

Coding and Themes

18 March Woking	20 March Reigate	22 April remote	24 April remote
Where support was found	Where support was found	Where support was found	Where support was found
Some primary years (dependent on teachers)	Proactive nursery, helped with paperwork	NHS support (for speech delay)	Supportive primary school (2 people)
Lived experience of teacher	EP found quickly	Primary school (3)	(Some teachers in primary school met need)
Training delivered by people with lived experience	Independent school supportive of getting EHCP	secondary school (making adjustments)	(secondary) SENCo explained why and was understanding
Responsive case officer (lived experience)	Case officer with lived experience	Nursery helpful-early identification	Supportive head and SENCo face-to-face explained process
Some independent schools provide therapists and help with EHCP process	Knowledgeable case workers	Third sector	(primary) SENCo and family link worker informed on process
Solicitor	Nursery and TATF meets led to referral	Parent groups	Nursery helpful with EHCP
Third sector (2) (knowledgeable)	Third sector (2) (helped train school staff, helped with paperwork)	Home school link worker and SENCo tried hard to be helpful	Facebook groups (3 people)
Parent groups	Facebook groups	GP tried (unsuccessfully) to speed up CAMHS	Peer support/parent groups (2 people)
Facebook groups	Perceived bad practice	Perceived bad practice	Family Voice Surrey
Perceived bad practice	Communication (word mentioned once as an issue)	Communication (word mentioned once as an issue)	Third sector (4) (quick response, knowledge of system, informative and thorough advice, helped with paperwork, provide training to school)
Communication (word mentioned 3 times as an issue)	Fight/battle (6 mentions, 4 people)	Fight/battle (3 mentions, 2 people)	Inclusion officer face-to-face
Fight/battle (2 people)	Case officer turnover (3 people)	Timeliness (14) (3 to issue Plan, 4 assessments/diagnosis, 2 intervention, 1 SLT provision, 3 people delay in support led to crisis, 1 length of appeal, 1 person case officer communication)	Mediation face-to-face
Fail (5 mentions)	Poor quality EHCP (4) (standard of English, lack of clarity and precision, SMART goals, health section)	Perception of illegality (when saying no to EHCNA despite autism diagnosis)	Swift decision at mediation
Unsupported (2 people) (1 LA, 1 social services)	EHCP error (1 person, 2 errors)	Last minute agreement before tribunal	LSPA and Be.Heard following protocol
Feel blamed/accused (3 people) (1 social worker)	Not signposted to support (8) (including 2 to list of special schools)	EHCP refused	
	Not aware of local offer (2)		

Lack of empathy (3) (2 in schools)	Not knowing who does what (case officer)	No school named on Plan (1 person)	LSPA informed on process
No to issue EHCP	Unsupported (2 people) (3 LA and 1 social services)	Named school not parental preference	Virtual School
No to assess		Lack of action resulting from EHCP	Some great caseworkers
Not considering privately commissioned reports	Timeliness (9) (autism assessment, getting appropriate school, 2 to issue Plan, waiting lists for help, general, 3 people case officer communication)	Unsupported by CAMHS (1 person)	Good communication, empathy and knowledge of system from case officer with lived experience
Primary school says can't meet need		Inadequate AP	
Special school not meeting academic need	Not considering privately commissioned assessment	Pressure from inclusion service	Honesty of OT
Mainstream schools not differentiating	Not involved in process	Incendiary language (teachers)	Apology appreciated
Some primary years (dependent on teachers)	Not listened to	Primary school not meeting need	Replacement case officer made things happen
Labelling (teachers)	No explanation	Plan names secondary school that says it can't meet need	LA staff explained why
No personalisation	OT failed to attend TATF	Secondary school not making (enough) adjustments for SEN (3 people) [often not understanding ASD presenting as anxiety]	Private clinicians' advice on schools
Timeliness (6) (to name school, 2 to issue Plan, assessment, 2 people case officer communication)	Case officer failed to attend TATF		Perceived bad practice
Not aware who case officer is	No personalisation (2 people) (1 OT report)	School provoked behaviour to get EHCP	Battle/fight (6 mentions, 4 people)
No explanation of decision	Poor communication with schools	Not involved in process (2 people)	Communication (The word mentioned 15 times as an issue)
Not listened to (3 people)	Complicated language	Not listened to / dismissed (3 people)	No personalisation (2 people)
Incendiary language	Feel blamed/accused (1 person)	Feel blamed/accused (1 person)	Not signposted to other support
Poor communication between services	Incendiary language (3)	Communication with LA	Not informed (7) (of entitlement to AP, of Panel outcome, that school hadn't responded, of process, 3 people who does what)
Case officer turnover (2 people)	Lack of understanding/empathy (3 people) (LA, 2 case officers, mainstream SENCo)	Complicated language (2 people)	Not informed of options by school (3 people)
	Not supported by CAMHS (2 people)	No explanation (2 people)	
	Not had provision in Plan	Lack of consistency in giving information	
	Suitable equipment not provided	Not signposted to support (3 people)	
	Shortage of short breaks provision		

<p>Tribunals perceived as unjustified</p> <p>Different policy for children with disabilities</p> <p>Support not equally accessible to all</p> <p>Don't follow CoP</p> <p>Poor quality EHCP (3 people) (1 EP report, 2 evidence edited, 1 errors generally)</p> <p>CAMHS error (lost paperwork)</p> <p>Unsupported by CAMHS (2 people)</p> <p>Consequences of bad practice</p> <p>Trauma (3 mentions, 1 person)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (CYP) (6 mentions, 3 people)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (P/C) (2 people)</p> <p>Financial impact (1 person)</p> <p>Lack of trust (2 people) (1 Delay perceived to be deliberate, 1 suspect refusal due to money)</p> <p>Unnecessary cost to taxpayer (2 people)</p> <p>Delay led to crisis</p>	<p>Perception of illegality (no to assess)</p> <p>Last minute agreement</p> <p>Local Offer unhelpful</p> <p>Consequences of bad practice</p> <p>Reliance on social media</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (P/C) (2 people)</p> <p>Strain on family relationships</p> <p>Financial impact (2 people)</p> <p>Lack of trust (4 people) (all suspect refusal due to money)</p> <p>CME, future prospects (2)</p> <p>Child nearly went into care</p> <p>Delay led to crisis</p> <p>Child not in best learning environment for them</p> <p>Loss of knowledge at key stage transfer</p> <p>Provision not fulfilled due to EHCP error</p> <p>Unnecessary taxpayer expense (last minute agreements)</p> <p>Barriers to Local Authority providing good support</p> <p>Under-resourced (6 mentions by 4 people) (inc. 1 OT shortage)</p> <p>Lack of SEND knowledge (4 mentions by 2 people) (2 teachers, 1 SENCo, 1 general)</p>	<p>Not knowing SCC's remit / Not informed who does what / Not knowing how to access help / Difficult to navigate EHCP process / Process complicated (4 people)</p> <p>Not child-centric</p> <p>Unsupported (3 people)</p> <p>Unsupported by CAMHS (1 person)</p> <p>Consequences of bad practice</p> <p>Emotional impact (CYP) (5 people)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (P/C) (4 people)</p> <p>'Trauma', in context of EHCP process (2) [Excludes 'Trauma' in context of school environment (2)]</p> <p>Financial impact (2 people)</p> <p>Later intervention more expensive</p> <p>Lack of trust</p> <p>Feeling isolated because not involved</p> <p>Reliance on social media forums</p> <p>Council perceived to be 'gatekeepers'</p> <p>CME</p> <p>Barriers to Local Authority providing good support</p> <p>Covid barrier to timeliness</p>	<p>No Panel transparency (2 people)</p> <p>Complicated language not explained (2 people)</p> <p>Asked again for same information</p> <p>Not listened to/dismissed (6 people) "neurotic mother"</p> <p>Not accepting private reports</p> <p>Feel blamed/accused (4 people)</p> <p>Unsupported (by LA) (2 people)</p> <p>No to assess overturned</p> <p>Timeliness (14) (3 to issue Plan, EHCP review, 2 assessment, Delay due to LA error, 6 people case officer communication)</p> <p>Poor quality EHCP (4 people) (therapist's report amended, not updated, wrong first language, forgot assessment)</p> <p>Hours considered too few</p> <p>Not providing provision</p> <p>Lack of self-reflection</p> <p>No ownership of mistake</p> <p>Perception of illegality</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>Strain on family relationships (2)</p> <p>CME</p> <p>CYP couldn't access mainstream</p> <p>Barriers to Local Authority providing good support</p> <p>School focus on grades (2 people)</p> <p>Pressure to meet EP advice targets</p> <p>Lack of SEND knowledge (7 mentions by 4 people) (4 by teachers and 1 by EPs on PDA)</p> <p>Under-resourced (10 mentions by 4 people, including 1 EP shortage, 1 increased demand and 2 case officers have inadequate time)</p> <p>Parents with varying standards of English</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Assess all children at statutory school age</p> <p>Training delivered by people with lived experience</p> <p>Variety of training to reflect spectrum</p> <p>Accept private assessments</p>	<p>Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Training (5 people) (all school staff, SEND officers LA staff in personalisation)</p> <p>Check knowledge after training</p> <p>Schools should make use of mental health training</p> <p>Want staff to care</p> <p>Staff with lived experience</p> <p>Want simple language parent guide</p> <p>Send parent guide out with school newsletter</p> <p>Want help with paperwork</p> <p>Agreement initially would direct the money into education rather than tribunals</p>	<p>Early intervention hampered by wait times</p> <p>Under-resourced (funding/staff) (7 mentions by 3 people)</p> <p>Lack of knowledge – teachers (6 mentions by 5 people) (2 autism/PDA in particular-school and LA + 1 school senior leadership in particular)</p> <p>Sufficiency of specialist places (2 people)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of which, for autistic girls in particular (1) <p>School focus on grades</p> <p>Loss of early help resource (children's centre)</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Answer communications</p> <p>Need SEND knowledge for all staff (2 people, 1 for teachers and 1 for schools and LA)</p> <p>Need for co-production</p> <p>Want transparency on Council's remit</p> <p>Make eligibility criteria for EHCP less opaque</p> <p>Want centralised directory of help available</p> <p>Should offer support before assessment</p>	<p>Primary school not meeting need</p> <p>Secondary school named said it was not suitable</p> <p>Last minute agreement before tribunal (3 people)</p> <p>Incendiary language</p> <p>Case officer turnover (1 person)</p> <p>Not child-centric</p> <p>Consequences of bad practice</p> <p>Delay led to crisis (2 people)</p> <p>Financial impact (2 people)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (CYP) (3 people)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (P/C) (7 people)</p> <p>Emotional/health impact (case officer)</p> <p>Unnecessary cost to taxpayer (2)</p> <p>Need for escalation wastes officer time</p> <p>Life opportunities harmed</p> <p>Inequality of access</p> <p>CME (2 people)</p> <p>Not able to make informed best choice for child</p> <p>Primary school said could not meet need</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>Ensure provision in Plan is provided</p> <p>Penalise schools for inappropriate exclusions</p> <p>EHCP quality assurance</p>			<p>because need not updated on Plan</p> <p>Out of appeal time because not informed of decision on time</p> <p>Lack of trust (LA) (4 people) (1 suspects refusal due to money)</p> <p>Lack of trust (school) (2 people) (1 suspects refusal due to money)</p> <p>Reliance on non-professionals who can misinform</p> <p>Barriers to Local Authority providing good support</p> <p>Under-resourced (7 mentions by 6 people) (3 saying provision motivated by money, 4 high caseloads)</p> <p>Lack of SEND knowledge – teachers (4 people) (including autism 1, PDA 1)</p> <p>CYP who mask not helped (3 people)</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Communicate (5) (proactively)</p> <p>Update parents</p> <p>Want conversation about rights and obligations</p> <p>Need help understanding legal process</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Take time to know children</p> <p>Take time to speak with parents (2)</p> <p>Want honesty (2)</p> <p>Provide Panel details (2)</p> <p>Reflect on how to avoid common causes of tribunals</p> <p>Immediately review strength of tribunal case</p> <p>Training for Panel</p> <p>Train LA staff (by IPSEA)</p> <p>Need training in legal obligations</p> <p>Need SEN training for all teachers</p> <p>Know legal responsibilities</p> <p>Train case officers</p> <p>'Secret shoppers' to check compliance</p> <p>Ensure named schools can meet need</p> <p>Want quality EHCP for school compliance</p> <p>Put child first (2)</p> <p>Want timeliness</p> <p>Want AP where required</p> <p>Want consistency (geographically)</p> <p>Recognise parents know their children</p>
--	--	--	--

Consolidated

Where support was found (and what made it good)

Nursery (4) (led to referral, early identification, helpful with EHCP, proactive, helped with paperwork)
Schools (13, including 8 primary and 2 secondary) (dependent on teachers, lived experience of teacher, 3 explained process)

Case officers (7, 3 of which with lived experience) (responsive, great, knowledgeable, good communication, empathy and knowledge of system, made things happen, apology from duty)
LA staff (explained why)

Inclusion officer (face-to-face)

LSPA (2) (following protocol/informed on process)

Be.Heard (following protocol)

TATF (meets led to referral)

Virtual School

OT (honesty)

EP (found quickly)

NHS (support for speech delay)

GP (tried, unsuccessfully, to speed up CAMHS)

Private clinicians (good advice on schools)

Mediation (2) (face-to-face, swift decision)

Solicitor

Family Voice Surrey

Third sector (9) (2 helped train school staff, training delivered by people with lived experience, 2 helped with paperwork, 2 knowledge of system, informative and thorough advice, quick response)

Peer support/parent groups (4)

Facebook groups (5)

Perceived bad practice

Fight/battle (12 people, 16 mentions)

Being 'failed' by SCC (10 times)

Unsupported (9 people) (6 LA, 2 social services)

Unsupported by CAMHS (4 people)

'Communication' – word raised 20 times as an issue

Poor case officer communication (12)

Poor communication between services

Poor communication with schools

Case officer turnover (7 people)

Not informed by LA (15) (of entitlement to AP, of Panel outcome, that school hadn't responded, of process/how to access help/SCC's remit, 4 people of who does what, 2 not aware of local offer, no Panel transparency)

Not signposted to support (12) (2 to list of special schools)

Parents not listened to/dismissed (13 people)

Parents not involved in process (3 people)

Not considering private reports (4 people)

Incendiary language (6) (1 by teachers)

Complicated language (5)

No explanation of decision/language (6 people)

Feel blamed/accused (9 people) (1 by social worker)

Lack of empathy (6) (3 in schools, LA, 2 case officers)

No personalisation (5 people) (1 OT report)

Local Offer unhelpful

No ownership of mistake

Pressure from inclusion service

Asked parents again for same information
Lack of consistency in giving information
Not informed of options by school (3 people)

Timeliness (43 mentions) (including the 12 people case officer communication, 10 to issue Plan, 8 assessments, 2 intervention, to name school, to get appropriate school, EHCP review, waiting lists for help, SLT provision, length of appeal, delay due to LA error)

School not meeting need (11 people) (4 primary and 6 secondary, secondaries often not understanding ASD presenting as anxiety, 2 secondaries named on Plan said they weren't suitable)
Special school not meeting academic need
Labelling (teachers)
School provoked behaviour to get EHCP

Poor quality EHCP (12 people) (poor EP report, 2 evidence edited, errors generally, standard of English, lack of clarity and precision, SMART goals, health section error, no school named, 2 named secondary school that said can't meet need, not updated, wrong first language, forgot assessment)
OT failed to attend TATF
Case officer failed to attend TATF
CAMHS error (lost paperwork)

No to issue EHCP (2)
No to assess
No to assess overturned
Perception of illegality (2) (no to assess)
Last minute agreement before tribunal (5 people)
Tribunals perceived as unjustified
Different policy for children with disabilities
Support not equally accessible to all
Don't follow CoP
Not child-centric (2)
Lack of self-reflection

Named school not parental preference
Not had provision in Plan
Suitable equipment not provided
Lack of provision
Shortage of short breaks provision
Lack of action resulting from EHCP
Inadequate AP
Hours considered too few

Consequences of bad practice

'Trauma', in context of EHCP process (3 people)
Emotional/health impact (CYP) (11 people)
Emotional/health impact (Parent/Carer) (15 people)
Feeling isolated because not involved
Strain on family relationships (3)
Financial impact (7 people)
Emotional/health impact (case officer)

Early intervention hampered
Delay led to crisis (4 people)
CYP missing education (6 people)
CYP couldn't access mainstream
Life opportunities harmed
Child nearly went into care

Not able to make informed best choice for child
Secondary school said could not meet need because need not updated on Plan
Out of appeal time because not informed of decision on time
Child not in best learning environment for them
Lost knowledge at key stage transfer
Provision not fulfilled due to EHCP error
Inequality of access
Unnecessary cost to taxpayer (7 people) (due to no response and need for escalation/last minute agreements/late intervention more expensive)
Reliance on non-professionals/social media (3 people)
Lack of trust (13 people) (2 school, 8 suspects refusal due to money)

Barriers to Local Authority providing good support

Lack of SEND knowledge (21 mentions by 15 people) (7 by teachers and 1 by EPs, 5 autism/PDA in particular)
CYP who mask not helped (3 people)
Under-resourced (30 mentions by 17 people) (EP shortage, OT shortage, increased demand, 6 case officers have inadequate time/high caseloads)
Sufficiency of specialist places (2 people) (1 for autistic girls in particular)
Loss of early help resource (children's centre)
School focus on grades (3 people)
Pressure to meet EP advice targets
Covid

Suggestions for improvement

SEND training for all teachers (2)
Mental health training in schools
Training in SEND/personalisation/legal obligations (by IPSEA) for LA staff/SEND officers/Panel (11)
Training delivered by people with lived experience
Variety of training to reflect autistic spectrum
Check knowledge after training
Staff to care
Staff with lived experience
Communicate proactively/update parents (7)
Want conversation about rights and obligations
Help understanding legal process
Take time to know children
Take time to speak with parents (2)
Honesty (2)
Put child first (2)
Need for co-production
Recognise that parents know their children
Transparency on Council's remit
Make eligibility criteria for EHCP less opaque
Provide Panel details (2)
Want centralised directory of help
Want simple language parent guide
Send parent guide out with school newsletter
Help with paperwork
Timeliness
EHCP quality assurance (2)
'Secret shoppers' to check compliance
Reflect on how to avoid common causes of tribunals
Immediately review strength of tribunal case
Accept private assessments
Ensure named schools can meet need
Ensure provision in Plan is provided

AP where required
Offer support before assessment
Assess all children at statutory school age
Agreement initially would direct the money into education rather than tribunals
Penalise schools for inappropriate exclusions
Consistency (geographically)