

## SEND Reform Readiness Survey Analysis Report

---

Based on survey responses (n=8) on supporting inclusion in mainstream settings. All personal and local authority identifiers have been removed or replaced with anonymous codes.

Date of report: 27 February 2026

### 1. What this upgraded report includes

This version includes: (a) question-by-question audit, (b) thematic coding with frequency counts, (c) anonymised respondent excerpts, (d) cross-analysis of key variables, (e) alignment against Area SEND inspection framework and current SEND reform proposals, and (f) an appendix mapping every survey question to findings.

### 2. Headline regional readiness for SEND reform

Overall readiness: MODERATE (strategically aligned, operationally stretched).

Most consistent strengths: leadership intent, partnership structures, peer networks.

Most consistent risks: specialist capacity (notably EP/therapy access), funding pressure, inconsistent impact measurement, and workforce recruitment/retention.

### 3. Quantitative results by question

#### 3.1 Vision clarity, partnership strength, and training quality

Question	Response	Count	Percent
Vision for inclusion in mainstream settings	Very clear	5	62.5%
Vision for inclusion in mainstream settings	Somewhat clear	2	25.0%
Vision for inclusion in mainstream settings	Not clear	1	12.5%
Partnership working strength	Somewhat strong	5	62.5%
Partnership working strength	Weak	2	25.0%

Partnership working strength	Very strong	1	12.5%
Training availability and quality	Good	4	50.0%
Training availability and quality	Excellent	2	25.0%
Training availability and quality	Poor	1	12.5%
Training availability and quality	Fair	1	12.5%

### 3.2 Networks and school leader involvement

Question	Response	Count	Percent
Established networks/cluster models	Yes	7	87.5%
Established networks/cluster models	No	1	12.5%
School leaders involved in co-producing inclusive leadership ambitions	Sometimes	7	87.5%
School leaders involved in co-producing inclusive leadership ambitions	Yes, consistently	1	12.5%

### 4. Thematic coding across qualitative responses

Coding approach: responses to open-text questions were coded against a consistent set of themes (keywords and manual sense-checking). Because the survey prompts repeatedly reference certain concepts (e.g., inclusion, partnership), some themes appear in many responses; frequency is most useful for identifying themes that are absent or uneven rather than ‘importance’ alone.

Theme	Number of respondents mentioning theme	Percent of respondents
Accountability & data/impact	8	100.0%
EP and specialist capacity	8	100.0%

Inclusion culture & leadership	8	100.0%
Peer support & networks	8	100.0%
Training/CPD quality & access	8	100.0%
Funding/finance pressure	7	87.5%
Co-production & parent voice	7	87.5%
TAS / graduated response	7	87.5%
Workforce recruitment/retention	6	75.0%
Communication/coordination	2	25.0%

## 5. Evidence excerpts

Excerpts are anonymised and lightly truncated for readability.

### What barriers exist to building a ‘team around the school’?

- Funding/capacity constraints.
- Funding/capacity constraints; Poor communication.
- Lack of universal/targeted support; Poor communication.

### What challenges do you face in recruiting and retaining skilled staff for SEND provision?

- Does this mean provision as in [Name]? If so then we do not recruit as an LA?
- Finance
- funding availability
- We have a reliance on locum EPs in addition to our permanent workforce. We have specialist teachers within our Service and do not have issues recruiting, however, we are experiencing relatively high levels of turn-over due to operational pressures. This is mirrored for EHCP casework also. We anticipate our [Name] review of services to provide a better framework for coordinated delivery and this will assist recruitment and retention.
- Recruitment into the LA services is generally good with high levels of interest in posts. We have a high turnover of SENCOs which is a challenge - but schools do manage to recruit. However, the churn does present challenges.

**What challenges do you face in measuring progress for disabled children and those with SEN?**

- Defining progress and outcome measures. Different for every child
- Variable measures in school - different curriculum offerings in specialist provision , classification remains inconsistent
- There is not enough accountability. Many schools in LA C are part of a Trust monitoring is challenging and many families feel that progress is not being made on highlighting the need for better inclusion.
- There is a need to be able to effectively triangulate outcomes from individual school Ofsted reports and C&YP specific targets within SEN Support and EHCP cohorts.
- Based on the standard methods such as primary progress and progress 8 for KS2 to KS4 but the data can be questionable in terms of progress. Pupils with high levels of need might appear on the surface to have made little progress - however, based on starting points and need may have made Significant progress which is masked by rather blunt measures used for most children.

**Please share any additional insights, examples of good practice, or suggestions for improving inclusion in mainstream settings.**

- No further comment
- The LA C [Name] Forum did two successful workshops with CONTACT on inclusion and reaching the seldom heard underrepresented families. These workshop brought together parent/carers and professionals from early years hubs and practitioners. It opened up wonderful conversations and much needed about bias/unconscious bias Co production and what it should look like. It was very successful and needed to hear the barriers and challenges faced in mainstream schools and judgement being made. Further conversations like this are needed for a targeted approach. Most schools in LA C the staffing does not reflect the cultural diversity of the children and students. The schools should recognise that better cultural awareness is needed but they do not and become very defensive if challenged. More examples of families lived experiences to be shared to give insight needed.
- Having attended the Regional workshop this week we have noted the good practice examples from LA D regarding the IPSEF and also the presentation on [Name] and will be reflecting these into our current work with school leaders as part of our Inclusion for All Programme.

- We are doing work on developing a sector led model of school improvement which encourages schools to share their effective practice with each other, or work collaboratively on shared priorities. This involves consider what Trusts and their teams can offer the sector so that their is a system lead leadership model in place. This fit with the direction of travel in terms of national agenda for school improvement work. Inevitably this will include a focus on inclusion. The virtual school also does some excellent work in supporting schools to be inclusive. [Name] and LA E [Name] is also organising a day in February on "[Name] [Name]" for schools to come together and share practice around the RISE priorities which of course include inclusion in maintain stream schools.
- Actively developing and delivering training focused on inclusive practice, ensuring alignment with broader workforce development initiatives.

## 6. Cross-analysis

### 6.1 Training rating vs monitoring of impact

Training rating	Monitoring classification	Count
Excellent	Developing	0
Excellent	In place	2
Excellent	None	0
Fair	Developing	0
Fair	In place	1
Fair	None	0
Good	Developing	2
Good	In place	2
Good	None	0
Poor	Developing	0
Poor	In place	0
Poor	None	1

Interpretation: where training is rated 'Poor', monitoring is also reported as 'None'. Where training is rated 'Good', monitoring is split between 'In place' and 'Developing', indicating a common improvement need even where training offer is viewed positively.

### 6.2 Vision clarity vs partnership strength

Vision clarity	Partnership strength	Count
Not clear	Somewhat strong	0
Not clear	Very strong	0
Not clear	Weak	1
Somewhat clear	Somewhat strong	2
Somewhat clear	Very strong	0

Somewhat clear	Weak	0
Very clear	Somewhat strong	3
Very clear	Very strong	1
Very clear	Weak	1

## **7. Alignment to Area SEND inspection framework and current SEND reform proposals**

This section maps survey evidence to: (a) Area SEND inspection framework and handbook (updated July 2025), and (b) current SEND reform consultation and supporting materials published February 2026.

### **Leadership, governance and accountability**

Relevant survey evidence:

- Vision clarity results; mechanisms for monitoring inclusive practice; comments on accountability measures and progress tracking.

Readiness judgement: Developing: vision is mostly clear, but impact monitoring and accountability for inclusive practice is uneven.

### **Joint commissioning and multi-agency working**

Relevant survey evidence:

- Partnership working strength results; SEND/AP boards; team-around-school barriers; specialist access (EP/therapy).

Readiness judgement: Established structures, but capacity constraints and variable coordination create delivery risk.

### **Inclusion in mainstream and early intervention**

Relevant survey evidence:

- Graduated response/TAS narratives; universal/targeted offer; training and peer support; barriers.

Readiness judgement: Strong intent; operational fragility due to funding, workforce, and specialist availability.

### **Participation, co-production and parent/carers voice**

Relevant survey evidence:

- Co-production narratives; involvement mechanisms; PCF/CYP voice references.

Readiness judgement: Developing: engagement present; move from consultation to co-design and consistent CYP voice is a common next step.

### 8. Reform readiness RAG assessment and priority actions

Domain	RAG	What the evidence suggests
Strategic vision and inclusion culture	Green/Amber	Clear intent and direction, but uneven embedding across leaders/settings.
Partnership governance (SEND/AP boards, MAT engagement)	Amber	Structures exist; quality and consistency varies.
Workforce capacity (including EP and therapy access)	Red	Recruitment/retention and specialist capacity repeatedly cited as limiting factors.
Funding and sustainability	Red	Funding/capacity is the dominant barrier, particularly for universal/targeted support.
TAS / graduated response infrastructure	Amber	Model exists in principle; resourcing and coordination are limiting.
Impact measurement and accountability	Amber/Red	Inconsistent tools, metrics, and evaluation; reform will increase evidence expectations.
Co-production and stakeholder confidence	Amber	PCF engagement is present; consistent co-design and CYP voice needs strengthening.

Priority actions (next 6–12 months):

- Agree a regional inclusion standard/expectations document (universal + targeted) aligned to national direction.
- Implement a minimum TAS offer with named service pathways and response times (including escalation routes).
- Stabilise workforce plans: recruitment pipeline, retention incentives, and shared specialist capacity models across areas.

- Build an inclusion impact dashboard (beyond attainment): attendance, exclusions, placement stability, progress measures, family confidence, timeliness.
- Strengthen quality assurance: regular inclusion reviews/self-evaluation tool plus multi-agency sampling of practice.
- Co-production upgrade: consistent CYP voice mechanism and co-design approach for local offer and any future 'support plan' processes.

## **Appendix A. Question by question audit**

**School leaders' buy-in, knowledge and experience of SEND, including a clear shared definition of inclusion, is vital for ensuring schools can provide what is set out in the local offer.**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Developing: Most school leaders understand their responsibilities for SEND and inclusion. Inclusion is referenced in strategic plans but not consistently reflected in practice. There is growing alignment between leadership priorities and the local offer expectations.
- Developing: Most school leaders understand their responsibilities for SEND and inclusion. Inclusion is referenced in strategic plans but not consistently reflected in practice. There is growing alignment between leadership priorities and the local offer expectations.
- Emerging: School leaders demonstrate variable understanding of SEND. Inclusion is viewed as an additional responsibility rather than integral to school improvement. Engagement with the local offer is limited or inconsistent.

**Tell us more about School leaders' buy-in, knowledge and experience of SEND in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Significant progress has been made in the identification of SEND within settings and leadership within the area has strengthened significantly as a consequence of the LAs investment in EPS, Specialist teachers, SALTA, Emotional well-being team. Not all schools however are in an embedded state and some schools are still emerging. Significant challenge.

- When the discussion of inclusion is approached by us as a parent carer forum and families experiences is defensiveness' and justification. There is not enough cultural awareness and there is an avoidance to openly approach the conversations with boldness for better understanding and outcomes. Also there is a struggle with the inclusion for children.
- We have good support from key school leaders as part of the governance arrangements for our Inclusion for All change Programme. Other school leaders are now also actively leading the development work related to [Name] Block related funding and provision developments.

**Strong partnership working, via robust SEND & Alternative Provision (AP) Partnership Boards and strong relationships with schools, both Multi Academy Trusts and maintained, underpinned by a shared...**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Developing: Regular partnership meetings take place with agreed priorities and shared actions. Relationships are constructive, though data-sharing and joint accountability are still maturing.
- Embedded: A well-established, multi-agency partnership structure drives inclusion. Roles, data, and accountability are shared transparently across partners. Collaboration leads to coordinated, timely support and measurable improvement in outcomes.
- Emerging: Partnership links between Education, Health, PCF, settings, schools and AP exist but are ad hoc or informal. Shared priorities and communication channels are unclear.

**Tell us more about strong partnership working in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Reviewed governance of area partnership - recognised as a strength by DFE/NHS colleagues. Forums and inclusion panels are multi-agency . Shared dashboard in place and measurable outcomes of impact evident and shared across partners. SEND Forum, Forum, Group, Safeguarding board, are all engaged in SEND and Inclusion space. Inclusion pa...
- Projects are approached by the LA lack attendance and buy in with projects on inclusion
- In addition to our Inclusion for All governance we also have school leaders actively leading the development work related to Block related funding and provision

developments (eg Base developments). We have also recently established with school leaders involvement in task and finish project work.

**Training and workforce development, ensuring consistency of inclusive mainstream practice and overcoming current challenges around recruitment and retention of a skilled workforce.**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Developing: A coordinated professional development plan supports inclusion. Training addresses identified needs but coverage and evaluation are still developing.
- Developing: A coordinated professional development plan supports inclusion. Training addresses identified needs but coverage and evaluation are still developing.
- Emerging: Training offers are reactive and vary across settings. Limited tracking of workforce needs or impact of training on practice.

**Tell us more about training and workforce development in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Universal and specialist training in place. Challenges to ensure consistency across area remain - partly reflecting fragmented education landscape of different Trusts. Across the sector EY, [Name] and post 16 - workforce training is available but not always prioritised or engaged with fully. LA workforce has a profession plan in place.
- needs improvement. There is not a join co production working partnership.
- We have a dedicated workstream within our Inclusion for All programme related to '[Name]' and this has a dual purpose of a) developing LA teams within a new model for 'team around the school' and b) complementary work to design CPD for school staff

**Peer to peer support, and the role of SENCO network groups in ensuring schools share best practice across mainstream, AP and specialist provision, and consistently meet expectations around inclusion.**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Embedded: Peer-to-peer support is systematic and valued as part of quality assurance. Schools learn from one another through coaching, review, and joint CPD. SENCO and leadership networks drive sustained improvement across the area.
- Embedded: Peer-to-peer support is systematic and valued as part of quality assurance. Schools learn from one another through coaching, review, and joint CPD. SENCO and leadership networks drive sustained improvement across the area.

- Emerging: SENCO or inclusion networks operate inconsistently or depend on individual enthusiasm. Limited sharing of best practice between schools.

### **Tell us more about peer to peer support in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Very active SENCO network with resource platforms in place
- SENCO forums do not actively include the parent carer forums for feedback from families for better outcomes to action and move forward positively
- We have a well established SENCO network including LA support for SENCO vacancy cover. There are also well established school clusters that meet termly and focus on their locality for both maintained and academy schools.

### **Robust team around the school model, with sufficient universal and targeted support including AP and ELSEC.**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Embedded: A fully integrated 'team around the school' model provides timely, needs-led support. Universal, targeted, and specialist services are coordinated and data-informed. Schools report confidence in accessing support that prevents escalation.
- Embedded: A fully integrated 'team around the school' model provides timely, needs-led support. Universal, targeted, and specialist services are coordinated and data-informed. Schools report confidence in accessing support that prevents escalation.
- Emerging: Support for schools is fragmented and dependent on individual services. Limited clarity about universal, targeted, and specialist pathways.

### **Tell us more about team around the school approaches in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Strong specialist and therapy support alongside a TAS Inclusion support service.
- There is not a targeted approach which shows consistency
- We have an existing 'district' footprint for service delivery, however, we have concluded a full review and are planning staff and school engagement in the Spring to fully develop a 'team around the school' model and bringing together, through matrix management and LA functions to support schools.

**Co-production with all stakeholders on local offer and OAP documents, and close working relationships with parent carer and children and young people voice groups**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Embedded: Co-production is integral to all stages of service design, delivery, and evaluation. Stakeholders report influence and trust in LA processes. Evidence of shared decision-making leading to improved experiences and outcomes.
- Embedded: Co-production is integral to all stages of service design, delivery, and evaluation. Stakeholders report influence and trust in LA processes. Evidence of shared decision-making leading to improved experiences and outcomes.
- Emerging: Engagement with parent carers, children, and young people is limited to consultation or feedback. Co-production is not yet embedded in planning or decision-making.

**Tell us more about co-production with all stakeholders in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Very strong Local offer and SEND network established - led by [Name] Forum, SCC has a co-production charter in place.
- There has been efforts to open up conversations with the LA around inclusion and regional meetings to discuss inclusion and for co production but leads in the LA when invited do not show up
- We have recently developed a Co-production reference groups as part of our Inclusion for All '[Name]' workstream to showcase best practice and ensure that all operational and strategic work is based on the principles of co-production. Membership of this group covers LA, health, schools and parent carer forum.

**How would you rate the clarity of your local authority's vision for inclusion in mainstream settings?**

Response	Count	Percent
Very clear	5	62.5%
Somewhat clear	2	25.0%
Not clear	1	12.5%

**Are school leaders in your area actively involved in co-producing and embedding inclusive leadership ambitions?**

Response	Count	Percent
Sometimes	7	87.5%

Yes, consistently	1	12.5%
-------------------	---	-------

**What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate inclusive practice in schools (e.g. school self-assessment tool, inclusion reviews, quality marks, frameworks)?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Waiting on clarity on definition of inclusion
- Inclusion panel, specialist teaching and inclusion teams, send audits, whole school provision reviews, data analysis and IDSR
- There are no clear monitoring systems in place for firm discussions and actions on inclusive practice

**How effective are current accountability measures (e.g. Ofsted, progress tracking) in supporting inclusive practice?**

Response	Count	Percent
Somewhat effective	6	75.0%
Not effective	2	25.0%

**What challenges do you face in measuring progress for disabled children and those with SEN?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Defining progress and outcome measures. Different for every child
- Variable measures in school - different curriculum offerings in specialist provision , classification remains inconsistent
- There is not enough accountability. Many schools in LA C are part of a Trust monitoring is challenging and many families feel that progress is not being made on highlighting the need for better inclusion.

**Tell us more about Leadership, Accountability & Measuring Progress in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Dashboards and data well embedded alongside established monitoring and engagement forums
- Better accountability is needed. There is mostly defensiveness and they appear to not receive being challenged

- The SEF has include commentary on the data outcomes for SEN support and EHCP pupils and how this compares to national. We monitor Ofsted outcomes and raised questions with school leaders if any concerns have been identified.

**How would you describe the strength of partnership working between your local authority, schools, and Multi-Academy Trusts?**

Response	Count	Percent
Somewhat strong	5	62.5%
Weak	2	25.0%
Very strong	1	12.5%

**Are there established networks or cluster models (e.g. SENCO forums, Area Inclusion Partnerships) in your area?**

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	7	87.5%
No	1	12.5%

**What barriers exist to building a ‘team around the school’?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Funding/capacity constraints.
- Funding/capacity constraints; Poor communication;
- Lack of universal/targeted support; Poor communication;

**How are parent carers and young people involved in decision-making and co-production?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- In every step of the way
- individually and though network, PCF, SENDIAS, vocational profiling
- work is needed in this area for consistent efforts

**Tell us more about Partnership, Outreach & Co-Production in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- See previous answers
- There is co production and parent voices in meetings with the LA but action points are not made clear at these meetings. It is more for sharing information

- Covered in other responses .

**How would you rate the availability and quality of training for school staff on SEND and inclusion?**

Response	Count	Percent
Good	4	50.0%
Excellent	2	25.0%
Poor	1	12.5%
Fair	1	12.5%

**What approaches are used to support workforce development (e.g. mentoring, peer review, coaching)?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- CPD, Mentoring, Peer review, teaching and learning advisors, [Name] SEND, NASEN
- All above and see earlier answers
- Not aware of any it is not shared widely to know what approaches are being made

**What challenges do you face in recruiting and retaining skilled staff for SEND provision?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- Does this mean provision as in [Name]? If so then we do not recruit as an LA?
- Finance
- funding availability

**How do you monitor the impact of training and workforce initiatives on inclusive practice?**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- evaluations. data
- QA embedded
- There is no active monitoring in place

**Tell us more about Supporting the Skills of the Workforce in your LA**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- See previous answers

- There is work to be done for better communication
- We are in the process of developing training for our own staff to have further develop the skills and knowledge of our own workforce.

**Please share any additional insights, examples of good practice, or suggestions for improving inclusion in mainstream settings.**

Qualitative responses (anonymised). Sample excerpts:

- No further comment
- The LA C [Name] Forum did two successful workshops with CONTACT on inclusion and reaching the seldom heard underrepresented families. These workshop brought together parent/carers and professionals from early years hubs and practitioners. It opened up wonderful conversations and much needed about bias/unconscious bias Co production and what it shou...
- Having attended the Regional workshop this week we have noted the good practice examples from LA D regarding the IPSEF and also the presentation on [Name] and will be reflecting these into our current work with school leaders as part of our Inclusion for All programme