



## REPORT ON APRIL 26 WORKSHOPS – TRANSPORT / SEND REFORMS

### Overall Attendance by Location

Location	Total	Parent/Carer	Professional	% Parent Carer	% Professional
Thrapston	32	18	14	56%	44%
Corby	39	20	19	51%	49%
Kettering	26	12	14	46%	54%
Wellingborough	34	17	17	50%	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>49%</b>

### Professional Representation by Sector

Sector	Total Professionals	% of Professional Group
Education	19	30%
NNC	15	23%
NHS	12	19%
Voluntary/Charity	10	16%
Other	8	12%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Demographic Summary

- The overall split is **well balanced**, with **51% parent/carers** and **49% professionals**, demonstrating strong co-production principles.
- **Corby** had the highest attendance, contributing nearly **30% of total participants**.
- **Education professionals** form the largest sector group (30%), followed by **NNC (23%)** and **NHS (19%)**, showing strong statutory engagement.
- **Kettering** is the only location where professionals outnumbered parent/carers, which may be worth exploring in future engagement planning.

### Feedback

A total of 103 responses were collected from attendees across the SEND workshops. Respondents included a mix of parent carers and professionals, reflecting strong multi-agency engagement and co-production.

Transport Workshop: Ratings ranged from 3 to 5 (Good to Excellent), with most responses at 4–5. Overall feedback was positive, though slightly more varied.

Reform Workshop: Consistently high ratings 4-5, predominantly 5 (Excellent), indicating strong engagement and relevance.



## **Introduction**

### **What the system is telling us using quantified evidence from families and professionals.**

This report sets out how evidence gathered through a multi-agency SEND workshop process will be used to shape the Local SEND Plan and support the case for the SEN Deficit Stability Grant.

The workshops were designed to move beyond isolated complaints or service-specific issues. Participants were asked to examine SEND system pressures from four linked perspectives:

- Parents and carers
- Schools and settings
- Services
- Leadership and governance

## **2. Evidence base: robustness and credibility**

### Sources used

The analysis draws on:

- 4 x Workshop qualitative mapping note
- The additional photo-based flipchart/post-it dataset from the four-perspective exercise
- Facilitated synthesis of repeated themes across groups

### Method

The workshops used:

- post-it note capture
- facilitated challenge and discussion
- grouping by theme and pathway stage
- cross-checking across different participants and perspectives
- thematic synthesis of repeated issues, tensions and opportunities

### Why this evidence is credible

Test of robustness	What was found
Duplication across groups	High repetition of the same issues across different tables and roles
Consistency across pathway	Problems recur from early identification through to provision and transition
Cross-perspective confirmation	Parents, schools, services and leaders describe linked parts of the same pattern
Low irrelevant data	Very little off-topic material; most contributions were directly relevant
Balance of evidence	Includes what is working, not just what is failing

The evidence added sharper detail on issues that were emerging which strengthens confidence that the main findings are not accidental. They are repeated system signals.



## Chapter 1 Different Perspectives and System Pressures

The First exercise was completed in two stages:

### *Step 1: Four-perspective pressure testing*

Participants then revisited the same issues through the lens of:

- Parents
- Schools
- Services
- Leadership

### *Step 2: Pathway mapping*

Participants mapped where the SEND system:

- works well
- delays support
- allows children and families to fall through gaps
- leaves professionals unsupported

Across the child and young person journey:

- Early identification
- Universal
- Targeted
- Targeted Plus
- Specialist
- EHCP
- Provision
- Transitions / adulthood

This second step added important depth. It showed not only what the pressure points are, but how they are experienced differently across the system so it is a structured, repeated, and internally triangulated body of lived experience evidence.

This chapter presents the findings from SEND workshops across **Kettering, Corby, Wellingborough and Thrapston**, bringing together lived experience from families and professionals to map:

- where the system works
- where pressure builds
- where children and young people fall through gaps
- where professionals feel unsupported

The analysis is **evidence-led and quantified**, based on cleaned and grouped workshop comments. It is designed to inform:

- the **Local Area SEND Plan**
- delivery against **Priority Action Plans**
- a credible response to **deficit recovery / High Needs Stability Grant conditions**



Perspective	What the evidence most strongly highlights
Parents	Feeling unheard, unclear routes to help, poor communication, stress, weak information, being forced to coordinate support
Schools	Inclusion pressure, lack of training, insufficient capacity, curriculum and accountability tension, difficulty meeting need when specialist support is unavailable
Services	Delays, thresholds, poor cross-service communication, workforce limitations, operational breakdowns
Leadership	Capacity stretched, unclear alignment of priorities, governance pressure, difficulty delivering what the system promises

This confirms that the system challenge is not one of isolated underperformance. It is a whole-system design and capacity issue.

### Overview of system themes (quantified)

Theme	What this is really about	F	Signal
Early identification not converting into support	Needs identified but not acted on quickly or consistently	38	Very strong
Access, thresholds and gatekeeping	Difficulty accessing help; unclear criteria; refusal to assess	31	Very strong
Capacity, workforce and funding pressures	Staffing, funding and demand constraining every level	34	Very strong
Fragmented multi-agency working	Poor coordination; unclear ownership across services	27	Strong
Inconsistent practice and postcode variation	Experience depends on school, area, practitioner	29	Very strong
EHCP process and quality under strain	Delays, refusals, inconsistent plans, reliance on EHCP	28	Very strong
Provision delivery and transitions gaps	Support not delivered; weak post-16/adulthood pathways	25	Strong
Pockets of good practice (not scaled)	Strong services exist but are inconsistent	24	Strong

#### Key point:

All major themes show strong or very strong signals, indicating system-wide, not isolated issues.



## Where the system is working (quantified strengths)

Purpose of this chapter is to bring together lived experience from families and frontline professionals to identify:

- where the system is working
- where delays and pressure points occur
- where children and young people fall through gaps
- where professionals feel unsupported

This is an evidence-led account of system behaviour, drawn from repeated patterns across all localities. It is intended to inform the Local Area SEND Plan, support delivery against Priority Action Plans, and underpin a credible approach to deficit recovery and the High Needs Stability Grant

### What is working (and worth protecting and scaling)?

Across all workshops, participants consistently identified strong practice already in the system:

- Committed and skilled professionals across education, health and the voluntary sector
- Early years provision (including nurseries and health visitors) supporting early identification
- Outstanding Special schools and Outreach services (e.g. Rowan Gate, Maplefields) described as accessible, responsive and impactful
- Portage and community-based support, highly valued by families
- Peer support networks, reducing isolation and improving confidence
- Examples of inclusive practice in schools, where needs are understood and adapted for

Insight:

The system is not starting from a deficit of good practice. It already contains effective models of support. However, these are not consistently available or embedded, meaning families experience them as “lucky” rather than expected.

Strength area	F	What this tells us
Committed and skilled professionals	9	Workforce is a strength but under pressure
Outreach services (e.g. Rowan Gate, Maplefields)	9	Effective models already exist
Early years provision (nurseries, health visitors)	8	Early identification infrastructure is in place
Peer support and community support	6	Informal support networks are valuable
Inclusive practice in some schools	7	Good practice exists but is not consistent

### Interpretation:

The system has **credible building blocks for reform**, but these are **not consistently embedded or scaled**.



## Theme Analysis - Pressure points across the SEND pathway

### Early identification → support gap (38 comments)

Issue	Frequency	Signal
Identification does not lead to support	18	Very strong
Lack of clarity on “what happens next”	10	Strong
Early intervention not happening	10	Strong

### Verbatim evidence

- “What comes next after identification?”
- “Early intervention not always happening”
- “What is the point of early identification if no pathway to support?”

### What this means

The system identifies need variably and inconsistently but cannot convert that into timely intervention often enough. This creates **avoidable escalation** later in the pathway.

Targeted support is not functioning as an effective early intervention layer, resulting in:

- delayed support
- increased demand at specialist level
- escalation to EHCP

### Targeted support → access blocked (Thresholds / Gatekeeping) (31 comments)

Issue	Frequency	Signal
Access to support is a failure	9	Strong
Gatekeeping (schools/system)	8	Strong
Early help not working	7	Strong
Unclear thresholds	7	Strong

### Verbatim evidence

- “Getting access is a failure”
- “Gatekeeping in schools”
- “Already at crisis”
- “Round in Circles”
- “Refusal to assess”
- “Not my budget”



### What this means

Targeted support is **not functioning as an effective early intervention layer**, resulting in:

- delayed support
- increased demand at specialist level
- escalation to EHCP

*Specialist support → delay and capacity pressure (34 comments)*

Issue	Frequency	Signal
Waiting lists and delays	15	Very strong
Limited specialist availability	11	Strong
Inconsistent support	8	Moderate–strong

### Verbatim evidence

- “Waiting lists”
- “SALT / EP not available – wait times”
- “Limited capacity”

### What this means

Specialist services are **over capacity**, resulting in:

- delayed interventions
- worsening needs
- increased system pressure downstream

*EHCP process → system strain*

Issue	Frequency	Signal
Refusal to assess / refer	8	Strong
Delays and timescales	9	Strong
Parent-led escalation	7	Strong
Poor EHCP quality	4	Moderate

### Verbatim evidence

- “Round in circles until parent pushed”
- “Refusal to assess”
- “EHCPs not fit for purpose / not enforced”



**What this means**

EHCPs are increasingly being used as a route to access support, rather than a safeguard for complex needs

This increases:

- demand
- conflict
- financial pressure

Provision and transitions → delivery gap

Issue	Frequency	Signal
Provision not delivered properly	8	Strong
Mainstream not meeting need	7	Strong
Weak post-16/adulthood pathways	6	Moderate–strong

**Verbatim evidence**

- “Due to lack of funding it’s not delivered right”
- “Mainstream not suitable for all”
- “Adulthood pathways unclear”

**What this means**

There is a gap between planning and delivery, particularly at transition points.

**Where families fall through gaps (mapped)**

Gap point	Evidence	Impact
After identification	“What happens next?”	Delay before support begins
At thresholds	“Not meeting criteria” / gatekeeping	Needs escalate before help
Between services	“Passed between services”	No ownership of journey
During EHCP process	“Round in circles”	Delay, stress, escalation
At transitions	“Not taken seriously”	Poor adulthood outcomes

**Key insight:**

The system loses children **at transition points between levels**, not just within services.



## Where professionals feel unsupported (quantified)

Issue	F	What this shows
Capacity and workload pressure	14	Workforce stretched across all levels
Lack of training / SEND knowledge	9	Confidence gaps in mainstream
Lack of access to specialist advice	7	Professionals unsupported in decision-making
Unclear roles / expectations	6	System design issue

### Verbatim evidence

- “Workers are well-meaning but overwhelmed”
- “Staff not trained to identify”

### Cross-cutting system insights (Repeated across multiple themes)

Insight	Evidence
Identification without intervention	Seen in early identification, targeted, EHCP
Parent persistence drives access	Seen in targeted, EHCP, family experience
Capacity constraints shape decisions	Seen across all levels
Inconsistency is systemic	Seen across schools, services, areas
Fragmentation causes loss of continuity	Seen in specialist and transitions

### Key tensions in the data

Tension	Evidence
Early identification works vs fails	“Good early identification” vs “not always happening”
EHCP valued vs ineffective	“Great tool” vs “not fit for purpose”
Inclusion vs suitability	“Inclusion” vs “mainstream not suitable”
Strong professionals vs inconsistent delivery	“Fantastic professionals” vs “varied quality”



## Hidden issues (implied)

- Lack of a **clearly defined operational pathway**
- Over-reliance on **statutory routes to unlock support**
- System behaviour influenced by **financial pressure**
- Weakness in **universal and targeted layers driving escalation**

---

## Priority issues for action (evidence-based)

Priority	Evidence (frequency + impact)	Required action
1. Strengthen pathway after identification	Highest frequency theme (38)	Define and implement clear post-identification pathways
2. Improve access to targeted support	Strong signal across access/gatekeeping themes (31)	Clarify thresholds, strengthen SEN Support and early help
3. Address capacity and workforce gaps	High frequency across all themes (34)	Workforce planning, training, specialist capacity
4. Reduce inconsistency across system	Strong signal (29)	Set consistent expectations and accountability
5. Improve EHCP quality and delivery	Strong signal (28)	Improve process clarity, plan quality and delivery assurance

## Implications for the Local Area Partnership

The quantified data shows a consistent system pattern across all localities:

Needs are identified, but the system does not respond consistently or early enough. Access is constrained, support is delayed, and demand escalates into specialist and statutory pathways.

This has direct implications for:

- High needs demand and expenditure
  - EHCP growth and tribunal pressure
  - Sufficiency and workforce planning
  - Trust and confidence in the system
-



## Conclusion

This evidence demonstrates clearly and consistently that:

- The system has strong foundations
- But is not consistently delivering early, effective support
- And is currently operating reactively rather than proactively

To improve outcomes for children and young people and to meet the expectations of SEND reform and deficit write off, the Local Area Partnership must shift towards:

- earlier intervention
- clear and consistent pathways
- reduced reliance on escalation
- system-wide consistency and accountability

### In summary:

The main challenge is not necessarily identifying need early (different from diagnosis).  
The real challenge is ensuring the system responds early, consistently, and at scale.

Questions to answer:-

Why does early identification not trigger support and how can we change that?

Who actually owns the child's journey across the system?

What decisions are being driven by funding risk rather than need and what is the solution?

Where are thresholds acting as blockers rather than enablers and how can we change them?

---



## Chapter 2: What We Heard

### Quantified System Risks, Opportunities and Priorities

This chapter presents a quantified analysis of the SEND reform workshops, bringing together perspectives from parent carers, practitioners and system partners. It draws on all submitted workshop data (pressures, risks and opportunities, and shared priorities), with duplicates retained where they indicate strength of signal.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a **clear, evidence-led and quantified foundation** for the Local Area Partnership SEND Plan and to support delivery of a credible programme aligned to deficit stability grant requirements.

All findings are grounded in the workshop data.

#### Overview

Across all workshops, there is strong convergence:

- Participants broadly agree on **what good looks like**
- There is less confidence in the system’s ability to **deliver this consistently**
- The dominant issues relate to **delivery, capacity and accountability**, not lack of policy

A clear shift in narrative has emerged:

- From: *“We need better support”*
- To: *“The system does not consistently deliver what it already says it will”*

This distinction is critical for planning and reform.

### Quantified Theme Analysis

A total of **224 coded comments** were analysed across all datasets.

Theme	F	% of dataset	Strength
Communication, trust & transparency	42	19%	Very strong
Demand, capacity, funding & workforce	38	17%	Very strong
Inclusion that works in practice	36	16%	Very strong
Early identification & timely help	31	14%	Very strong
EHCP quality & accountability	27	12%	Strong–Very strong
Pathways, thresholds & complexity	20	9%	Strong
Therapies & specialist services	17	8%	Strong



Theme	F	% of dataset	Strength
Transitions & continuity	13	6%	Strong (lower volume, high impact)

## What the Quantified Data Shows

### 1. Communication is the dominant system failure (19%)

Communication is the **single largest theme**, cutting across:

- EHCP processes
- Schools
- Therapies
- Family Help
- system navigation

#### What this is really about:

- Lack of clarity on decisions and next steps
- Inconsistent messaging between services
- Parents feeling unheard and excluded

#### Evidence:

- “Parents not listened to”
- “Lack of communication”
- “Information not always received”
- “Parents unsure who to contact”

#### Implication:

Improving communication is a **core system reform priority**, not a secondary improvement.

---

### 2. Demand and capacity pressures are systemic (17%)

Participants were explicit that the system is operating beyond sustainable capacity.

#### What this is really about:

- Workforce shortages and burnout
- Insufficient staffing ratios
- Funding constraints
- Rising complexity of need

#### Evidence:

- “Demand + capacity resolution”



Northamptonshire Parent Carer Voices

- “Lack of funding” / “Lack of staffing”
- “Staff ratios insufficient”

**Implication:**

Reform delivery must be grounded in a **realistic workforce and capacity model.**

---



### **3. Inclusion is a top-tier priority but inconsistently delivered (16%)**

There is strong consensus on what inclusion should be, but inconsistent delivery in practice.

#### **What this is really about:**

- Inclusion as belonging, safety and participation
- A gap between policy intent and lived experience

#### **Evidence:**

- “Inclusion is belonging, not just placement”
- “Every child feels they belong and are understood”
- “Recognise behaviour as need”

#### **Implication:**

Inclusion must be **operationalised and measurable at child level.**

---

### **4. Early identification and intervention is the key system lever (14%)**

Early help appears consistently across pressures, risks and priorities.

#### **What this is really about:**

- Delayed support
- Reliance on diagnosis
- Reactive system design

#### **Evidence:**

- “Intervention as early as possible – no long waits”
- “Children are sometimes required to fail before needs are fully recognised”

#### **Implication:**

Strengthening early help is the **primary mechanism to reduce escalation and demand.**

---

### **5. EHCP issues are significant but not the root cause (12%)**

The EHCP system is under strain but reflects wider system weaknesses.

#### **What this is really about:**

- Variable quality and outdated plans
- Weak implementation and accountability



Northamptonshire Parent Carer Voices

- Increasing reliance on tribunal



### **Evidence:**

- “Plans written at age 4 still being used at age 10”
- “Stronger accountability is needed when EHCPs are not followed”

### **Implication:**

EHCP reform must be linked to **stronger SEN Support and earlier intervention.**

---

## **6. Pathways and thresholds create system friction (9%)**

Confusion about access routes and eligibility is widespread.

### **What this is really about:**

- Inconsistent interpretation of thresholds
- Lack of shared understanding of complexity
- Inequitable access

### **Evidence:**

- “Complex is subjective”
- “Clear thresholds”
- “Consistent pathways”

### **Implication:**

Clear, co-produced pathways are essential to improve access and reduce escalation.

---

## **7. Therapies and specialist support remain constrained (8%)**

Access to therapy is inconsistent and often delayed.

### **What this is really about:**

- Limited SALT and specialist capacity
- Lack of joined-up delivery
- Delays impacting school support

### **Evidence:**

- “SALT access limited”
- “Services not always joined up”

### **Implication:**

Earlier and more integrated specialist input is needed to support inclusion.



Northamptonshire Parent Carer Voices

---



## 8. Transitions are predictable failure points (6%)

Transitions have lower volume but high impact.

### What this is really about:

- Loss of continuity
- Increased risk at key stages
- Weak preparation for adulthood

### Evidence:

- “Year 6 → Year 7 transition = huge gap”
- “Transition weakens inclusion”

### Implication:

Transitions require targeted, coordinated planning.

---

## Cross-System Analysis

When grouped, the data highlights four core system pressures:

System pressure	Combined themes	% of dataset
Delivery failure	Communication + EHCP + Pathways	40%
Capacity constraint	Workforce + Therapies	25%
Frontline practice quality	Inclusion + Early help	30%
Transition risk	Transitions	6%

### Key insight:

The system is primarily facing a Delivery, capacity and consistency problem.

---



## Priority Areas for Action

Based on both **volume and system impact**, eight priority areas emerge.

### Tier 1: Core system priorities

1. **Early identification and SEN Support**
    - Earlier intervention without reliance on diagnosis
    - Clear and accessible pathways
  2. **Workforce and capacity**
    - Recruitment, retention and training
    - Realistic delivery expectations
  3. **Communication and transparency**
    - Clear information and consistent messaging
    - Defined points of contact and accountability
- 

### Tier 2: Embedded priorities

4. **Inclusion that works in practice**
    - Measurable expectations at school and service level
    - Focus on belonging, safety and participation
  5. **Clear pathways and thresholds**
    - Shared understanding across the system
    - Consistency in access and decision-making
- 

### Tier 3: Targeted improvements

6. **EHCP quality and accountability**
  7. **Therapy access and integration**
  8. **Transitions and continuity**
- 

## Risks and Opportunities for Reform

### Key risks

- Reform is not matched by workforce and capacity
  - Inclusion is interpreted as placement rather than support
  - EHCP demand is reduced without strengthening earlier support
  - Families experience reform as reduced access
  - Continued fragmentation across services
-



## Key opportunities

- Shift towards earlier, preventative support
  - Strengthen co-production and lived experience
  - Improve consistency and equity of access
  - Build integrated multi-agency delivery
  - Focus on delivery and outcomes, not activity
- 

## Limitations of the Data

- Greater representation from parent carers and frontline professionals than children and young people
  - Some findings reflect system-wide experience rather than specific services
  - Repetition strengthens signal but may reflect workshop dynamics
  - Limited demographic data restricts representativeness
- 

## Summary

The quantified analysis provides a clear message:

- The system does not necessarily lack understanding of need
- It does not lack a vision for improvement

It lacks:

- **consistent delivery**
- **sufficient capacity**
- **clear accountability**

Participants are not calling for a fundamentally different system.

They are calling for a system that **reliably delivers what it already promises**:

- early help
- clear communication
- inclusive practice
- skilled support
- joined-up services
- and accountability when plans are not implemented

This evidence should form the foundation of the Local Area Partnership SEND Plan and the approach to reform.



## Chapter 3: Defining Success – What Good Looks and Feels Like

This chapter brings together the collective voice of workshop participants in defining what success looks and feels like across the SEND system. The findings are drawn from structured qualitative analysis of workshop outputs, with duplication carefully retained during initial stages and then consolidated to enable robust quantification.

What emerges is a coherent picture of the outcomes families and professionals expect from a well-functioning system.

---

### Overview of Findings

Across all workshops, participants consistently described success in terms of both lived experience and system performance.

At its core, success is defined by:

- Children and young people thriving, happy and achieving
- Families feeling heard, supported and not having to fight
- A system that delivers timely, appropriate and consistent support
- Communities that are inclusive, connected and enabling

These are not separate ambitions—they are interdependent.

---

### Quantified Themes

The table below sets out the main themes identified, alongside their relative frequency and strength based on volume and intensity of responses.

Priority Area	Frequency	Strength
Happy, thriving children & families	Very High (≈25+)	Strong
Needs met & progress achieved	High (≈18–22)	Strong
Right support at the right time	High (≈15–20)	Strong
Feeling heard, valued, understood	High (≈15–20)	Strong
Inclusion, belonging & acceptance	Moderate–High (≈12–16)	Strong
Communication & joined-up working	Moderate (≈10–14)	Moderate–Strong
System accountability & consistency	Moderate (≈8–12)	Moderate



Priority Area	Frequency	Strength
Preparation for adulthood & life outcomes	Lower (≈6–10)	Moderate (Strategic)

## Thematic Insights

### Happy, Thriving Children and Families (Strong Signal)

The strongest and most consistent theme across all data is the expectation that children and families experience genuine wellbeing and success in everyday life.

Participants described success as:

- “Happy thriving children”
- “A happy, content, fulfilled child”
- “Families feel supported, children are thriving and reaching their potential”

This reflects a clear expectation that system success must be judged not only by outputs, but by lived experience and quality of life outcomes.

---

### Needs Met and Progress Achieved (Strong Signal)

A high volume of responses focused on children’s needs being appropriately identified, understood and met, leading to meaningful progress.

Examples include:

- “The child’s needs are being met and progress is being made”
- “Child in a setting that meets their needs”
- “Progress in line with goal, effort and potential”

This demonstrates the importance of effectiveness and impact, rather than simply access to services.

---

### Right Support at the Right Time (Strong Signal)

Timeliness and appropriateness of support were consistently highlighted as critical.

Participants emphasised:

- “The right support for the right children at the right time”
- “Help accessible when needed”
- “Specialist support... in a timely manner”



This theme reflects systemic pressures around waiting times, thresholds, and access pathways, and is central to improving system performance.

---

### **Feeling Heard, Valued and Understood (Strong Signal)**

A significant proportion of responses focused on relational experiences within the system.

Participants described success as:

- “Actually feeling heard and understood”
- “My voice is heard and valued”
- “Feeling listened to and respected”

This indicates that success is not only about what is delivered, but how it is experienced, highlighting the importance of co-production and trust.

---

### **Inclusion, Belonging and Acceptance (Strong Signal)**

Inclusion was consistently described as a core feature of success, both within education and the wider community.

Examples include:

- “All children are valued, included and part of their own community”
- “Belonging”
- “No child left behind”

This reflects a system ambition that extends beyond provision, towards cultural and societal inclusion.

---

### **Communication and Joined-Up Working (Moderate–Strong Signal)**

Participants identified communication breakdowns as a key barrier, and conversely, effective communication as a marker of success.

Examples include:

- “Better communication between professionals and families”
- “Being able to talk to someone... rather than no communication”
- “Working together to meet local needs”



Northamptonshire Parent Carer Voices

This highlights the need for integrated working across education, health and care, with clear and accessible communication pathways.

---



## **System Accountability and Consistency (Moderate Signal)**

There is a clear expectation that systems operate consistently and are accountable for delivery.

Participants referenced:

- “Schools held accountable”
- “EHCPs followed properly”
- “Not feeling like everything is a battle”

This reflects ongoing challenges in variation, compliance, and transparency across the system.

---

## **Preparation for Adulthood and Life Outcomes (Strategic Signal)**

Although less frequently referenced, preparation for adulthood remains a critical strategic outcome.

Participants described:

- “Ready for adulthood... independent young adults”
- “Skills for life”
- “Work and life success”

This suggests that while immediate needs dominate lived experience, there remains a clear expectation that the system should support long-term outcomes and independence.

---

## **Cross-Cutting Insights**

### *Experience and Delivery Are Interdependent*

The data shows a clear link between system performance and lived experience. Where services are delayed, inconsistent or unclear, families report feeling unheard and unsupported.

### *Trust Is a System Outcome*

A recurring theme—often implicit—is the desire for a system where families do not have to:

- chase support
- repeat their story
- or “fight” for provision

Trust emerges as a key indicator of system effectiveness.



Northamptonshire Parent Carer Voices

### *Timeliness Is Central to Multiple Themes*

“Right support at the right time” underpins:

- needs being met
- reduced stress for families
- improved outcomes for children

Delays are therefore not isolated issues, but system-wide pressure points.

### *Inclusion Extends Beyond Education*

Inclusion is described not only in terms of school placement, but:

- social belonging
- community participation
- emotional safety

This reflects a broader expectation of whole-system inclusion.

---

## **Implications for the Local Area Partnership**

The findings suggest that success should not be framed as a broad set of disconnected priorities, but as a coherent system ambition with clear lines of delivery.

A focused interpretation of the data indicates four overarching outcome areas:

1. Children and young people thrive and achieve their potential
2. Families feel heard, supported and empowered
3. Right support is delivered at the right time, consistently
4. Inclusive communities where every child belongs

These outcome areas provide a clear and evidence-based foundation for:

- the Local Area SEND Plan
  - Deficit Stability Plan requirements
  - ongoing partnership accountability
-



## Conclusion

The workshop data presents a consistent and compelling picture of what success looks like from the perspective of those who experience and deliver SEND services.

It is not defined by complexity, but by clarity:

- Children are happy, safe and making progress
- Families are heard, respected and supported
- Systems are timely, consistent and joined-up
- Communities are inclusive and enabling

The strength of alignment across participants provides a high level of confidence in these findings.

The challenge for the Local Area Partnership is now to translate this clarity into:

- measurable outcomes
- deliverable actions
- and visible system change

so that the experiences described here become the reality for all children, young people and families.