



Question 12: What more can be done by employers, providers and government to ensure that those young people with SEND can access, participate in and be supported to achieve an apprenticeship, including through access routes like traineeships?

CONTENTS

SNJ's response to Question 12	1
Responses from parents/SNJ readers	3
[Redacted]	4
[Redacted]	5
[Redacted]	5

SNJ's response to Question 12

1. This is a very narrow point. Why is the only real question about Post-16 confined to apprenticeships? What about the academic futures of all disabled young people?
2. Why are you ignoring those disabled young people who are able to get to university? Is this because you'd then get into the murky area of EHCPs for 18-25s in HE? We need to as this is a vitally important point and we will address this further in our response to question 22.
3. If you persist with the "national standards" plan, how do you propose that they would work for transition to post-16 settings, to supported internships (which you also haven't mentioned) and apprenticeships?
4. We also think that SENCOs in Post 16 institutions should also be bound by proposals for SENCO NVQs and NASENCOs.

5. How do you hold employers accountable for fulfilling EHCPs? We do not believe that you have evaluated apprenticeships and EHCPs for accountability, however, [you have this research for funding](#) (Jones et al. 2018)¹ How has this report been used?
6. EHCPs and apprenticeships are not even mentioned in the current Apprenticeship Accountability Framework Technical Specification 2021 to 2022. How much research has been done about the success of this over the past eight years?
7. There is also no reason that EHCPs cannot be used in the same way for disabled students in HE aged 18-25, with the main funding coming from DSA, but holding universities, health services and LAs to account for providing the support. We do not believe that it is beyond the wit of officials to make this work. It is a massive –and indefensible–anomaly.
8. Further Education settings must also be properly resourced and facilitated, to offer rich learning experiences to their students with SEND and more fully meeting their needs. To do this, there needs to be increased funding for students on SEN support in general FE colleges so that it matches what’s available to children in schools. Again, another unfair anomaly.
9. There also needs to be investment at national level into FE centres of specialist expertise to support training for local colleges, for example in sensory impairment or positive behaviour support, and changes to commissioning approaches that would allow young people to access dual placements in specialist and general FE settings.
10. Additionally, there should be an exploration of a regional or national funding mechanism for the small numbers of young people with low incidence or very complex SEND who need highly specialised provision. This would make securing a place at a specialist college easier and provide more of a recognised, appropriate route for those who need it.
11. DWP is piloting “adjustments passport” that set out the required support for work or higher education be statutory? These should be put on a statutory footing for young people with disabilities without an EHCP.

¹

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/697649/Exploring_the_funding_and_support_for_apprentices_with_additional_support_needs.pdf.

Responses from parents/SNJ readers

NB: These views are those of parents for whom we have acted as a conduit for their response to the Green Paper. The views expressed from here are not necessarily those held by Special Needs Jungle.



1. Huge amounts of training and support to ensure employers understand send properly. It sounds like a dreamy future, but, sadly discrimination and a lack of a truly inclusive society means this is doomed to fail. And, your lovely Green Paper supports this by further eroding the rights of children with SEND.



1. Stop the discrimination from the top down. The inherent disability discrimination is brushed under the carpet in education, in local government and in the workplace.
2. Our school's ethos that is written on their website states they do not expect children with SEND to achieve that of others their own age. Disgraceful. The level has been set from childhood.



1. Post-16 provision for young people with SEND is often really poor and limited.
2. National standards are a fundamentally bad idea for all ages. Some particular considerations for post-16s:
 - a. Chapter 8 of the SEND Code of Practice talks about the importance of “more tailored post-16 pathways” for young people with EHC plans (para 8.20). This must not be lost. “Planning must be centred around the individual and explore the child or young person’s aspirations and abilities, what they want to be able to do when they leave post-16 education or training and the support they need to achieve their ambition” (para 8.9). Tailored, individual pathways are vital for post-16s, and they are completely

incompatible with standardised provision under “national standards”.

- b. Standardised provision under national standards would also be completely unrealistic and unworkable given that post-16 education and training routes are so different and diverse. How can you possibly offer “standard” provision that covers not just every type and degree of SEN, but also every type of apprenticeship, work placement, traineeship etc in every different business, company and industry?



1. Why just apprenticeships - unless you are already admitting that this entire review is about simply shuffling SEND children through an education system and out the other side? Where is the ambition for those children academically? Why should they be aiming purely for a low-paid apprenticeship? Smacks of getting our children Down the Pit or into the Mill or filling up those low-paid, zero-hours contracts that have suddenly become available. Do our children not deserve to go to university? Or on to further education of any kind?
2. A child with SEND deserves an educational pathway that they want to pursue, that they are involved in and that every agency along that journey is working with them. Every Child Matters. Where is their voice in this? This is just a projection of your expectation on them so you can save your further education for an elite minority that fits your view of a valuable member of society.
3. The original placement for my child, thought to be a success for children leaving their depressing ASD unit, was a "bit of a gardening job" I have nothing against gardeners BUT this was them IMPOSING a future on my son before he even arrived, not actively working towards him reaching his potential.
4. I am also assuming that if you can kick them out of Full Time Education at 16 you can grab back the EHCP and claim you're done your bit? This question makes me incredibly angry at this Government. This surprises me because I thought I was already as furious as I could be.



1. What more can be done by employers, providers and government to ensure that those young people with SEND can access, participate in and be supported to achieve an apprenticeship, including through access routes like traineeships? (Chapter 3) : Firstly this should have no restriction and shows a lack of understanding. Many SEND children are capable of going to further education and provision should be made for them and SEND pupils wanting apprenticeships or traineeships. The key for employers is educating them in understanding SEND children and what skills they can bring to a business.



1. This question should focus on helping post 16 to achieve in further education as well as apprenticeships. Multi-agency planning for life including robust support packages for social housing and education support should be the norm. Promotion of apprenticeships to companies and small businesses in the form of grants to help pay for support to work and learn would help. Careers services should not just be available via schools and colleges and certainly careers officers should be trained to identify suitable placements and have a good understanding of SEN. The careers officer had nothing to give to our son and we have effectively had to become one to seek out opportunities for him.
2. Young people who finally manage to get to university rely on the individual university to support them. This should not be a lottery but universities should have similar accountability to support their students. SENCO training should be for post 16 and it may be worth there being a slightly different curriculum that focuses on life skills and opportunities for employment. Dedicated transition support workers would help enormously.