

**Disabled Children and Young People (Transitions to
Adulthood) (Scotland) Bill**
6 February 2023

**NASUWT evidence to the Scottish Parliament Education,
Children and Young People Committee**

The NASUWT's submission to the Scottish Parliament Education, Children and Young People Committee sets out the Union's views on the key issues which should be explored by the Committee in its scrutiny of the Disabled Children and Young People (Transitions to Adulthood) (Scotland) Bill. The NASUWT's evidence is informed directly by serving teacher and headteacher members and also by the work of its representative committees and consultative structures, made up of practising teachers and school leaders working in the education system.

For further information, parliamentarians may contact:

Dr Patrick Roach

General Secretary

nasuwt@mail.nasuwt.org.uk

www.nasuwt.org.uk

Current experiences

What are the key issues that disabled young people face as they move out of school/children's services and access adult services?

The Union agrees that the families of disabled children and young people are experiencing real difficulties in transitioning from children's services to adult services and are feeling isolated fighting for services with their own local authority. It is accepted that genuine concerns have been raised around transparency and accountability of decision making.

The intentions of the Bill are well founded, but the devil will be in the detail. Currently, there is insufficient information provided to guarantee that legislation on its own would improve the quality of life for people covered by the Bill. Indeed, there are risks that in order to tick the box for a statutory requirement, local authorities may need to cost-cut other measures, adversely impacting longer-term strategic decision-making and resourcing for schools so that they can meet the needs of pupils with additional support needs (ASN).

How are young people and (where appropriate) their families views' taken account during the transitions process?

PSE/guidance teachers are responsible for monitoring and supporting the development of pupils, from their friendships and relationships to their personal achievements.

There has been a review into personal and social education (PSE) in schools, including pastoral care and counselling services. The review is part of the Mental Health Strategy 2017 to 2027. It focused on PSE in schools and included consideration of pastoral care and guidance, as well as school counselling services.

The NASUWT is a member of the PSE Delivery and Implementation Group, jointly chaired by the Scottish Government and COSLA, which was established to monitor progress against the recommendations.

One of the recommendations says:

'The Scottish Government and Education Scotland will work with practitioners to produce advice and guidance on approaches to monitoring young people's progression in HWB/PSE, linked with the wellbeing indicators and the HWB experiences and outcomes and PSE benchmarks to:

encourage children and young people to take ownership of their learning and progress in HWB/PSE;

ensure approaches are appropriate for use throughout the learner journey, from early learning to senior phase, and link to transition monitoring systems in Further and Higher Education; and

link with the action underway in the Learner Journey Review regarding an Online Learner Account and the recommendation to develop better data'.

There have been significant delays to the progression of the business of the working group, which the Union has repeatedly raised with the Scottish Government. Engagement with learners, as part of the PSE review recommendations, is anticipated to be subject to further national guidance or intervention in due course.

How do schools, colleges and universities identify students with disabilities currently?

Within an education context, teachers, schools and local authorities are currently working within a policy framework built around ASN. While many children and young people with ASN will have a disability, some may not. The Union is concerned that an unintended consequence of the legislation would be that an unhelpful two-tier system of support for ASN children and young people in schools would ensue. It may also create a situation where a

statutory obligation exists for children and young people who may not have disclosed their disability to their school, or who equally may not self-identify as having a disability (despite meeting the statutory definition).

As the Education, Children and Young People Committee will be aware, there has been a year-on-year increase in the number of children across Scotland with identified ASN: in 2018, 30.9% of children and young people in Scotland's schools had an identified ASN. It requires to be addressed directly how the proposed Bill will dovetail with the existing policy framework in relation to additional support for learning (ASL) and ASN in schools.

As further context, the evidence from the ASL Review, led by Angela Morgan, was that ASL is not visible or equally valued within Scotland's education system. The NASUWT fully agrees that additional support provision should not be viewed as a minority area of interest, nor should it continue to be considered separately within the framework of Scottish education. Nevertheless, the situation remains that across Scotland, there is great variability of ASN provision, a variety of approaches to cost saving at local authority budget level which have affected ASN provision, including reductions to support staff, and an absence of openness and transparency from local authorities and the Scottish Government on spending allocated for ASL. The Disabled Children and Young People (Transitions to Adulthood) (Scotland) Bill must be viewed through this lens, and the Union would suggest it is explicitly set out:

- how the framework will dovetail with ASN legislation and policy;
- the mechanisms which will be in place to support equity of support and provision across Scotland; and
- a clear outline of the investment and training being provided to support implementation.

How do schools, colleges and universities ensure that reasonable adjustments are made?

There needs to be clarity surrounding the interaction with a child's Co-ordinated Support Plan (CSP). Some children with complex or multiple needs will have a CSP, but this will not apply to all children who have a disability.

The proposal does not look to address the current variety of approaches being undertaken in relation to the completion of the CSP, which is also a statutory document. The Scottish Government should not be blind to the considerable variation in planning documents used on the ground, and greater time and effort is needed to build for this consistency with the use of better communication and training before adding further tiers of planning documentation. While the policy memorandum to the Bill acknowledges that very few CSPs are actually put in place, the Union remains concerned that the drivers for this variability have not been adequately acknowledged or addressed and therefore a similar local variability might be anticipated (should the Bill be enacted).

How is retention of disabled students at colleges and universities monitored?

'Scotland's Wellbeing: national outcomes for disabled people' collated many of the key statistics.

'Disabled people (25%) are more likely than non-disabled people (10%) to have low or no qualifications at SCQF level 4.

The vast majority of disabled school leavers are recorded as leaving to a positive destination (89%), although this remains lower than for non-disabled school leavers (95%).

A lower proportion of disabled people leave school for higher education or have university degrees, compared to non-disabled people.

The number of disabled students attending Scottish Higher Education providers has increased since 2013/14, from 9% to 12% of the total'.¹

The Scottish Government also collate the school leaver attainment and initial destinations statistics, with the most recent publication being in February 2022.²

How do colleges and universities collaborate with other services (e.g. health or social work) to support individuals?

Transition is a particularly difficult time because it exposes many of the weaknesses in the education, health and social care systems. Communication, effective and efficient sharing of information, along with effective joint working, are key to improving practice: however, these are also the areas which present the biggest challenges. Where communication and joint working are not effective, it often falls to schools to provide the support as best they can. It is not appropriate for the burdens to fall on schools. Particular attention needs to be paid to the roles and responsibilities of other players, especially those in health and social care.

Investment in, and collaboration between, wider children's services is critical. The last two years have highlighted and deepened pre-pandemic concerns about the fragmented nature of children and young people's services in some parts, particularly in the areas of special and additional needs. The Scottish Government must support action in this area through significant investment in these services. The real-terms cuts in spending in the children's services sector experienced over the past decade must be reversed, with additional resources made available to meet recovery-related priorities.

¹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-wellbeing-measuring-national-outcomes-disabled-people/>

² <https://www.gov.scot/publications/summary-statistics-attainment-initial-leaver-destinations-no-4-2022-edition/>

How successful has the work of the Scottish Transitions Forum been in improving transitions processes for students?

The Scottish Transitions Forum operates across a small section of the country currently. In the absence of a consistent evidence base, it is difficult to assess impact. The Union is concerned that, on its own, this will not achieve a consistent level of support for individual students.

How are disabled students supported if they complete a course or leave a course early?

Once young people have made choices and left school, it would not be appropriate for schools to monitor or support ex-pupils.

How would you measure success of a transition at an individual level?

Rather than push responsibility for securing successful onward transition onto schools, might it not be more straightforward to overhaul and standardise across Scotland the provision and access to adult services for disabled young people? Creating graduation within the current system and ensuring every young person is fully included in decision making and experiences a positive, collaborative person-centred approach to their support could be done without enacting the provisions of the Bill. If the reticence to overhaul and review adult services within Scotland is due to an unspoken acceptance that this would require considerable investment which is not able to be guaranteed, then we are designing a system which is destined to fail: schools cannot be responsible for fixing all societal ills.

How might you measure the success of outcomes for disabled young people at a national level?

It will be insufficient to merely enact a Bill: there is a need for much more than legislation and guidance. What measures will be taken to ensure that the

requirements are appropriately resourced? If it is not resourced, then it is likely to fail.

The Bill

Would a national transitions strategy support more consistent approaches and better outcomes? If so, how?

Effective strategies to address and deal with discrimination require concerted action across all spheres of society. The Scottish Government must recognise the challenges and barriers that disabled people face in education, in the labour market and during transitions, focussing on measures which will reduce the disability-related employment gap.

The NASUWT would suggest the following key areas require further critical reflection by the Scottish Government, as they are not adequately addressed within the proposed bill:

- In addition to setting positive aims to support disabled people in the labour market, and specifically in the public sector, the Scottish Government must ensure that significant investment is given to the public sector as a whole.
- The statutory Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) was introduced to ensure that schools and colleges play their part in advancing equality and tackling discrimination faced by staff and learners. However, independent NASUWT research shows that the majority of schools are unaware of their duties and obligations under the PSED.
- Greater transparency in terms of disability reporting could create the conditions in which employers are expected to demonstrate that they value disabled workers in terms of their pay and rewards practices.
- It is clear that a lack of robust data on employment levels for disabled people in individual public bodies creates a challenge for the setting and monitoring of targets. Many teachers, for example, report fear of being

victimised and excluded at work, that they will not get a job or promotion, or that they will be targeted for capability or disciplinary procedures if they reveal their disability to a prospective employer. The Scottish Government should be actively promoting the positive contribution that disabled workers make in the workplace.

- The *A Fairer Scotland for Disabled People: employment action plan* contains a number of actions to support young people and transitions. Published in December 2018, the NASUWT recognises that it includes many positive aims; however, the Union considers that without stringent accountability structures, such commitments cannot effect real and long-lasting change.
- In addition to consistent structures of accountability, the Scottish Government must ensure the aims underpinning the *Fairer Scotland for Disabled People: employment action plan* are mainstreamed within all political decisions. The positive effect of political visibility, alongside a commitment to fiscal resource, can be seen in the import given by teachers, schools, local authorities and wider education stakeholders to closing the poverty-related attainment gap.

Comments on the powers to create duties on colleges and universities.

How would plans be managed while the pupil is at school?

The NASUWT would argue that no teacher should be compelled to take on the role of coordinating the transition plans, despite the suggestion that this should fall within the remit of guidance/pastoral staff in secondary schools. There are clear implications in terms of additional workload and distraction for teachers from their core role of teaching and learning.

Whoever ends up coordinating the plan faces a significant addition to their workload, given collaboration and discussion with the child, their family and other agencies, as well as always making children and families aware of their rights around information-sharing, not to mention existing responsibilities around wellbeing and Getting It Right For Every Child (GIRFEC). As

mentioned above, the NASUWT does not believe that it is possible or desirable for a teacher to fulfil the role of the Named Person.

The NASUWT notes the key role of the Lead Professional, where children and families require the help of two or more agencies for support. It is also the strongly-held view of the NASUWT that teachers would not have the time or the appropriate training to take on the role of the Lead Professional without there being a negative impact on their responsibility for all of the other children they teach.

Colleges and universities' views on how they would engage with the planning process or be able to respond to any plans already agreed.

In all cases, should local authorities take the lead on planning transitions?

The NASUWT agrees that partnership working is critical. Agencies with responsibility for the transition of disabled children and young people must be able to collaborate effectively. Collaborative working has to be supported and facilitated, and it requires the investment of time and financial resources.

It is critical that this collaboration is organised in a way that allows each children's service to discharge their distinct functions effectively and in a way that minimises practitioner workload. The principal contribution made by schools in enhancing the life chances of children and young people relates to their work in providing high-quality learning experiences.

Multi-agency working is too often subject to excessive and unjustifiable local variation in the form that collaboration is expected to take, the way that collaborative arrangements are overseen and managed, as well as the ways in which responsibilities are distributed between different services and agencies. There needs to be a consistent and coherent national approach. Disabled children and young people should be able to benefit from common, minimum expectations of how agencies will work, regardless of locality or postcode.

**NASUWT
The Teachers' Union**

Cultural differences between education and health and social care should also not be ignored and these would need to be addressed before transition plans could successfully be embedded. The NASUWT does not subscribe to an automatic assumption that schools should be responsible for the Named Person or for coordinating planning processes.

Indeed, it is worth revisiting the inescapable problems which remain with information sharing and the Named Person role in Scotland as one example of the barriers to effective collaboration and the embedding of a national system or entitlement. As far back as December 2016, the NASUWT met with Scottish Government Ministers to discuss the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *The Christian Institute and others v Lord Advocate*. At this meeting, the Union suggested that, in the absence of any clear proposals from the Scottish Government as to how it would address the concerns of the Supreme Court, proposals around information sharing breached the right to privacy and a family life under the European Convention on Human Rights, and that it was time to reconsider this policy and look at developing an alternative approach. Providing legally sound information-sharing guidance has been a challenge the Scottish Government has not been able to meet yet, and the NASUWT has been clear that attempting to move forward this matter without legislative support and by shifting the burden for making difficult judgements about information sharing onto schools, teachers and others who work with children and young people remains wholly unacceptable. As well as the unseemly passing of the buck, this places another intolerable workload burden on staff in schools.

How should/can local authorities identify children and young people eligible for a transitions plan?

As highlighted elsewhere in this submission, there are multiplicities of legal responsibilities on schools, many of which are inconsistently applied or understood and many of which do not use any coherence in terms of their language. Providing a clear definition of children and young people eligible for

a transitions plan is simply a sticking plaster approach to a national failing in strategic direction. The current hotchpotch approach does not facilitate ease of understanding or implementation on the ground.

To what degree does part two of the Bill replicate duties under ASL or social work (e.g. SDS) legislation? What are the reasons for the gap between implementation of policy and duties and experiences?

As a teachers' trade union, the NASUWT clearly has concerns not only for the impact on a pupil's learning, but also for the wellbeing of the teachers who deliver that learning. The issue of reduction in ASN support has been consistently raised at our local/national conferences and the impact on teacher workload is clear.

Teachers report that the failures of the school system in providing adequately for vulnerable children and young people, and worsening provision for pupils with ASN, are stoking up problems for society in the future, when these children and young people will become adults. Provision for violent, autistic or mentally ill pupils is at crisis point.

The downward turn in investment in ASN, and education more generally, shows no signs of improving and therefore the current inability of the system to best support the policy of mainstreaming/inclusion shows no sign of positively changing.

Teachers and schools will always strive to do their best for every child they teach, but it is unacceptable for them to be expected to meet the needs of pupils without the necessary resources. Supporting children and young people with ASN, including disabilities, requires renewed investment in tailored services and education settings to ensure there is equality of opportunity for all.

The teaching workforce want to work within an education system which will enable all children and young people to get the support they need to reach

**NASUWT
The Teachers' Union**

their full learning potential. But sole responsibility for ensuring barriers to learning are overcome and how the policy intention behind GIRFEC is achieved should not be shouldered by classroom teachers.

Without the addition of funding, resources and support for the education workforce, the current ASL policy rhetoric appears to the profession little more than an attempt to pass the buck to schools and teachers.

Within this context there are, therefore, significant risks that the proposed arrangements to support transition within the Bill will create further bureaucracies and workload burdens on the various players, but particularly on schools: it is essential that steps be taken to ensure that this does not happen.

To what degree (and how) would a statutory planning process support better outcomes for disabled children and young people?

The NASUWT supports the overall aim of the Bill to improve outcomes for disabled children and young people in the transition to adulthood: in particular, the strong focus on including young adults is very welcome.

The Union notes that the intention would be to assign to a member of the Scottish Government, or a Junior Scottish Minister, special responsibility in relation to the exercise of these functions under the legislation and to require local authorities to introduce a transitions plan for each disabled child and young person, to ensure that each disabled child and young person receives appropriate care and support before, and during, the transition to adulthood.

It is foreseeable that there will likely be some challenges in marrying up current practice within schools and local authorities to support children and young people and the framework identified to meet aims of the Bill.

For further information, please contact:

nasuwt@mail.nasuwt.org.uk

www.nasuwt.org.uk

Dr Patrick Roach

General Secretary