where there is a higher proportion educated out-of-county are PMLD and HI. The numbers are, however, small. Most children with PMLD are in other LA special schools and most with HI are in other LA mainstream schools.)

Special school leaders are keen to work collaboratively to develop means to meet more of these needs locally. In previous research, we described the Manchester special school partnership, through which resources that would have been spent on out-of-city placements were devolved to special schools collectively in order to meet a wider range of complex needs, including SEMH, locally. There is enthusiasm to develop a similar approach in the East Riding, with the special schools, and potentially the ERPs, working together and with the LA and partners to develop bespoke support for children would otherwise go out-of-county.

Placements in INMSSs - age breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8-10yo</th>
<th>11-13yo</th>
<th>14-16yo</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEMH</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: LA data
**What, then, does this tell us about future demand for specialist provision?** If current trends continue, we would expect to see an increase in the total number of children and young people with EHCPs of around 50 per year. The left-hand chart below shows the trend in the proportion of school-age children with a statement or EHCP. (Data is not available for pre-school children and post-16 young people.) This shows that the proportion of children with a statement of EHCP educated in East Riding schools is 2.4%, and has been increasing by 0.1% annually since 2012. If this trend continues, this would equate to an addition 50 new EHCPs each year. Internal data suggest that one in three children with a statement / EHCP attend a special school. Again, assuming this trend continues, we would expect to see the need for an additional 17 places in special schools each year. We know, however, that capacity within East Riding special schools is under pressure. For example, the right-hand chart shows that more EHCPs have been issued in the last four years (highlighted in green) to INMSS and local mainstream schools than East Riding special schools. Agreeing appropriate place numbers with the special schools and Education & Skills Funding Agency will be vital.

**It is more difficult to make firm predictions about the types of needs of children requiring specialist provision, given the concerns around the primary need data highlighted earlier.** For these reasons, we would want to be cautious about making projections of future need based on these. Instead, we have sought to triangulate our fieldwork findings and the data to show the needs that are not being met by local provision currently. Work to strengthen the primary need data could then be undertaken, which could then be used for further analysis and refined projections of future need.

---

**Theme 6: Special school provision**

**Universal support**

**Targeted services**

**Specialist provision**

---

**% pupils with statements or EHCP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>East Riding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comparison of placement by age of statement / EHCP**

- **INMSS**
- **Other LA special**
- **In-county special**
- **Other LA mainstream**
- **In-county mainstream**

**Data source: SEN in England 2017**

---

**Data source: LA data**
There was broad consensus that a priority for the future should be the development of pathways and support to enable young people aged 16-25 to prepare for adult life. There was a strong message from parents, young people, SEN professionals, LA officers and partners that long-term outcomes for young people, including routes into paid employment, could be improved with the right support and pathways in place. Several schools and colleges were in the process of fostering links with community groups and employers themselves, but argued that this agenda needed greater co-ordination in order to give young people the widest range of options. They also argued that more pro-active planning was required, both for individual young people (they argued that this often started too late and could be somewhat piecemeal) and at a strategic level (drawing together young people’s aspirations to inform pro-active commissioning of pathways). The young people to whom we spoke described a range of aspirations, including working in the sciences (we met budding biologists, physicists, mathematicians and engineers), academia, creative arts (acting, directing, producing), digital (working in IT, games design), the police (in forensics) or the army, transport, retail, hospitality, sport, teaching and animal care. These young people are in the system currently – the challenge is ensuring feedback about their and others’ aspirations are collated and used to inform future commissioning. Encouragingly, there is a willingness among partners to work together to achieve this. Likewise, the LA has recently appointed a lead for this agenda, which should provide the co-ordination, pro-activity and drive needed to improve the range of 16-25 pathways for young people.

We asked professionals if SEND support, services and provision prepared young people effectively for adult life. Unsurprisingly, given the majority of responses came from early years settings and primary schools, a large proportion (46%, shown in orange in the graphic) could not say. Of the rest, 32% strongly / agreed, while 21% strongly / disagreed.

Recent feedback gathered by ERVIP suggests that half of parents surveyed did not think current SEND provision fully prepares young people for adult life.

- ‘There is a lack of opportunities post-19 – e.g. supported internships.’ (LA officer)
- ‘We haven’t been able to access any appropriate post-19 provision. There is just day-care provision for the more severely disabled.’ (Parent)
- ‘We are focusing on what we need to fund, rather than on the ambitions of young people. We are not using this to inform commissioning. In the past, we have failed some young people by just doing the same old thing.’ (LA officer)
- ‘If you want to be the best of what you can be, you need to carry on and see how far that gets you.’ (Young person)
- ‘I think we need to do more work with laptops. It’s 2017, and you barely use computers in the sixth form, and yet you cannot get a job without knowing how to use a computer. … I’m more into this than cleaning animals. Some people love this, and gardening. It’s not my cup of tea.’ (Young person)
Many of the young people to whom we spoke described strong networks of friends. Many of these were, however, based predominantly around school, particularly for young people who attended a special school. Although they were not necessarily complaining, many of these young people described not having similar networks where they lived and consequently not having a lot to do in their communities beyond solitary activities (watching TV, playing computer games). Parents and professionals were of the view that more was needed to facilitate young people being brought together around shared social interests and pastimes, and to foster locally-based peer networks. They noted the challenges of doing this in a largely rural area. Parents and young people also raised concerns about the lack of social support for young people with SEND in mainstream education settings – both to enable young people with SEND to take part in social activities with their peers, but also to support activities specifically for young people with SEND. Some young people and parents were positive about activities such as the special Olympics and sports teams for disabled young people, but also argued that the offer of such activities should be broader than sport.

A number of parents also argued that there was more that needed to be done to increase awareness of SEND and ensure equitable access within community facilities. These included gyms, leisure centres, youth clubs, groups such as scouts and guides, and other community-based recreation activities. A number of parents also cited examples where issues had arisen due to a lack of understanding and training for professionals working in public and home-to-school transport.

Theme 8: Social inclusion and support

Universal support

Targeted services

Specialist provision

A lot of the activities you can access are things that have been set up by other parents. For others, the parents have to stay with their child, which is not always easy to do because of time. Because some services are discriminatory, young people become isolated and introverted. Places like leisure complexes, parks, clubs, children with SEND want to take part alongside their non-disabled peers. They want to be able to go to the gym on their own, as their peers would, without their parents in tow. (Parent)

‘The level of support in out-of-school activities provided by the local East Riding Council is excellent. I will remember the two lads who organised the special Olympic games forever. Their work and empathy for the children was priceless. It was one of the best days my daughter has had. We are looking forward to more fun with that team again this year.’ (Parent)

‘I love playing football, but there are not many sports clubs for young people with disabilities.’ (Young person)

‘Mainly I have friends from school. I have some friends at home, but mainly my friends are from my school.’ (Young person)

‘Some young people don’t feel like they can socialise because they have special needs or learning difficulties.’ (Young person)

‘Some young people get comments from their peers – like, ‘why have they got special paper?’ – because they don’t understand, because it has not been explained to them.’ (Young person)

‘My son was socially excluded all through secondary school. Nothing was put in place.’ (Parent)

‘The level of support in out-of-school activities provided by the local East Riding Council is excellent. I will remember the two lads who organised the special Olympic games forever. Their work and empathy for the children was priceless. It was one of the best days my daughter has had. We are looking forward to more fun with that team again this year.’ (Parent)
Overall, there are key strengths, but two overarching challenges

**Overall, during our evidence-gathering, we found many strengths of the local SEND system.** These include services providing impartial advice to parents, some mainstream support, the quality of some targeted services, and local special school provision. In many areas, the feedback we have gathered, from professionals particularly, has been more positive than that which we have heard in other local areas where we have carried out similar reviews. Most importantly, while SEN is an area where there will always be the need to adapt and develop support to meet changing needs and choices, there is broad consensus about what is working well and what the priorities should be for the future, and positive feedback on strategic relationships between the LA, partner agencies and providers needed to pursue those priorities.

**There are, however, two sets of overarching challenges.** First, from professionals, there is the challenge of ensuring core systems and processes support the effective day-to-day operation of the local system and can inform effective strategic planning and pro-active commissioning. Second, from parents, there is the challenge of ensuring that they feel listened to and supported by a system that is working with them. The charts below, taken from our online surveys, demonstrate the scale of this second challenge. It shows that, among the parents we engaged, there are strong views that the current offer is not enabling them to access the support they need. Key to addressing both challenges will be working closely with parents and professionals in a spirit of co-production.

**"Overall the current offer of SEND support, services & provision works well."**

- **Agree:** 86%
- **Disagree:** 26%

**"Overall, I have been able to access the right support."** (Parents)

- **Strongly agree:** 54%
- **Agree:** 22%
- **Disagree:** 15%
- **Strongly disagree:** 3%
- **Cannot say:** 6%
Introduction – Background and aims of the review

Part 1 – Key findings

Part 2 – Options and recommendations

Conclusion – taking forward the findings of this review
Part 2: Options and recommendations

**Theme 1: Identification and assessment**

1. **Improve the consistency and accuracy of identification and use this to inform individual and strategic planning.** As described in Part 1, the data show that East Riding has a different profile of primary need to similar LAs, and our evidence suggests this may reflect issues of both process and practice. Addressing this will require a multi-faceted approach. First, this will involve ensuring robust internal processes are in place for identifying needs and capturing data in an appropriate form – e.g. ensuring data on needs and trends is captured by the Early Years Inclusion Service to inform future planning, ensuring core datasets on needs are used in a consistent and easily-analysable manner. Second, this will involve ensuring that a child’s needs are identified clearly on relevant paperwork so they can be considered and updated through annual reviews. Third, this will involve developing more consistent understanding and practice in relation to identifying needs, particularly in mainstream settings and schools, and ensuring that there is clarity about how certain types of needs should be understood. The SENCOs we engaged would welcome these discussions, which could take place through SENCO networks. As we emphasised in Part 1, this is not about focusing on “labels”, but rather ensuring needs are identified clearly, accurately, and can be used to inform effective individual and strategic planning.

2. **Develop a clear pathway for autism assessment and support.** In Part 1, we noted the comments on the long waiting-times for autism diagnostic assessments and the lack of clarity about the overall pathway. There is the need to set out clearly how the autism assessment and support pathway should work. Work is underway to do so, and there are opportunities for co-production with professionals and families. There is then the need to use data and feedback routines to look at trends, rates of referrals, and specific bottlenecks in the process, with the aim to ensure swifter and more accurate assessments.

3. **Refine the statutory assessment and placement process.** We recognise that a restructure is underway currently that is designed to enable the LA to address some of the challenges detailed in this report. As well as the structure of the team, consideration should be given to (a) developing core service standards around communications and culture (e.g. maximum response times, an easily contactable first point-of-contact); (b) streamlining the statutory assessment process around aspects some providers have found duplicative (e.g. the initial planning meeting); (c) putting in place protocols governing how external agencies will be involved in, communicated to about, and expected to contribute to assessments and reviews; and (d) building in more strategic oversight and dialogue with providers during the placement process.
### Part 2: Options and recommendations

**Theme 2: Information about and access to support**

1. **Redevelop the local offer as an accessible, practical tool for parents and professionals.** Parents and professionals have argued that the local offer is not currently as effective as they would like it to be. There is a big opportunity here not only to revise the local offer, but to co-produce a more accessible, practical local offer with parents and professionals. Our review suggests they would value something that provides a more visual overview of the SEND continuum, perhaps broken down by the four categories of need and/or age, with clear “flow-charts” or similar showing what support is available at the universal, targeted and specialist level, how those services can be accessed, and who to contact to request their involvement. We suggest a small task-and-finish group of parents and cross-phase SENCOs are brought together to agree the principles and shape the design of a new local offer. We suggest, furthermore, that routines are put in place for a similar group to review the content so that it can be kept up-to-date. Recognising that some parents and professionals may not find the information they need or may prefer to speak to someone directly, you may want to ensure the message about who to contact if in doubt is displayed prominently throughout the local offer and other communications: the FISH call-centre is already set up to play this role. Colleagues agreed that a message about contacting FISH if in doubt about any information on the local offer could be displayed more prominently.

2. **Consider how to develop swifter and more flexible routes to accessing support.** A strong message from early years settings and schools was the need for swifter access to support – they were critical of what they saw as a “wait-and-see” approach, with support available when a child reached crisis-point and then only through the statutory assessment process. Professionals wanted to see a route for accessing swift professional advice, rapid response support, short-term funding, and fast-track access in cases of clear-cut and very complex needs. Colleagues also argued that more flexible top-up funding should be considered to enable mainstream settings to meet a wider range of needs. There were frustrations that top-up funding approaches differed between the East Riding and neighbouring LAs. This need not mean additional resources. Instead, we would suggest working closely with schools to agree how best to balance investment in short-term, flexible support with resources available for longer-term top-up funding and provision.

3. **Clarify the respective roles of KIDS and SENDIASS.** Within a re-designed local offer and in any communications to parents about the statutory assessment process and access to impartial advice and support, the respective roles of these two services, what each does (and does not do), when and how to engage them, need to be set out clearly.
Part 2: Options and recommendations

Theme 3: Support in mainstream education early years settings and schools

1. Rearticulate in clear, practical terms the expectations of effective identification, inclusion and support in mainstream settings and schools. While we heard positive examples, inconsistency across settings and schools and some negative examples were also themes in the feedback. Lots of what parents and young people said, which are characteristics of effective practice, relate to simple, practical adjustments, based on understanding a child’s needs and how best to support them. In some instances, these may require specific tools to differentiate teaching or track progress, specific support strategies, input from external services, the effective use of additional resources, or more bespoke options. What is clear, however, is that there would be value in revisiting and rearticulating these expectations in clear, practical terms. It is vital that these expectations are not set out in isolation, but are linked to a comprehensive offer of support (and, where appropriate, challenge), not only for SENCOs, but also school leaders and governors. Related to this, but relevant specifically to the early years, there is the need to ensure there is clarity about the responsibilities for providing additional support for children with SEND whose parents wish to access hours above the free entitlement, particularly in the context of the extension of the free entitlement to 30 hours. A joined-up approach across SEND and support for school improvement has a key role to play here. This also presents a co-production opportunity, namely to work with parents, young people and professionals to shape expectations and marks of effective mainstream practice.

2. Link these expectations to a comprehensive offer of support. There are two parts to this. First, building on the already highly-valued SENCO networks, develop a forward planner for the SENCO meeting agendas, focused on knowledge and practice enhancement, and identify specific all-SENCO and phase-specific activities. The SENCO networks could become the hub for specific peer-to-peer projects (e.g. action research, cross-phase work on effective transition), with some facilitation support. Second, there is the need to develop a rolling programme of training for professionals involved in SEND, not only SENCOs, but also targeted at school leaders and governors. The aim here should be not only to develop the knowledge and practice of local SENCOs, which should include fostering effective identification and support around needs including MLD, SLCN, SEMH and autism, but also to foster effective leadership and whole-school inclusion. Colleagues wanted a consistent expectation that SENCOs to be part of their school’s leadership team. This could be set out as good practice, and supported with CPD focused on developing SEND and leadership skills. Again, there are opportunities to work with professionals, partners and parents to co-design and sustain this programme.
Part 2: Options and recommendations

Theme 4: Targeted services

1. **Strengthen the consistency of support from LA central SEND services.** The feedback received on the current offer of LA central targeted SEND services was largely positive, and much more so than compared to other local areas where we have done similar reviews. The main concerns did not relate to specific gaps in services, but rather the consistency and capacity of certain targeted services. Largely, our recommendation here is about sustaining services that are clearly valued, and ensuring that their capacity, particularly where it is under pressure, is utilised to best effect. The Educational Psychology Service is one where feedback from many professionals was positive, but some concerns were raised about consistency and capacity. Again, there is a good opportunity to continue to work with professionals to get feedback on where targeted services could use their resources and capacity to best effect, and where more could be done through other, more universal services.

2. **Address the concerns raised about support from social care services.** The feedback on EHaSH was largely positive, but some professionals, particularly those new to the East Riding, would welcome a refresh on what support is available from EHaSH and through other routes. Professionals also argued that there needed to be greater professional knowledge and awareness, specifically around autism, among Youth & Family Support Workers. For parents, there was the need for greater transparency about the criteria for accessing the Disabled Children’s Service, and a broader programme of targeted family support for those who did not meet the criteria but would benefit from early support.

3. **Address the gaps identified by parents and professionals in targeted health services.** First, professionals and parents commented on the lack of and need for support from children’s therapy services for children who do not have significant physical disabilities and those aged 19-25, noting such services were available in other local areas. The fact that East Riding services are asked to undertake this work on an ad hoc basis shows that there is the need for it. As such, we suggest consideration is given as to how such support can be commissioned. Second, this review provides an opportunity to redesign the SEMH continuum, linking up the work to develop a clearer pre-CAMHS offer with work to address some of the concerns raised about access to and experience of CAMHS. The aim should be to set out, through the local offer, a clear offer of SEMH capacity-building and training, early and targeted support, and clear routes to support in cases of more complex needs. There are opportunities to work with parents to redesign the training programmes offered to parents of children with complex mental health needs.
Part 2: Options and recommendations

**Theme 5: Enhanced resource provisions**

1. **Continue to support the development of ERPs to offer greater choice and meet a wider range of needs locally.** There is strong support for the development of ERPs, and our evidence suggests that the focus should be on SEMH and high-functioning autism. The data suggests the children placed out-of-county are of secondary-age. There is, therefore, a question of whether earlier support in primary schools or additional secondary ERP capacity is needed, and how the latter fits with the development of The Hub and the secondary autism ERPs. We suggest further analysis of the cohort placed out-of-county is undertaken to inform commissioning and the gradual development of the ERPs.

2. **Ensure that there is clarity about the strategic role and day-to-day work of existing ERPs.** There should be clarity among strategic leaders, officers making placement decisions and professionals about the purpose, needs catered for, fit with other SEND services, capacity and model of support within the ERPs, and set out in the service-level agreement. This may also include registering the ERPs formally as resourced provision/units to improve transparency. ERPs should also be included in the local offer to ensure broad awareness and understanding among parents and professionals.

**Theme 6: Special school provision**

1. **Ensure that, within the existing area special school model, there is clarity about how specific types of needs can be met within the local continuum of services and provision.** First, this requires ensuring that there is clarity about how the needs of children who would previously have been placed at Riverside can met within mainstream settings, and how the capacity to do so will be developed. Second, this will require clarity about how the needs of pupils with SEMH and high-functioning autism can be met within local provision or commissioned effectively from elsewhere. This clarity should also be used to inform a more strategic dialogue with special schools around placements, informed by knowledge of the special schools themselves, professional judgement and parental choice, and commissioning of places.

2. **Develop a partnership-based approach to considering how the needs of young people, who would otherwise require an out-of-county placement, could be met locally.** This will require some initial work with specialist providers and partners to design such a process (administrative support, information and data requirements, link to formal resourcing and placement decisions). The aim would be to bring together special schools (and potentially the ERPs and The Hub) to enable collaborative discussions about how the most complex needs could be supported locally.
Part 2: Options and recommendations

**Theme 7: Preparation for adulthood**

1. **Strengthen the planning process around individual annual reviews.** Parents and professionals commented on the need for a more pro-active approach to planning for young people’s transition to adulthood. There are different ways this could be achieved, but we suggest these should involve (a) agreeing some good practice guidelines around transition reviews; (b) using those reviews to capture young people’s aspirations and using these to inform pathway planning; and (c) agreeing how best to involve partners, including adult services, in those reviews.

2. **At a strategic level, foster a partnership-based approach to developing a broader range of 16-25 pathways.** From other local areas, we know the key ingredients for developing a broad, personalised and outcomes-focused range of options for young people preparing for adulthood are (a) ensuring this agenda is led and co-ordinated pro-actively; (b) bringing key partners across the education, adult services, health, and housing together; and (c) employers and potential partners are engaged to develop supported internships and pathways into work. Encouragingly, the first is in place, and there is willingness among partners to work together on this agenda. What is needed next is to identify some key local employers, including identify roles within the LA and local NHS that could be used as supported internship opportunities, developing some small-scale projects, and using these to build momentum, demonstrate impact, and engage others. Within this approach, there should also be clarity about progression routes, including routes through school and college.

**Theme 8: Social inclusion and support**

1. **Develop creative solutions for facilitating peer networks for young people with SEND.** We heard some very positive feedback on social activities for young people with SEND, but these were either isolated (the special Olympics) or were largely school-based. There is the need to develop mechanisms for facilitating peer networks for young people whose friendship groups revolve around school. This could include, for example, using short breaks resources or other personalised funding to facilitate peer activities and trips for friendship groups who would otherwise not be able to come together, or fostering local groups around common interests and hobbies.

2. **Ensure equity of access to community facilities for young people with SEND.** This is another co-production opportunity to work with parents and young people to build awareness of SEND and enable community facilities – gyms, leisure centres, scouts, public transport – to offer equitable access to young people with SEND.
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Conclusion: Taking forward the findings of this review

In the previous section, against each of the themes we have explored during this review, we have set out a total of 19 recommendations. In this final section, we have sought to draw together how these could be taken forward. We think it is important to recognise two things.

First, we know that work that seeks to address many of the challenges identified in this report is underway in a number of areas. We noted at the start of the report that there is a broad consensus about what is working well and where the challenges lie. We also know that there are cycles of regular self-evaluation and feedback in place. In setting out our proposed next steps, we recognise these will need to be aligned with existing plans and activities.

Second, running throughout this review has been a strong theme of the need for ongoing communication, engagement and co-production. There was a strong view expressed by all parents, professionals, partners and LA officers that the findings of the review should be shared openly and at an early stage, so that colleagues can work together to shape how it is put into practice.

As such, in this concluding section, we offer suggestions for immediate next steps and long-term actions that can be considered, debated with partners and adapted as appropriate. Our recommendations fall into three broad categories, and under each we have set out our suggestions as to the immediate next steps and longer-term actions.

1. Recommendations around revisiting, rearticulating and ensuring broad understanding of the overall strategic vision for the local SEND continuum.

2. Recommendations that focus on some of the work required to strengthen core systems and processes.

3. Recommendations about building on existing effective practice and highly-valued services and provision, and considering how to respond to gaps identified through this review.
Conclusion: Taking forward the findings of this review

The first broad category of recommendations we have made relate to revisiting, rearticulating and ensuring broad understanding of the overall strategic vision for the local SEND continuum. As we have noted, the East Riding has taken steps to sustain an offer of targeted services, and develop an equitable offer or specialist provision, in both ERPs and special schools. There is, however, the need to ensure there is clarity about how these services and provisions fit together, and their respective roles across the continuum. We suggest that there are two sets of immediate next steps.

1. **Information about available support** – we would suggest that there are some actions that could be taken quickly to improve the clarity of information on the local offer. These would include ensuring that there is an overview of the SEND continuum, showing the different forms of universal, targeted and specialist support available for different types of needs and how they can be accessed. This would also include making the option to contact the FISH call-centre more prominent on the local offer, and clarifying the information about, for instance, responsibilities for additional supports costs above the early years free entitlement and the respective roles of SENDIASS and KIDS.

2. **The role of specialist provision** – we would suggest an initial action would be to bring together the local specialist provision (including the ERPs, The Hub, and the special schools), potentially with other targeted services, and collective reviewing and rearticulating their respective roles across the continuum and how they fit together. This may also include initial work around formally registering the ERPs and tackling the issue about special school place numbers with the ESFA.

Beyond that, we suggest that there are three sets of long-term actions.

1. **Information about available support** – in the longer term, we suggest there may be value in setting up a task-and-finish group or similar, made up of representatives of parents, young people and professionals to review and redevelop the local offer along the lines of the principles described to us and set out in this report.

2. **The coherence of the local SEND continuum** – we suggest that the ongoing cycle of gathering feedback and self-assessment should also focus on gathering information and analysing data about current and anticipated future needs, which could then be used to keep the overall strategy and roles across the continuum up-to-date.

3. **Identification of needs** – an ongoing priority, and one that we understand is underway currently, is to develop a more clearly-articulated pathway of autism assessment and support.
Conclusion: Taking forward the findings of this review

The second broad group of the recommendations we have set out in the report concern the work that we suggest is required to strengthen some core systems and processes. These recommendations recognise some of the work that is underway currently to ensure there is are the right systems to underpin an effective local SEND continuum. In line with this ongoing work, we suggest that there are two immediate next steps.

1. **Identification of need** – first, we suggest that some further work is undertaken to ensure the core datasets, specifically the data on children with EHCPs, including data on primary need, is strengthened so that it is in a form that can be easily analysed and manipulated. Second, we suggest some work is undertaken to strengthen the systems and processes for identifying and recording primary need, including the data recording, panel discussions, description of needs on key paperwork, and annual reviews.

2. **Preparation for adulthood** – as part of the wider work on strengthening support for young people preparing to make the transition to adulthood, we suggest some initial work could usefully be done to look at how information about young people’s aspirations and likely future needs are captured and used to inform pro-active planning.

Beyond that, we suggest that there are two sets of long-term actions.

1. **Identification of need** – the wider work picks up our recommendation about the need to strengthen the consistency of practice around identifying needs, and ensuring this is informed by a consistently strong understanding across mainstream settings. We have suggested that this is something that could usefully be part of the agenda for forthcoming SENCO networks, which could also consider how SENCOs themselves and those supporting school improvement could help to ensure consistent, effective and timely identification of need across the county.

2. **Access to support** – a strong message during the review was how routes to access support, particularly where there is the need for some swift advice and input, could be made more responsive and flexible. We suggest that this is considering with professionals and partners.
Conclusion: Taking forward the findings of this review

The third broad group of recommendations concern building on existing effective practice and highly-valued services and provision, and considering how to respond to gaps where needs are not currently being met by the local continuum. We suggest that there are four sets of immediate next steps.

1. **Mainstream support** – we suggest that the immediate next steps here are building on the work to redevelop the SENCO networks, with greater forward planning (using some of the points highlighted in this review as themes), phase differentiation where appropriate, and focus on practice development. We also suggest discussions begin through this forum and others, involving parents, focusing on revisiting and strengthening mainstream expectations.

2. **Targeted services** – as we noted in the report, feedback on targeted services where access was swift and straightforward was very positive. In terms of next steps, our review suggests there would be value in rearticulating and criteria for and offer of support from services such as the Disabled Children’s Team and EHaSH.

3. **Specialist provision** – as we have noted, there was broad support for the idea of establishing a specialist providers group to consider how the needs of children who would otherwise be placed out-of-county could be met locally. We suggest initial steps are taken to agree membership and start to develop the process for these discussions.

4. **Preparation for adulthood** – since a new lead officer for this agenda is now in place, we suggest that there is an immediate focus on working with the special schools, colleges and the LA itself to start some specific, small-scale pilot projects to test and develop new pathways, supported internship opportunities and suchlike.

Beyond that, we suggest that there are three sets of long-term actions.

1. **Mainstream** – in the longer term, we suggest work is undertaken with SENCOs, professionals and other partners to develop a new offer of CPD and support, picking up on some of the workforce development priorities (identification and support strategies, particularly around MLD, SLCN, SEMH and autism) identified through the review.

2. **Targeted** – we know that work to look at the SEMH continuum as a whole, and the space between CAMHS and more universal forms of support is underway and ongoing. We suggest that consideration is given to how the needs for therapy services for children who do not have significant physical difficulties and those aged 19-25 can be met.

3. **Specialist** – in the longer term, once the data on need is in a position about which colleagues feel confident, we suggest this is used to continue to inform strategic planning of services and provision – ERPs, special schools, and preparation for adulthood. This also includes developing tailored offers of social activities for young people.
Conclusion: Taking forward the findings of this review

Many of these recommendations we have made in this report present opportunities for co-production with parents and professionals. We have summarised below some of the main co-production opportunities highlighted throughout Part 2 of this report. As a next step, we suggest there is discussion about how these actions could be taken forward by existing partnership groups or potentially by some new task-and-finish groups bringing together professionals and parents established for a fixed period of time.

- **Co-production opportunities with parents** – in the report, we have highlighted the development of the local offer (theme 1), developing the autism assessment and support pathway (theme 2), helping to articulate the hallmarks of effective mainstream inclusion (theme 3), redesigning training for parents in supporting children with mental health needs (theme 4), developing post-16 pathways (theme 7), and raising awareness of SEND and improving equity of access within community facilities (theme 8). As we have remarked during the review, there is consensus that the relationship between the LA and parent / carer groups could be strengthened. We suggest using this review, and some of the areas listed above, as an opportunity to reset the relationship and focus it on addressing specific challenges highlighted through this review. In local areas where this is working, the equivalent of the parent carer forum has a key strategic role in working alongside the LA to shape a shared agenda, and may even be commissioned to provide some specific services (e.g. initial advice to parents, training around mental health or autism). Following this review, the aim should be for parent / carer groups such as ERVIP and the LA to be working together to shape and communicate a shared agenda, set of priorities, achievements and initiatives to the wider community of parents and carers of children and young people with SEND in the East Riding.

- **Co-production opportunities with professionals** – likewise, we have highlighted agreeing common definitions and appropriate usage of certain definitions of need (theme 1), describing characteristics of effective mainstream practice and designing a corresponding support programme (theme 3), agreeing the future role of certain targeted services (theme 4), working with special schools to shape the future offer, admissions and bespoke approaches to meeting more complex needs (theme 6), and shaping post-16 pathways (theme 7).
Having shared the findings of the report and put in place immediate actions to work with partners across the system to shape a future approach, the next step will then be to bring these actions together in a long-term strategy and plan. It was always envisaged that this review would help to inform the future SEND strategy for the East Riding, and would add evidence to the ongoing cycle of local self-evaluation and feedback-gathering exercises. What we are seeking to emphasise in the final part of this report is the need to engage the groups who have taken part in this review in a process of helping to shape how the review’s findings are translated into a new shared strategy. We would make two other brief final points here.

First, we suggest that consideration is given to establishing periodic “SEND continuum” meetings. In the final phase of our review, we brought together the majority of professionals and providers involved in providing SEND services and provision – in other words, many of those who are responsible for the targeted and specialist end of the SEND continuum. They argued that such meetings, held at suitable intervals, could be valuable in connecting services and professionals, considering county-wide strategic challenges, and helping to shape services and provision to meet anticipated future need. Our understanding is that, while existing governance arrangements involve meetings with specific groups and partners individually or different combinations, there is not currently a means through which colleagues working across the SEND are convened. Colleagues said that they would welcome this as a means to take forward and sustain a shared strategy.

Second, it will be vital that the future strategy is sustained, kept up-to-date and remains relevant to partners, professionals and parents across the system. The strategy will need to be widely understood, but also revisited and updated through regular discussion with key stakeholders and informed by ongoing analysis of data and other evidence of trends. Equally importantly, the future strategy must inform commissioning priorities and be aligned with budgeting and the use of resources. On the final two slides of this report, we present a brief summary of the current picture of resourcing for SEND and potential future trends.
The East Riding receives the lowest per capita funding for high needs of any local authority in England. While the Government is committed to bringing forward a reformed, fairer approach to funding, the gradual transition to any new system means that pressure on high needs resources will continue to be a feature of the next period.

The chart below compares East Riding’s reported spend (for 2016-17) with the average for its statistical neighbours. This shows that the East Riding spends proportionately more on top-up funding (56% for maintained providers and academies) than similar LAs (52%) and more on SEN support services (20% compared to an average of 12% among similar LAs, but note the relatively positive feedback on East Riding’s central services). The East Riding spends a smaller proportion on top-up funding for INMSSs than similar LAs.

Data source: Section 251, 2016 to 2017 (DfE)
As the chart below shows, where the East Riding does appear to spend significantly more than similar LAs is on SEN transport. This shows that the East Riding has the fourth highest per pupil spend (£129), above the average for similar LAs (£100) and England (£94). It also shows that East Riding has the second highest spend on pre-16 SEN transport per pupil (£100), second only to Warwickshire (£103), and well above the average for similar LAs (£63) and England (£64). It has been beyond the scope of this review to get into the detail of home-to-school transport, but this data does add to the picture we have built up through our review. The data suggest that, while the East Riding is not spending proportionately more on placements in INMSSs, it is spending more both in absolute terms and, given its low level of funding to begin with, proportionately on transporting pupils across the county and to provision, including special schools, in neighbouring local areas. This adds further evidence to the argument that a key priority of the future SEND strategy should be developing the capacity to meet a wider range of needs locally. As we have highlighted in Part 1, the key areas of need are SEMH and (high-functioning) autism. Further analysis of the files of young people placed out-of-county and gathering intelligence through the proposed special school collaborative model will add further evidence here. Lastly, the data suggest that continued oversight of transport arrangements and spending will be valuable – we know work in this area has been ongoing, resulting in a reduction of the overall transport budget of £1m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMHS</td>
<td>child &amp; adolescent mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHaSH</td>
<td>Early Help and Safeguarding Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCP</td>
<td>education, health &amp; care plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>enhanced resource provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERVIP</td>
<td>East Riding Voices in Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EY</td>
<td>early years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>Families Information Service Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>hearing impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INMSS</td>
<td>independent or non-maintained special school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>moderate learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>occupational therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>for brevity, in certain parts of the report, we use the term ‘parents’ to refer to parents and carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLD</td>
<td>profound &amp; multiple learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaLT</td>
<td>speech &amp; language therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaPTS</td>
<td>sensory &amp; physical teaching service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMH</td>
<td>social, emotional and mental health needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCO</td>
<td>special educational needs co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>special educational needs and disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENDIASS</td>
<td>special educational needs and disability information, advice and support service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCN</td>
<td>speech, language &amp; communication needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>severe learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYLER</td>
<td>The Young Leaders of the East Riding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the review, we ran two parallel online surveys. One was for parents, which received 75 responses (plus a further 22 responses via a hard-copy version distributed at the workshops).

The second was for professionals – early years settings, schools, colleges and other education, health and care services, which received 99 responses. The two charts below show the make-up of the responses – the chart on the left shows the type of institution, the chart on the right shows the role of the person who completed the survey. The charts show the majority of responses came from early years or primary schools, with a mixture of responses from leaders and SENCOs.
Below are responses to two sets of questions we asked in parallel of parents and professionals – on the left are responses to a question about information about support and on the right about the process for accessing support.

"There is clear and accessible information."

- 3% Strongly agree
- 16% Agree
- 13% Disagree
- 26% Strongly disagree
- 19% Cannot say

Parents / carers
Professionals

"The process for accessing support works well."

- 2% Strongly agree
- 8% Agree
- 9% Disagree
- 9% Strongly disagree
- 8% Cannot say

Parents / carers
Professionals
In the survey of professionals, we asked whether there was currently the right offer of support, services and provision in each of the following areas: mainstream education settings and schools; targeted services; specialist provision; and preparation for adulthood. The breakdown of responses is below.

**Professionals' survey responses – the current offer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Cannot say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Right offer - mainstream.&quot;</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Right offer - targeted.&quot;</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Right offer - specialist provision.&quot;</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Right offer - preparation for adult life.&quot;</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Cannot say
Lastly, we asked both parents and professionals whether they agreed with the statement that, overall, the current offer of support, services and provision works well. The comparison of the breakdown of responses from parents (in blue) and professionals (in green) is below on the left. On the right is the breakdown of responses to the question we asked parents about whether they had been able to access the right support that had met their child’s needs.

"Overall the current offer of SEND support, services & provision works well."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents / carers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Overall, I have been able to access the right support."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents / carers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>