

**Question 16:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that a statutory framework for pupil movements will improve oversight and transparency of placements into and out of alternative provision?

## CONTENTS

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>SNJ’s response to Question 16</b>  | <b>1</b> |
| <b>Responses from parents/SNJ readers</b>   | <b>2</b> |
|  | 2        |
|  | 2        |
|  | 2        |

---

## SNJ’s response to Question 16

1. It is disgraceful that it isn’t already a statutory reporting duty for LAs to explain “*how children and young people move around the school system, including through off-site direction and unregulated managed moves*”. This means you don’t know where highly vulnerable pupils are being educated, what they are learning, or how good the teaching is.
2. It shows a massive lack of care for children who don’t fit the mould of “acceptable”.
3. We understand that many good, elective home educators are against a statutory register, however, these are not the vulnerable children who are at risk of exploitation or poor education.
4. Those children who are out of school through a lack of suitable provision often have little to no professional tuition. While some parents can fill the gaps, they shouldn’t have to. Also, those children who have EOTAS provision deserve to have just as high-quality provision as everyone else. A requirement to have provision registered with a regulatory body should not be a frightening prospect; it should be welcomed.

5. We believe that if a light is thrown on all unregistered provision, it will show how many children with SEND are not receiving secure or excellent education, which can only be a good thing and a way to hold LAs to account. It's unacceptable that there is no clear tracking for where vulnerable pupils are being educated or what they are learning or how good the teaching is.
- 

## 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. I agree that oversight of pupil movements into and out of AP is needed. It's unacceptable that there isn't any such oversight at the moment. LAs should already know how many children are attending the AP they commission and on what basis.
2. But this should not be taken to imply that increased use of AP for SEND pupils is a good thing – it isn't.



1. Given that many pupils get forgotten about once they are in AP then this may help to track placements but it all depends on the quality of the framework and who is implementing it and monitoring it.



1. I would somewhat agree that a framework could offer the improvements described. But it would be important that the framework developed captures the right information and that experts and practitioners' views are given great weight in their formulation.