

## Response ID ANON-XFFY-STK4-3

Submitted to Reviews of Education, Health and Care plans: proposed timescales  
Submitted on 2022-07-27 16:07:36

### Instructions

### Introduction

Welcome. Please tell us if you are responding as a child or young person, parent or on behalf of an organisation.

SEND organisation

What is your name?

Name:  
Simon Want

Would you be happy for us to contact you for further information if required? If so, what is the best way to contact you?

Whether and how to contact respondent for any follow-up:

Yes. Via Email.

Would you like to provide your email address?

Email::  
simon.want@NDCS.org.uk

Would you like us to keep your responses confidential?

No

Reason for confidentiality:

### Introduction: follow up

What organisation do you represent (if any)?

Type of organisation the respondent represents:  
The National Deaf Children's Society

### Question 1

To what extent do you agree or disagree that, where a local authority proposes to amend an Education, Health and Care plan after a review meeting, it should issue proposed draft amendments to the plan as soon as practicable after that meeting and in any event within eight weeks?

Strongly Disagree

### Question 1: supplementary

You have said that you don't agree with an eight week deadline for local authorities to issue draft proposals for any amendment to EHC plans. Please say what deadline you think the local authority should be subject to instead and why.

What deadline other than eight weeks should there be and why?:

- We don't agree with this proposal.
- We don't believe that extending the timeline for producing the plans will result in better quality plans being put in place. Within our casework we regularly see local authorities breaching the current legal timescales, and this does not seem to equate to any improvement in the quality of plans put in place.
- The need for, and nature of, amendments should usually be apparent and clear upon the conclusion of the review meeting. One of the main purposes of the meeting is to discuss such issues. Necessary amendments should be all the more identifiable at this point if all relevant advice and information has been appropriately prepared and shared between parties in advance, particularly if the proposed advance time for this is extended to 3 weeks as proposed. The current four week timescale allowed to formally propose such amendments post review is therefore reasonable.
- The system already has lots of delays. Decisions need to be made sooner rather than delaying the provision of vital support.
- The content of EHCP amendments regularly affect school placements and the specialist provision required by children whose education, progress and welfare can be significantly impacted by every week's wait to have their needs met.

- Further every week's delay in finalising an EHCP frustrates parents and young people's right to appeal its content, including school placement at points of transition which can be time critical.
- We submit that the majority of the issues under review, namely local authorities struggling to meet existing timescales, would be better and more appropriately addressed by ensuring local authorities have adequate resources to meet the current timescale.

## Question 2

To what extent do you agree or disagree with Proposal 2?

Strongly Disagree

## Question 2: supplementary

You have said that you disagree with the proposal about what local authorities should have to issue at each stage in any two stage procedure. Please tell us why.

Reasons for disagreeing with proposal 2:

- Again, we disagree with this.
- If, within four weeks post review, is expected that the local authority has sufficient information to decide that amendments are necessary, we submit it would usually follow that it has enough information to propose the nature of such amendments at that same point.

## Question 3

Currently the advice and information gathered before a review meeting should be circulated at least two weeks in advance of that meeting. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals that information should instead be circulated at least three weeks in advance of the review meeting?

Strongly Agree

## Question 4

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposals in this consultation would have a positive impact on those with particular 'protected characteristics' such as a disability and on children's rights?

Disagree

Please explain your response.

Explain impact on protected characteristics and children's rights:

We know that deaf children regularly fall behind at every stage of their development. Building extra time into the system before changes are implemented will likely have a detrimental effect on children. Development at a young age is extremely quick, so changes need to be implemented quickly.

## Question 5

Is there anything else you would like to say about the proposals in this consultation?

Any final comments:

Advice and information gathered before a review to be circulated three weeks in advance of the review meeting:

- We agree with this. We think this is positive. Sharing information sooner in advance gives all parties a clear benefit of being able to review the documents in more detail, identifying areas of agreement, disagreement or in need of further discussion. Indeed, we would suggest the proposals could go further and a timescale of circulation of four weeks in advance would be beneficial to all parties.

Accessibility of the Consultation

- There was no accessible version of this consultation in British Sign Language (BSL). We are extremely disappointed with this, as it restricts the people the proposals in the consultation directly affects from being able to respond to the consultation.