



Question 19: How can the National SEND Delivery Board work most effectively with local partnerships to ensure the proposals are implemented successfully?

CONTENTS

SNJ's response to Question 19	1
Responses from parents/SNJ readers	2
	2
	3
	3
	3

SNJ's response to Question 19

1. This proposed National SEND Delivery Board is a mystery and there is not enough information to properly form an opinion other than it sounds like a SEND Review Steering Group Plus. It sounds like a large board of people who really have the best interests of disabled children at the centre of their decision-making (other than parents) but care a lot about money.
2. Who would be on this National SEND Delivery Board? It's almost certain that it will contain the same people who have already allowed the failure of the current system. What makes you think that they can do a better job? How will they be held to account?
3. On the subject of parent carers - which parent carers? Will you default to the NNPCF who rely on DfE funding to operate? Or will you allow other proven experts to participate (though not for free)? Will it include local or

national charities? Young people's representatives? How big will it be? Who will fund them?

4. How will they "hold partners to account"? By what mechanisms? And in holding these partners (who presumably will also have a place on the board) to account, what powers will they have?
5. How will it work with other existing - and opaque - SEND boards and accountability systems at national and local level? Who will fund it?
6. On Local Partnerships, one would assume LAs already have such groups in operation with varying levels of effective participation from parent carer forums. Ultimately, the same issues as national boards arise.
7. And who holds them accountable? Won't the more powerful voices with the purse strings always override the parent voices?
8. How will you ensure these boards are transparent and publish minutes, ensuring parents know how decisions are being made and that any potential conflicts of interest are avoided?

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 strongly disagree with the premise of this question. These proposals should not be implemented at all.
2. The expense and effort of implementing the 2014 reforms was enormous. That time and expense would be far better used to enforce the current system so that needs are met, not to change the system again to take away rights and entitlements.



1. It can't and it won't. If local authorities are still failing to adequately apply and implement the 2014 requirements some 7 years later then....well, nothing can or will change. Let us be real: the Green Paper is about money and stripping away support for children and young people with SEND. If it wasn't, then the paper would be FULL of ideas about radically changing the education system and teacher training to ensure that more needs can be better identified and supported earlier. There is nothing like this in here. The paper lacks ambition, it is just about reducing the power of the law for children and families in trying to access the education they are entitled to.
2. A National SEND Delivery board may contain some absolutely amazing people, including representatives from bodies that champion children's rights, but they will be limited in their impact and effectiveness because the proposals are the wrong ones. You cannot keep the education system as it is AND improve outcomes for children with SEND.



1. The National Board needs to have powers to identify underperforming LAs, deploy inspectors to investigate the sources of underperformance and be able to order remedial action to address the issues identified within a defined time limit. Local partnerships should be the first point of contact in raising concerns with local performance, offering context and assistance in answering queries and helping to coordinate inspections/assessments. A weaker system without such powers, just an 'advisory' role, would be pointless as it would (on current evidence of LA behaviour) simply be ignored. All meetings of the national and local panels should be minuted and published for complete transparency.



1. Much thought needs to be given as to who will be on this board and must include health, social services, Ofsted, young people and parents as well as other charity partnerships. The board must have practical powers to enforce delivery and not just be another layer of red tape to wade through. All the work of the board must be transparent and visible to all with all minutes published in an easily accessible form. I am also concerned about conflicts of interest and who the board will answer to. I am not clear how these issues are going to be addressed.