



Consultation Response

Consultation on Excellence and Equity for All: Guidance on the Presumption of Mainstreaming

The Scottish Commission for
Learning Disability
February 2018



Section 1 – Introduction

The introduction sets out the purpose of the document, a vision for inclusive education in Scotland, a series of key principles that underpin the guidance and a summary of the key legislative and policy milestones.

The vision for inclusive education in Scotland is -

*‘Inclusive education in Scotland starts from the belief that education is a human right and the foundation for a more just society. An inclusive approach, with an appreciation of diversity and an ambition for all to achieve to their full potential, is essential to getting it right for every child and raising attainment for all. **Inclusion is the cornerstone to help us achieve equity and excellence in education for all of our children and young people.**’ (para 2)*

Q.1 Do you agree with the vision for inclusive education in Scotland?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

If you selected yes or no, please explain why you either agree or disagree with this definition. If you disagree, please offer alternative suggestions.

The Scottish Commission for Learning Disability (SCLD) welcomes the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. SCLD is an independent charitable organisation and strategic partner to the Scottish Government in the delivery of Scotland's learning disability strategy, The keys to life (2013)¹. The strategy defines a learning disability as a significant, lifelong, condition that started before adulthood, which affects development and means individuals need help to understand information, learn skills, and cope independently. SCLD is committed to finding new and better ways to improve the lives of people with learning disabilities and is focused on sharing innovation and good practice so that those providing services and interventions can learn from each other. SCLD also aims to

[1 The keys to life \(2013\)](#)

be a knowledge hub and to build an evidence base, sharing how policy is being implemented and building on an understanding of what really works.

For this consultation, SCLD held a series of conversations with key stakeholders in the field of education and learning disability. This included: Skills Development Scotland, Children in Scotland, ARC Scotland and ENABLE Scotland. This consultation reflects our conversations with these stakeholders and a review of existing evidence on the topic of inclusion.

This response will focus on learning disability and will outline a range of key areas which we believe the guidance should address or which should be strengthened. These areas are:

- 1) Defining inclusion, attainment and wellbeing
- 2) Clarifying principles
- 3) Addressing stigma
- 4) Promoting equality of access
- 5) Reframing language towards strengths
- 6) Clear expectations and joint understandings of public expenditure
- 7) Embedding the extension of children's rights
- 8) An inclusive education for an inclusive society
- 9) Expanding and developing training.

1) Defining inclusion, attainment and wellbeing

With regard to Question 1, SCLD fully supports the vision statement for inclusive education in Scotland outlined on page 3. Of central importance to this is an inclusive approach which understands both the diversity and ambition of individual pupils. SCLD supports the statement but would welcome a clearer definition of both inclusion and attainment.

A clear working definition of inclusion in this document would help to address disparities in definitions highlighted by Florain (2014)². Understandings of inclusion in practice have varied from bringing special education into mainstream settings or to change whole school practices. Inclusion should be defined early in this document, addressing practice-based disparities and introducing the four key features outlined in section 2 of the consultation document.

This definition of inclusion should take a whole school approach, while embedding specialist provision in the mainstream. This is in line with IncludED in the Main (2016)³, which highlighted a lack of additional support for learning staff in mainstream settings and recommended continual renewal and investment in additional support for learning teachers.

In respect of a definition of attainment, SCLD would support a definition which takes account of aspirations and ambition of children and young people with learning disabilities. This would challenge teacher's low academic expectations of these children and young people highlighted by McTeir et al (2016)⁴. McTeir et al, attributed this to the finding that 17% of individuals with learning disabilities achieved SCQF at level six, compared to their peers at 58%.

² [Florain \(2014\)](#)

³ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

⁴ [McTeir et al \(2016\)](#)

The definition of attainment should be strengths based and should acknowledge that goals for each individual will be unique. Additionally, the guidance should demonstrate an understanding of the impact high levels of academic expectation can have on emotional mental wellbeing. Particularly if this not in line with an individual's aspirations and existing academic attainment. Particular consideration of this is required as children and young people with learning disabilities are six times more likely than their peers to have a diagnosable psychiatric disorder, triggered by changes or traumatic events (Bond; 2015) ⁵.

Therefore, SCLD would support Section One Part 6 with a strengthened emphasis on 'considering the wellbeing of children and young people' (2017, p.4)⁶ which extends to the mental wellbeing needs of children and young people with additional support needs. This could be informed by The New Economics Foundation: Five Things to Improve Wellbeing and Resilience highlighted in BOND (2015)⁷ and the GIRFEC Wellbeing Indicators referred to as SHANARRI⁸. SCLD would also support the guidance directing education staff to the Bond (2015)⁹ paper on the mental wellbeing of children and young people with learning disabilities.

The key principles that underpin the guidance are:

- *Improve outcomes and support the delivery of excellence and equity for all children and young people*
- *Meet the needs of all children and young people*

⁵ [Bond \(2015\)](#)

⁶ [Scottish Government \(2017\)](#)

⁷ [Bond \(2015\)](#)

⁸ [GIRFEC Wellbeing Indicators](#)

⁹ [Bond \(2015\)](#)

- *Support and empower children and young people, parents and carers, teachers, practitioners and communities*
- *Outline an inclusive approach which identifies and addresses barriers to learning for all children.’ (para 3)*

Q.2 Do you agree with these principles?

☒ *Yes* ☐ *No* ☐ *Don't know*

If you selected yes or no, please outline why.

2) Clarifying Principles

SCLD supports the key statements which underpin this guidance, with particular reference to empowering children and young people as well as parents and carers. While SCLD supports what is outlined in the principles, SCLD would view these statements not as principles but rather as aims. SCLD would therefore suggest these are titled: Key aims that underpin the guidance.

SCLD would also welcome a strengthening of the wording: ‘Meet the needs of all children and young people’ (2017, p.3)¹⁰. This aim should reflect the strengths as well as the needs of a child and a young person while embedding a strengths based approach throughout the guidance. This aim could be reworded to: Support the strengths and meet the needs of all children and young people.

¹⁰ [Scottish Government \(2017\)](#)

Section 2 – Key features of inclusion – present, participating, achieving and supported

This section of the guidance sets out four key features of inclusion which can be used to set expectations and evaluate children and young people's inclusion in their learning environment – present, participating, achieving and supported.

Q.3 Are the expectations set out under each of the 'present, participating, achieving and supported' principles the right ones?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

If you selected yes or no, please explain why. If you have said no, please offer alternative measures.

3) Addressing stigma

SCLD agrees that the key features of inclusion of 'Present, Participating, Achieving and Supported' and the expectations are correct. However, SCLD would support a strengthening of expectations with regard to person centred and strength based support. This should reduce the stigmatising impact that a deficit focused model of support can have.

Jahoda (2010)¹¹ highlighted that providing support in an exclusionary way could have negative impact. Considering this, SCLD would welcome further attention given to what is meant by the 'Right Help' (p.15). This should take into account the negative and stigmatising impact support can have when it does not consider an individual's capabilities.

Evidence of this is best illustrated by Bargas's (1996)¹² study of 9 students with learning disabilities in the United States. This found that being labelled as having

¹¹ [Jahoda \(2010\)](#)

¹² [Barga \(1996\)](#)

a learning disability created differential treatment by an individual's peers and that some students felt isolated in special programmes. Additionally, such negative labelling resulted in individuals adopting coping strategies. Some of these coping strategies were negative and involved individuals constantly adjusting their lives to pass as an individual without a learning disability. One respondent stated they hid and waited until other students left before leaving the special education room. These findings are supported by Goffman's (1963)¹³ work on stigma and self-identity.

This is not to say that a diagnosis of learning disability and the consequent support is inherently negative: for many individuals a diagnosis of learning disability provides required support (Barga,1996)¹⁴. Therefore identification and positive support is about meeting both the capabilities as well as needs of the individual.

Considering this, the guidance should address the stigma, isolation and negative self-image which the wrong kind of support can create. To ensure this is addressed, SCLD would support the inclusion of an additional two key expectations under the feature of 'supported'. These are stated below:

- All children and young people should be provided with support that has a focus on capabilities at its centre. This support should be provided in a way which does not stigmatise and isolate individuals.
- Those delivering education should be able to demonstrate an understanding of the long-term impact on self-perception and self-esteem that a deficit focused model of support can have.

¹³ [Goffman \(1963\)](#)

¹⁴ [Barga \(1996\)](#)

Section 3 – Deciding on the right provision for a child or young person

This section sets out entitlements and options for provision and Annex B sets out a series of reflective questions to ask when deciding on the most appropriate provision for an individual child or young person.

Q.4 Are the entitlements and options for provision clear?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Don't know

*If you selected no, please suggest ways in which this section might be improved.
Please state the relevant paragraph numbers.*

4) Equality of access

SCLD views the entitlements outlined on page 8 as correct. In particular, SCLD supports the proposed relationship between entitlements to education, support and wellbeing, as illustrated in the diagram on page 8. However, SCLD would suggest strengthening of the entitlements, options and the questions in Annex B. This is detailed below.

SCLD sees a need for The Education (Scotland) Act 2016¹⁵ to be included within the legislative framework with reference to the entitlement of a child or young person having their view heard about their support and education. This should be in line with extension of children's rights.

With reference to point 22 (2017,p.9)¹⁶, SCLD would see value in the guidance providing clarity on the mechanisms for children, young people and their carers to express their views (including tribunals, mediation and adjunction) and how these mechanisms are accessed. This should include: links or reference to accessible information about these mechanisms, and a clear statement about the value of independent advocacy and the role it can play to support children, young people

¹⁵ [The Education \(Scotland\) Act 2016](#)

¹⁶ [The Scottish Government \(2017\)](#)

and their parents/ carers. This is supported by recommendation 10 of IncludED in the Main¹⁷ which stated that as a minimum The Scottish Government's Strategy for families with disabled children should provide access to advocacy and provide interventions to support families to meaningfully participate as equal partners in a child's education.

Evidence from Riddle (2016)¹⁸ highlighted tensions between parental empowerment and resource allocation. This discussed the disparity of resource allocation for children living in economic deprivation, more commonly identified with: social emotional and behavioural difficulties (Riddle; 2016)¹⁹ and their peers living in higher economic areas, who have the benefit of social capital. Local Authorities and schools have a role in addressing these inequalities and to provide families with accessible information about the mechanisms for having their voices heard. Therefore, SCLD would support the guidance outlining these mechanisms and providing links to accessible information. This should level the access so that all children, young people and their families have equal opportunity to make their voices heard.

This is not to say that individuals cannot or should not advocate for themselves; instead SCLD would support the guidance promoting equality of access to these mechanisms and the provision of advocacy to support this.

In Annex B, SCLD views the questions relating to a child's entitlement to learn as placing too great an emphasis on how the child or young person with a learning disability impacts upon the education system. The questions should focus instead on how the same system impacts on them. SCLD would welcome these questions taking a strengths based approach. This is in line with SCLD's later comments

¹⁷ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

¹⁸ [Riddel et al \(2016\)](#)

¹⁹ [Riddel et al \(2016\)](#)

regarding reflective questions under the heading, 'Incompatible with the efficient education for other children' on page 10 - 11 of this response.

Section 4 - How and why could the exemptions be applied?

This section sets out guidance on the three exemptions set out in legislation.

Q.5 Is the commentary and the reflective questions on each of the exceptions helpful?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Don't know

If you selected no, please suggest ways in which the commentary and reflective questions might be improved.

SCLD fully supports points 28 to 31 under the heading ability and aptitude and the practice-based focus on the reflective questions. SCLD feels this is in line with a view of attainment which considers individuals' own aspirations and goals and attainment across a range of areas. (See response to Question 1).

While understanding the importance of outlining the exemptions to ensure that those who require specialist provision can access it, SCLD would welcome:

- Reframing the exemption 'Incompatible with the efficient education for other children' to take account of a consideration of individuals' strengths and capabilities (5)
- Clear expectations and joint understandings of 'unreasonable public expenditure' (6)
- Embedding the extension of Children's Rights with regard to the three exemptions (7).

5) Reframing the exemption ‘incompatible with the efficient education for other children’ to take account of a consideration of individuals’ strengths

SCLD would support those utilising the guidance taking into consideration the implications of the language in The Scottish Schools Act. 2000²⁰, with particular reference to the exemption, “Incompatible with the efficient education for the children with whom the child would be educated” (2017, p.10)²¹.

When applying this exemption Local Authorities should consider this in conjunction with The Equality Act (2010)²² section 85, The Human Rights Act²³ (Article 1, Protocol 2) and The United Nations Convention on the Rights of The Child²⁴ (article 28 and 29). To ensure this, SCLD would welcome the language of these acts being expressed more explicitly in the guidance. This would balance the deficit language of this exemption.

In doing this the guidance would address inequality of access to education which was demonstrated in findings from IncludED in the Main (2016)²⁵. These findings highlighted that young people with learning disabilities were excluded from school on account of their disability and/ or behaviors arising from this, for example disruptive behavior (38%).

Considering the above, SCLD sees a need for the reflective questions to be reworded. This should place the onus on the school to ensure all supports have been offered to the child to allow them to positively engage in a mainstream setting. SCLD welcomes the inclusion of the existing fourth question: “How will

²⁰ [Standards in Scottish Schools etc. Act 2000](#)

²¹ [Scottish Government \(2017\)](#)

²² [The Equality Act \(2010\)](#)

²³ [The Human Rights Act 1998](#)

²⁴ [The United Nations Convention on the rights of the child \(1990\)](#)

²⁵ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

you balance the needs of all children and young people within the school?” (2017,p12)²⁶, but proposes reframing the first 3 questions to align these more closely with human rights and equalities legislation. These could be replaced by the following:

- Has the school ensured the necessary adjustments to facilitate the successful integration of the child or young person in the school community?
- In what way *can* the child or young person impact positively on the wider school community?
- If the child presents barriers to other children's learning, what adjustments have been made to counteract this?

SCLD would also support consideration being given to the use of the word ‘placement’ in section 32. Using the word placement in the context of the presumption of mainstream creates an unnecessary stigma which would not be applied to those without additional support needs.

6) Clear expectations and joint understandings of ‘unreasonable public expenditure’

SCLD supports Terzi’s (2007)²⁷ view that access to additional resources to meet education needs is a matter of justice. It is reasonable to conclude that public expenditure for one pupil may differ from another. It is important that clarity is given regarding this decision making process. Therefore, SCLD would welcome a definition of ‘unreasonable public expenditure’ for local authorities to avoid decisions based solely on professional decision making. While resources for support should be equally accessible (See; Question 4) it is acknowledged that an equalities based approach recognises that some people will have greater needs.

²⁶ [Scottish Government \(2017\)](#)

²⁷ [Terzi \(2007\)](#)

This is in line with the ‘funding follows the child model’ (A Blueprint for 2020²⁸), which aims to be responsive to local needs. Equality of public expenditure could helpfully be addressed in the guidance through the use of case studies.

In determining what would be deemed as ‘unreasonable public expenditure’, SCLD would emphasise the wishes and views of the child and young person. This is in line with the extension children’s of rights which ensured that children 12 years old and their parents/carers can have an active role in requesting assessments for support, making plans about support, accessing advocacy at tribunals and resolving disagreements (Children in Scotland, 2017)²⁹. While the guidance makes reference to this in point 34, SCLD would support strengthening this through inclusion of a fifth reflective question stating:

- To what extent has the local authority considered the views of the children, young person and their parent and carers?

7) Embedding the extension of Children’s Rights with regard to the three exemptions

SCLD sees a need to embed the extension of Children’s Rights throughout section four. This will ensure all children and young people and their parents and carers can express their views about the type of education provision the individual will receive. However, it should be acknowledged that the process used to involve children and young people can be long, complex and demanding. Understanding this, the guidance should give thoughtful consideration to both ensuring participation and also protecting their right to childhood experiences which these processes may disrupt.

²⁸ [A Blueprint for 2020: the expansion of Early Learning and Childcare in Scotland](#)

²⁹ [Children in Scotland \(2017\)](#)

Section 5 – Delivering Inclusion

This section reflects on how to support the principles of inclusion (present, participating, achieving and supported) in and outside of school. It identifies the following key areas:

- *Inclusive school values and ethos*
- *Leadership*
- *Constructive challenge to attitudes*
- *Evaluation of planning process*
- *Capacity to deliver inclusion*
- *Parental and carer engagement*
- *Early intervention, prevention and strong relationships*
- *Removal of barriers to learning*

Q.6 Are there any areas missing, requiring strengthening, or which are not required and could be removed? Please tick the box that applies.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't know**

If you selected yes, please suggest ways in which this section might be improved. Please refer to relevant paragraph numbers.

In line with conversations with key stakeholders, SCLD would suggest a strengthening across the eight key areas for delivering inclusion. While SCLD agrees that these headings are correct we would welcome expanded detail in all of the 8 sections and in particular the following sections:

- Inclusive school values and ethos
- Evaluation of planning processes
- Capacity to deliver inclusion
- Parental and career engagement
- Early intervention.

SCLD would also welcome the inclusion of an additional key area that is inclusive education for an inclusive society. This would also require a strengthening of the section on training. Both are discussed below.

8) An inclusive education for an inclusive society

This new key area should reflect how those working in education can provide a basis for an inclusive society in the future. This involves the promotion of equal opportunities for children and young people with regard to their lives following school including; education, employment, community life, social life and family life.

Equality of opportunity at a range of stages in life can be promoted by those working in education through supporting positive transitions. However, IncludED in the Main³⁰ found that 41% of young people who have learning disabilities and/or autism spectrum disorders in mainstream schools did not feel they had support to develop a plan for their future.

This is an area in which mainstream schools can take learning from special schools and specialist provision. Surveys carried out by ARC Scotland and The Scottish Transitions Forum, published in 'Facing the Future Together' (2018)³¹ showed what young people with additional support needs and their families thought of their experience of transitions. It showed a small but significant difference between the experiences of pupils at mainstream schools and pupils at special schools.

Disaggregated data (available in Appendix 1) from 'Facing the Future Together' ³² highlighted that:

³⁰ [ENABLE \(2017\)](#)

³¹ [ARC and Scottish Transitions Forum \(2017\)](#)

³² [ARC and Scottish Transitions Forum \(2017\)](#)

- 15% percent of parents and carers with children in mainstream schools were very unhappy with the support the young person and child received to prepare for leaving school, compared to 4% where a young person attended a special school
- 17% of parents and carers with children in special schools were very happy with the information their children received from schools about transitions, while only 6% of those with children in mainstream schools were very happy.

The guidance should reflect on learnings from special schools in this area and outline what is required for young people with learning disabilities (and those with additional support needs) to make a successful transition to the adult world. This should support education staff's understanding of the role they play in providing a starting point for inclusion throughout an individual's life.

9) Expanding and Developing Training

Training is addressed through points 49 and 50 in the guidance. This correctly identifies that the teacher will want to feel confident they have the required training and experience to provide the right support to a child or young person. SCLD would support an expansion of the section on training. This should address training across three distinct levels each of which are outlined below:

Peer Training

SCLD supports the inclusion of lessons on learning disability being embedded into the curriculum, in line with Recommendation 2 of IncludED in the Main (2016)³³. The guidance would be enhanced by linking to 'Talking About Learning Disability'³⁴. This is an online lesson planning resource about people

³³ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

³⁴ [Talking About Learning Disability](#)

with learning disabilities experiences of bullying. This was produced by: Strathclyde University, The University of Glasgow, and ENABLE Scotland.

SCLD also support young people with learning disabilities leading peer education and sharing their experiences around bullying and exclusion. This is in line with Enable Scotland, Be the Change campaign. The impact of young people sharing experiences is highlighted in a case study about Lucy McKee³⁵. The guidance should thoughtfully address this, considering that this type of peer training will work best on an individual basis, based on the confidence, resilience and wishes of the young person.

Leadership Training

SCLD views leadership training as vital to ensuring excellence and equality for children and young people with additional support needs. This, in line with the 'National Improvement Framework for Scottish Education: Achieving Excellence and Equity for All' (The Scottish Government: 2016)³⁶. SCLD supports that head teachers have access to comprehensive training on additional support needs and the barriers to access individuals face. This should have a focus on learning disability.

John Swinney has committed to developing inclusive education resources for head teachers and other staff during the Presumption of Mainstreaming debate in Parliament on 2nd November. During this debate he stated,

"I have already highlighted the crucial role that is played by teachers, support staff and other staff in mainstream primary and secondary schools, and in units and special schools all over Scotland. They are the key to ensuring that children's and young people's experience of education—in the classroom and in the whole school—is truly inclusive. They need to know that they have access to resources

³⁵ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

³⁶ [National Improvement Framework for Scottish Education: Achieving Excellence and Equity for all \(2016\)](#)

that support their professional practice and give them the confidence to support children's learning successfully" (Meeting of the Parliament, 02 November 2017)³⁷.

Staff Training

INcludED in the Main (2016)³⁸ found that less than 12% of the education workforce felt satisfied that they could meet the educational and developmental needs of a child or young person with a learning disability and that 98% of the education workforce stated that initial teacher training does not adequately prepare teachers for working with children and young people with additional support needs, including learning disabilities.

This is supported by findings from Hodkinson (2006)³⁹ who found that newly qualified teachers after one year of teaching could define inclusion as a concept, but were unsure how to make it a reality. Research from Florian (2012)⁴⁰ and Florian and Rouse (2009)⁴¹ also identified that the positive long term impact of inclusive practices was not reaching teachers.

Taking this into consideration, SCLD would suggest that the guidance addresses the need for comprehensive training for teaching staff on additional support needs, the positive impact of inclusion and the long-term negative impacts of exclusion. Examples of the types of training which may be appropriate to staff would include, learning disability awareness training and unconscious bias training.

³⁷ [Meeting of the Parliament 02 November 2017](#)

³⁸ [ENABLE \(2016\)](#)

³⁹ [Hodkinson \(2006\)](#)

⁴⁰ [Florain \(2012\)](#)

⁴¹ [Florain and Rouse \(2009\)](#)

Q.7 Were the case studies helpful? Please tick the box that applies.

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Don't know

If yes, please say why and if you would like further case studies or are content with the current number. If you selected no, please explain why and what would be helpful instead.

SCLD would support further development of the case studies in addition to the strengthening of the key areas for delivering inclusion (see Question 5). We see a need for more comprehensive case studies which illustrate how inclusion was delivered and any challenges in achieving this goal. We believe this would help teachers and head teachers to consider fully the barriers to inclusion. This would support them to develop whole school inclusive practices.

Q.8 Overall, is the guidance helpful? Please tick the box that applies.

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

If you selected no, please explain your answer. If you selected yes, please indicate what was particularly helpful.

Yes, with the further additions and expansions identified in this consultation response.

Q.9 Are there any other comments you would wish to make about the draft guidance on presumption of mainstreaming?

In addition to the 9 key areas which have been outlined throughout this response, SCLD see a need for clarity to be given to reflective questions on ability and aptitude in section 4 and a need for the guidance to address evaluation. This is discussed below:

Clarity regarding reflective questions on ability and aptitude

SCLD would support greater clarity regarding the reflective questions on ability and aptitude. This would benefit from clearer differentiation between the five GIRFEC practice model questions and the additional reflective questions. This could be resolved with the insertion of sub- headings.

Addressing Evaluation

SCLD sees a need for the guidance to examine how schools best evaluate the impact and effectiveness of inclusion for children and young people. In developing the guidance SCLD would welcome a framework for schools to evaluate inclusion across three different levels. This could be in line with Florain (2014)⁴² who recommended evaluation across three different levels: person, classroom and school. This should take account of the impact of training as discussed in the response to Question 6.

SCLD views this guidance as an important part of ensuring an inclusive education for all children and young people in Scotland. However, SCLD would value: strengthening of definitions and understandings, redefining principles to aims and reframing the use of language with reference to a strength based approach. SCLD would also welcome the guidance addressing complex issues around stigma and equality of access while also making reference to the extension of children's rights, developing training and promoting understanding of inclusive education as the foundation for an inclusive society.

Thank you the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

⁴² [Florain \(2014\)](#)

Appendix 1

Comparison - mainstream vs special school (Jan 2018)

Data from 'Facing the Future Together: A National Survey of young people with additional support needs and their parents and carers about their experiences of leaving school (ARC Scotland, 2017)

1. Parents / carers with children still at school

a) Happiness with support they are getting to prepare for leaving school

All parents / carers (470)

How happy are you with the support they are getting to prepare for leaving school? (No. = 197)						
Answer options	Very happy	Fairly happy	Neither happy or unhappy	Fairly unhappy	Very unhappy	Not getting support but would like it
From a charity or voluntary organisation	12%	13%	19%	5%	1%	49%
From college	3%	1%	25%	4%	8%	59%
From school	12%	20%	23%	15%	11%	19%
From Skills Development Scotland	1%	5%	16%	6%	3%	69%
From social work	2%	12%	15%	9%	21%	40%
From the NHS	4%	11%	26%	8%	8%	42%

Parents / carers with children in mainstream school (118 / 470)

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting support but would like it -
From a charity or voluntary organisation	10.11% 9	14.61% 13	19.10% 17	3.37% 3	1.12% 1	51.69% 46
From college	2.53% 2	1.27% 1	21.52% 17	1.27% 1	11.39% 9	62.03% 49
From school	6.03% 7	18.10% 21	21.55% 25	15.52% 18	15.52% 18	23.28% 27
From Skills Development Scotland	1.04% 1	7.29% 7	13.54% 13	4.17% 4	4.17% 4	69.79% 67
From social work	2.15% 2	9.68% 9	13.98% 13	3.23% 3	19.35% 18	51.61% 48
From the NHS	4.17% 4	9.38% 9	21.88% 21	8.33% 8	11.46% 11	44.79% 43

Parents / carers with children currently in special schools (78 / 470)

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting support but would like it -
From a charity or voluntary organisation	14.49% 10	13.04% 9	17.39% 12	7.25% 5	1.45% 1	46.38% 32
From college	3.33% 2	1.67% 1	30.00% 18	8.33% 5	3.33% 2	53.33% 32
From school	20.00% 15	21.33% 16	25.33% 19	14.67% 11	4.00% 3	14.67% 11
From Skills Development Scotland	0.00% 0	1.59% 1	20.63% 13	7.94% 5	1.59% 1	68.25% 43
From social work	1.41% 1	16.90% 12	16.90% 12	16.90% 12	22.54% 16	25.35% 18
From the NHS	4.55% 3	15.15% 10	30.30% 20	9.09% 6	3.03% 2	37.88% 25

b) Happiness with information received about transition

All parents (470)

How happy are you with the information you have received about their transition? (No. = 192)						
Answer options	Very happy	Fairly happy	Neither happy or unhappy	Fairly unhappy	Very unhappy	Not getting information but would like
From a charity or voluntary organisation	8%	10%	16%	5%	1%	59%
From college	3%	1%	18%	4%	5%	69%
From school	11%	17%	15%	14%	7%	37%
From Skills Development Scotland	0%	5%	13%	7%	5%	71%
From social work	1%	5%	17%	7%	14%	55%
From the NHS	2%	6%	21%	5%	8%	58%

Parents / carers with children in mainstream school (118 / 470)

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting information but would like it -
From a charity or voluntary organisation	9.52% 8	8.33% 7	15.48% 13	2.38% 2	1.19% 1	63.10% 53
From college	2.56% 2	1.28% 1	15.38% 12	1.28% 1	8.97% 7	70.51% 55
From school	6.25% 7	16.07% 18	11.61% 13	14.29% 16	7.14% 8	44.64% 50
From Skills Development Scotland	0.00% 0	6.98% 6	10.47% 9	6.98% 6	5.81% 5	69.77% 60

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting information but would like it -
From social work	0.00% 0	3.49% 3	18.60% 16	1.16% 1	12.79% 11	63.95% 55
From the NHS	1.18% 1	4.71% 4	20.00% 17	2.35% 2	8.24% 7	63.53% 54

Parents / carers with children currently in special schools (78/ 470)

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting information but would like it -
From a charity or voluntary organisation	7.46% 5	13.43% 9	17.91% 12	8.96% 6	1.49% 1	50.75% 34
From college	3.23% 2	0.00% 0	22.58% 14	8.06% 5	0.00% 0	66.13% 41
From school	17.57% 13	17.57% 13	20.27% 15	13.51% 10	6.76% 5	24.32% 18
From Skills Development Scotland	0.00% 0	1.64% 1	16.39% 10	8.20% 5	3.28% 2	70.49% 43

-	Very happy -	Fairly happy -	Neither happy or unhappy -	Fairly unhappy -	Very unhappy -	Not getting information but would like it -
From social work	1.43% 1	7.14% 5	17.14% 12	15.71% 11	15.71% 11	42.86% 30
From the NHS	3.08% 2	7.69% 5	23.08% 15	7.69% 5	7.69% 5	50.77% 33

Notes

1. Overall there do not appear to be major differences in satisfaction between parents with children in mainstream schools and those with children in special schools with regard to the support and information received about transitions. Similar patterns occur across most of the questions.
2. There are some positive points regarding special schools:
 - a. The greatest disparity in satisfaction between special and mainstream schools is with regard to information received from schools (as opposed to from social work, NHS etc). 35% of parents with children at special schools are very or fairly happy with the information received, while only 23% are similarly satisfied at mainstream schools.
 - b. A similar disparity exists for support received - 41% for special schools, 24% mainstream schools
 - c. Parents with children at special schools are less likely to say they are not getting (but would like) the support / information they need from their school, (Support wanted - mainstream 23%, special 15%. Information wanted - mainstream 45%, special 24%).

Contact us

Website: **www.sclld.org.uk**

Twitter: **@SCLDNews**

Facebook: **@ScotCommission**

Instagram: **@sclldnews**

For information on Scotland's Learning Disability Strategy *The Keys to life*, visit: **www.keystolife.info**

The Scottish Commission for Learning Disability
Suite 5.2
Stock Exchange Court
77 Nelson Mandela Place
Glasgow
G2 1QY

