



Department
for Education

School attendance: improving the consistency of support

Government consultation response

May 2022

Contents

Foreword by Minister of State for School Standards	4
Introduction	5
Background	5
Who this was for	5
Consultation period	5
Proposals	6
Methodology	6
Summary of responses received	8
Main findings from the consultation	9
Question analysis	11
Proposal 1: Requiring schools to have an attendance policy, and have regard to statutory guidance on the expectations of schools, academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools on attendance management and improvement	11
Question 1: Do you agree that all schools should be required to publish an attendance policy?	11
Question 2: Are the proposed principles to be covered in school policies sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support that pupils and parents receive?	12
Question 3: Do you agree that minimum attendance management expectations should be set for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools?	14
Question 4: Are the proposed expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support and challenge schools receive?	15
Government response	16
Proposal 2: Introducing guidance on the expectations of local authority attendance services	19
Question 5: Do you agree that a minimum set of components for Local authority attendance services should be set?	19
Question 6: Are the proposed components for Local authority attendance services sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support which pupils, parents and schools receive?	20
Government response	21

Proposal 3: Introducing a clearer more consistent national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence	23
Question 7: Do you agree that a national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence should be set?	23
Question 8: Are the proposed areas for inclusion in the new regulatory framework for fixed penalty notices sufficient to improve the consistency of them being issued?	24
Government response	25
Proposal 4: Bringing the rules for granting leaves of absence in academies in line with other state funded schools	27
Question 9: Do you agree there should be consistency in the rules around granting leaves of absence across all state funded schools?	27
Government response	28
Public Sector Equality Duty	29
Question 10: What do you consider to be the equalities impacts of the proposals on protected characteristics?	29
Government response	30
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	32
Annex B: List of self-reported local authority area of the 1,523 online consultation respondents	44

Foreword by Minister of State for School Standards

Improving attendance is everyone's business. The barriers to accessing education are wide and complex, both within and beyond the school gates, and are often specific to individual pupils and families. Yet being in school and ready to learn is crucial to pupils' attainment, wellbeing, and wider life chances. That's why improving attendance remains a top priority across government.



We of course recognise the impact that the pandemic has had on children's education, but that cannot and should not be an excuse to lower our ambitions. The government is determined to address the wider underlying causes of children not being in school. As we learn to live with COVID-19 it is more important than ever that agencies work together to secure the regular attendance of pupils and minimise unnecessary non-COVID-19 absence as much as possible.

At national level, the Secretary of State has brought together an Action Alliance of lead professionals from key frontline services that support families. Members from education, health, justice, the third sector and parent organisations have collectively committed to use their roles and organisations to undertake activities to improve attendance.

We also set out our wider vision for improved rates of attendance in our recent white paper [Opportunity for all - Strong schools with great teachers for your child](#). Progressing with the measures in this consultation is central to that. The reforms will build on the existing work of schools, trusts and local authorities and put attendance expectations on a statutory footing so every part of the system is clear on their role. This will ensure everyone works together to improve the consistency of support pupils and families receive, and that parents can expect earlier, more focussed help to remove barriers to attendance whether they live in St Austell or Stoke or Streatham.

As the white paper sets out, we will go further. That includes helping schools to access and emulate best practice through new off-the-shelf evidence-based interventions developed by the Education Endowment Foundation and the Youth Endowment Foundation, new voluntary standards for attendance professionals working with families, and 21st century national data collection to better understand patterns of attendance in a timelier way. To help ensure no child falls through the cracks, we will increase the focus on pupils who are severely absent (missing 50% or more of school), expecting schools, trusts, and local authorities to work together to reengage these pupils. We will also introduce legislation to create registers of children not in school in each local authority.

Robin Walker MP

Minister of State for School Standards

Introduction

Background

In January 2022, we launched a consultation seeking views on 4 measures to improve the consistency of support available to families in England on school attendance. The public consultation exercise sought views on making these changes and allowed respondents to express comments, views or concerns.

This document provides a summary of responses and the government's response to the consultation.

Who this was for

- All school staff, headteachers and governors in England
- Academy trusts
- Local authorities
- Other organisations and representative bodies
- Parents and pupils

Consultation period

The consultation ran for 5 weeks from 25 January to 28 February 2022. Responses could be submitted via the government's online consultation portal, or by email or post.

Proposals

The consultation sought views on 4 proposals to build on schools, trusts and local authorities' existing work on attendance and improve the consistency of attendance support for families across England through better, more targeted multi-agency action for the pupils who need it most. These were:

- Requiring schools to have an attendance policy, and have regard to statutory guidance on the expectations of schools, academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools on attendance management and improvement.
- Introducing guidance on the expectations of local authority attendance services.
- Introducing a clearer more consistent national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence.
- Bringing the rules for granting leaves of absence in academies in line with other state funded schools.

Methodology

The consultation asked respondents 10 questions on these 4 proposals. One of the questions asked about the potential equalities impacts of the changes on those with different protected characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate on a rating scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the proposal, or the extent to which the proposals were sufficient to achieve a particular objective. Respondents were invited to also give a text response in support of their answer on the rating scale. The equalities impact question only asked for a text response. For questions 1-9, a table has been provided to summarise the proportion of respondents who selected the different options on the rating scale. Those who did not select an option, or respondents who responded by email and did not provide a response from the rating scale, are recorded in the category 'No rating scale response recorded'. Although respondents may not have provided a response on the rating scale, where they still left a text response these were considered in qualitative analysis.

All submitted responses were considered. This document summarises the main points raised by respondents, after all responses were grouped into categories or themes. This summary is not intended to be an exhaustive record of all the points made and the absence of a particular issue does not indicate that it has been ignored or that it is of lesser importance. The consultation was not designed to be a representative survey. The respondent sample were self-selecting and as such the results cannot be generalised to a wider population.

The majority of respondents to this consultation were parents (919 individuals or 56% of total) and the highest proportion of text responses for each question were from parents, e.g., for question one, 63% of text responses were from parents. In presenting the summaries of the findings, an attempt has been made to represent views from all respondent groups, although for some questions very few or no text responses were provided from some groups. Even though the majority of respondents were parents, the findings reported in this document are not representative of the views of all parents, where pupil population size is over 8 million¹. Even though, overall, local authority (LA) employees formed a smaller proportion of respondents to the consultation (11%), the 178 local authority respondents from 118 local authorities (78% of LAs) are likely to be more representative of the overall population of 152 local authorities.

Where respondents answered the specific consultation questions, their answers have been included in the analysis and reported throughout this document. Where email responses provided general comments on the proposals these have been included in the analysis where pertinent points were made.

¹ [Schools, pupils and their characteristics, Academic Year 2020/21 – Explore education statistics – GOV.UK \(explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk\)](https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk)

Summary of responses received

In response to the consultation, the Department for Education (DfE) received contributions from 1,640 respondents: 1,619 responses were received through Citizen Space, our online consultation platform, and 23 were received via email. Two respondents responded via both email and Citizen Space.

Online respondents were asked to choose which of the following descriptors best described their circumstances, and submissions via email have been allocated to one of the categories as part of our analysis:

Table 1. *Categories of respondents to the consultation*

Which of the categories below best describe you?	Total	Percent
Interested member of the public	44	3%
Local authority employee	178	11%
Multi-academy trust employee	90	6%
Not answered	3	0.2%
Other organisation or representataive body	88	5%
Parent	919	56%
Pupil	7	0.4%
School employee	272	17%
School governor or trustee	39	2%
Total	1640	100%

The respondents who selected other organisation or representative body were made up of charities, unions, trade bodies, parent and child's rights organisations, and community interest companies. Annex A presents full details of the organisations who responded to the consultation.

The online respondents originated from 150 local authority areas with 6% not providing details of the local authority area in which they live. The local authority areas with the most respondents were Surrey (74 respondents, 5% of 1523 respondents), Warwickshire (3%), Suffolk (2%), Cambridgeshire (2%), Hampshire (2%) and Kent (2%). The proportion of respondents from each of the other local authority areas were fewer than 2%, with 4 local authority areas having one respondent each (0.06%): Brent, Camden, Halton and Lambeth. Annex B presents full details of the number of respondents from each local authority area.

Main findings from the consultation

The responses to each question posed in the consultation are summarised below.

The majority of respondents agreed with the proposals for requiring schools to have an attendance policy (71%), that there should be a minimum set of expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools (51%) and that there should be a minimum set of components for local authority attendance services (59%).

When asked whether the draft expectations for inclusion in new statutory guidance would be sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support for pupils and parents, similar proportions of respondents rated the proposed areas for inclusion in the guidance as being sufficient at school (38%) or academy trust and governing body level (35%), as insufficient at school (48%) or academy trust and governing body level (44%). There were also similar proportions of respondents who rated the proposed changes to local authority services as sufficient (39%) or insufficient (43%) to improve consistency of support for pupils, parents and schools. Common themes from the text responses were that there is a need for multi-agency working with other children and families services to manage attendance, clearer and more specific language and that the proposed areas for inclusion in statutory guidance did not go far enough to address individual pupil SEND or mental health issues. These topics have been used to shape the new guidance and the ongoing development of the proposals.

With regards to the proposal to introduce a clearer more consistent national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence, just under half supported the proposal (41%). A third viewed the proposed areas for inclusion in the new regulatory framework as being sufficient to improve consistency in the issuing of fixed penalty notices (34%). When asked to give a text response in support of their rating, many respondents voiced their objection to the use of fixed penalty notices overall rather than concerns over the proposed areas for inclusion in the framework for fixed penalty notices. However, many respondents also agreed with the importance of support being provided first as well as highlighting the need for consistency across schools and local authorities.

Respondents who were parents were more likely to disagree with the proposals and view the draft expectations for inclusion in new statutory guidance as insufficient to improve consistency for pupils, parents and schools. Parents were more likely to state in their text responses a need for flexibility in the guidance and appropriate school provision to meet individual needs of pupils. Those respondents who were school or multi-academy trust employees, school governors or trustees, or local authority employees were more likely to agree with proposals and view the proposals as sufficient to improve consistency. Where these respondents gave text responses the more common response categories were around ensuring the new guidance was clearly written and available to parents, and

the importance of schools and local authorities consistently delivering the guidance in practice.

Charities, unions, and representative bodies were more likely to agree with the proposals, especially around school attendance policies. Respondents in this group also suggested that there needs to be a greater focus on preventing school absence (especially around disability and mental health), tracking and monitoring data, and improved consistency both at a local and national level.

Question analysis

This section provides a breakdown of the responses received for each consultation question following a categorisation process and the government's response.

Proposal 1: Requiring schools to have an attendance policy, and have regard to statutory guidance on the expectations of schools, academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools on attendance management and improvement

Question 1: Do you agree that all schools should be required to publish an attendance policy?

Table 2. Question 1: Do you agree that all schools should be required to publish an attendance policy?

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	798	49%
Somewhat agree	369	23%
Neither agree nor disagree	133	8%
Somewhat disagree	104	6%
Strongly disagree	214	13%
No rating scale response recorded	22	1%
Total	1640	100%

Note: Around half of respondents left a text response to this question. Of these, around two thirds were from parents. The next most common respondent groups were local authority employees, school employees, other organisations and multi-academy trust employees.

The majority of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that schools should be required to publish an attendance policy (71%). This was the case across all respondent groups, including employees of schools or academy trusts (91%), local authority employees (97%) and parents (58%). Around a third of parents responded somewhat disagree or strongly disagree (29%) to the proposal.

Many employees of schools, academy trusts and local authorities welcomed the consistency that the proposal would provide and felt it would improve practice across schools. Responses also referred to the need for the new guidance to be clearly written, and that schools' attendance policies should be available to parents and guardians.

“It is essential schools have a clear policy to set clear expectation for pupils, parents and school staff and to enable legal interventions to take place if required. This should be easily accessible to parents. I would recommend that it is one of the suite of policies schools must publish online.” **Multi-academy trust employee, Strongly agree**

“Attendance is everyone's responsibility therefore a policy will ensure clarity and consistency for the school community, its partners and stakeholders.” **Local authority employee, Strongly agree**

The most frequent comments from parents were that the draft principles to be covered in school policies did not go far enough to address support for barriers to attendance including pupil mental health and wellbeing, or to meet the individual needs of those with special educational needs and/or disabilities. This was true for both respondents who agreed and disagreed with the proposal.

“I agree with a policy, but it must acknowledge that some children will struggle with attendance more than others, and clearly describe how these children and their families will be supported to access an education.” **Parent, Somewhat agree**

“This will not help SEN kids with [un]-treated mental health needs and disabilities including anxiety” **Parent, Strongly disagree**

Text responses from all respondent groups commented on issues relating to funding and resources. Most commonly, respondents commented on a lack of funding and resource in schools.

Question 2: Are the proposed principles to be covered in school policies sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support that pupils and parents receive?

Table 3. *Question 2: Are the proposed principles to be covered in school policies sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support that pupils and parents receive?*

Option	Total	Percent
Entirely sufficient	177	11%
Somewhat sufficient	443	27%
Unsure	204	12%
Somewhat insufficient	289	18%
Entirely insufficient	496	30%
No rating scale response recorded	31	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In support of their answers to proposal one question two, around half of respondents also provided a text response.

The majority of responses from employees of schools or academy trusts (72%) and local authorities (88%) responded that the draft principles for inclusion in school policies were either somewhat or entirely sufficient to improve the consistency of support offered to parents and pupils.

“Further detail is needed to cover the scope of the school and LA [local authority]... There needs to be further clarity in terms of agency ownership for PA [persistent absence] or missing students, specifically in terms of follow up and consistent communication. This will break down if each LA does not have the same clear expectations” **School employee, Somewhat sufficient**

“School policies for attendance must require all schools to communicate their expectations in relation to what constitutes regular school attendance. The policy documents should translate to clear process and procedures for supporting attendance and addressing absence.” **Local authority employee, Somewhat sufficient**

The majority of parents responded that the proposed principles were somewhat or entirely insufficient (69%). A common concern was that the principles did not go far enough to address the individual needs of those pupils with SEND, mental health issues and/or poor wellbeing. Another commonly mentioned subject was that there needed to be alternative, more suitable, supportive or more accessible school provision offered to pupils who need it.

“The absence policy needs to take into consideration the reasons for absence and what steps the school need to make to help the child attend. Examples to consider are mental health and SEND as well as any adversity at home. There needs to be a holistic, individualised approach and referrals made to other agencies (for support and/or assessment) where appropriate.” **Parent, Entirely insufficient**

As with question one, text responses from all respondent groups commented on issues of funding and resource at school and local authority level and the funding available for other child and family services.

Question 3: Do you agree that minimum attendance management expectations should be set for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools?

Table 4. Question 3: Do you agree that minimum attendance management expectations should be set for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools?

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	475	29%
Somewhat agree	354	22%
Neither agree nor disagree	178	11%
Somewhat disagree	185	11%
Strongly disagree	417	25%
No rating scale response recorded	31	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In support of their answers to proposal one question 3, around half of respondents also provided a text response.

The majority of respondents agreed that minimum attendance management expectations should be set for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools (51%). The majority of respondents from employees of schools or academy trusts, school governors and trustees (78%), local authority employees (94%), and half of those from other organisations or representative bodies (50%) strongly or somewhat agreed with the proposals. Around a third of parents responded strongly agree or somewhat agree (31%) with the proposal.

Of schools, local authorities, and other organisations that agreed with the proposal and provided a text response, common themes in the responses were that consistency was needed across schools and local authorities and that flexibility and understanding was required in the guidance to ensure that individual and local needs were met.

“This [proposal] should help to support consistency of practice.” **Multi-academy trust employee, Strongly agree**

“All educational establishments need to be working from the same platform, this would vastly reduce poor practice and families moving from school to school if or when challenged on attendance.” **Local authority employee, Strongly agree**

A small minority of employees of schools or academy trusts, school governors and trustees (14%), local authority employees (3%) and other organisations or representative bodies (26%), and a majority of parents (54%) responded strongly disagree or somewhat disagree.

Some text responses from these respondents suggested that they may have misunderstood the proposal and were therefore concerned that ‘expectations’ would include a numerical target, which it will not.

“They [the expectations] are completely unrealistic and a blanket percentage applied to all pupils regardless of disability etc. does not provide a level playing field. Many children need numerous medical appointments, therapies or just days away from school to ensure their wellbeing, why should they and their parents be penalised for just trying to survive. 100% attendance has an element of luck, children get ill all the time and they may just fall lucky and only be ill in school holidays etc....” **Parent, Strongly disagree**

Other commonly raised concerns included the need for flexibility and understanding to meet individual or local needs, the proposed areas for inclusion in guidance not going far enough to address SEND issues and that alternative, more suitable, supportive or accessible provision needed to be offered to improve attendance.

“There should be consistent support and the same expectation wherever the school is. However, if the schools set policies that are in the child’s best interests, it should be encouraged. Support for children with SEND is important and they shouldn’t be treated the same.” **Parent, Somewhat disagree**

Question 4: Are the proposed expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support and challenge schools receive?

Table 5. Question 4: Are the proposed expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support and challenge schools receive?

Option	Total	Percent
Entirely sufficient	156	10%
Somewhat sufficient	423	26%
Unsure	312	19%
Somewhat insufficient	235	14%
Entirely insufficient	486	30%
No rating scale response recorded	28	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In support of their answers to proposal one question 4, around half of respondents also provided a text response. Where the total percentage does not add up to 100%, this is due to rounding error.

The majority of multi-academy trust employees (71%) and school governors or trustees (51%) responded that the proposed expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies of maintained schools were entirely or somewhat sufficient.

“Improving attendance remains a cultural responsibility of every academy and must be resourced appropriately to enable attendance to truly be everybody’s responsibility.”

Multi-academy trust employee, Somewhat sufficient

Of those who responded that the expectations were sufficient, a common theme was that the expectations should ensure consistency of practice across schools and local authorities which will help to ensure accountability. There was also a desire for the new guidance to be clear, and concerns over funding or resources.

A smaller proportion of multi-academy trust employees (14%) and school governors or trustees (31%) and a majority of parents (63%) responded entirely or somewhat insufficient.

From the parents who provided text responses, there were common themes between those who responded sufficient or insufficient. One of the most frequent subjects from parents to this proposal was that the proposed expectations for academy trusts and governing bodies did not go far enough to address individual pupil mental health and wellbeing, or to meet the needs of those pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities.

Government response

We are grateful to all those who took the time to respond to the consultation. DfE has noted the range of responses received, which alongside correspondence and continued conversations with stakeholders and representative bodies², have helped inform decisions on next steps and the drafting of new guidance.

As outlined in the consultation document, it is intended that proposal 1 will build on the existing attendance improvement work that many schools are already undertaking, and subsequently improve the consistency of effective practice and prompt targeted, early

² In addition to the formal consultation, DfE has informally consulted with and took feedback from: 150 of 152 local authorities, Ofsted, the Confederation of School Trusts, Association of School and College Leaders, the National Association of Headteachers, the Local Government Association, the Association of Directors of Children’s Services, National Education Union, Prospect, NASUWT The Teachers Union, advisory groups to DfE including numerous schools and trusts, the National Governance Organisation, DfE’s attendance action alliance, the Independent Schools Council, the Special Educational Consortium, SquarePeg Community Interest Company, the National Association of Support Workers in Education, the Association of Education Welfare Management and the Boarding Schools’ Association.

attendance support for pupils who require it. We welcome the broad support for schools to be required to publish an attendance policy.

We note that there was some misunderstanding on the proposed expectations for trustees and governors, with some respondents interpreting this as requiring numerical attendance targets to be set. This is not our intention and we have made clear in the new guidance published alongside this response that we instead expect that trustees and governors provide effective support and challenge to their schools on their attendance processes and provision of support.

We welcome agreement from respondents that the measure would help improve the clarity of attendance expectations and consistency of application of attendance processes. We are also in agreement that families need support which addresses the underlying causes of absence. We noted the large number of respondents raising concerns over the possible impact on pupils with SEND and mental health conditions, and we agree with suggestions that guidance and school attendance policies need to take personal circumstances into consideration and not discriminate against these pupils. We note the importance of all parties coming together to overcome all barriers to attendance and have made this central to the new guidance. This includes a specific section on supporting pupils with medical conditions or special educational needs and disabilities which were the most commonly raised barriers in the consultation. This recognises that some pupils face greater barriers to attendance and require additional support, and that schools should work with parents and pupils to develop individual approaches that meet a pupil's specific needs.

It is our intention that these proposals will improve the access to education of all pupils but we believe they will particularly benefit those with disabilities and long-term medical conditions who are likely to face greater barriers to attendance. This includes more quickly and precisely identifying individual pupils' needs or barriers to attendance and encouraging schools, local authorities and local services to work closely with pupils and parents to put the right types of support in place, including access to reasonable adjustments and individual health care plans.

We note the concern over the lack of funding and resource in some schools to meet these expectations. We are aware of numerous schools who already meet these expectations within their existing budgets. DfE therefore intends to run sessions sharing effective existing practice, alongside new best practice sharing between schools in geographical areas facilitated by their local authorities, to support schools in meeting these expectations.

Following this feedback, the Secretary of State is now publishing non-statutory guidance to schools, trusts, and governing bodies of maintained schools which includes an expectation that all schools develop and publish a school attendance policy. All schools' policies will be expected to cover attendance expectations, named attendance staff

contacts, day-to-day attendance management processes, their strategy for using attendance data, their strategy for reducing persistent and severe absence, and the point at which sanctions will be used. These expectations will apply on a non-statutory basis from the beginning of academic year 2022-23 to give schools time to implement them before legislation requires it.

The Secretary of State also plans to legislate at the earliest opportunity to introduce a new statutory duty on proprietors to ensure such a policy is produced, published and regularly publicised. Legislation will also (subject to Parliamentary approval) require schools to have regard to guidance, putting the expectations on a statutory footing. This will come into force no sooner than September 2023.

Proposal 2: Introducing guidance on the expectations of local authority attendance services

Question 5: Do you agree that a minimum set of components for Local authority attendance services should be set?

Table 6. Do you agree that a minimum set of components for Local authority attendance services should be set?

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	570	35%
Somewhat agree	398	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	178	11%
Somewhat disagree	134	8%
Strongly disagree	324	20%
No rating scale response recorded	36	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In support of their answers to proposal two question 5, around half of respondents also provided a text response.

The majority of respondents to this question either strongly or somewhat agreed that a minimum set of components for local authority attendance services should be set (59%). The vast majority of local authority employees (94%), multi-academy trust employees (90%) and school employees (84%) either strongly or somewhat agreed that a minimum set of components for local authority attendance services should be set. Roughly the same proportion of parents agreed (41%) as disagreed (42%) that a minimum set of components for local authority attendance services should be set.

Among the local authority, multi-academy trust and school employees who left text responses, a common theme was that the proposal should bring consistency across schools and local authorities. Another common comment was the acknowledgment that there may be a lack of funding or resource for some local authorities or that it would require them to reprioritise existing resource.

“It’s important that all schools have the right support to ensure a joined up approach when responding to parents. It’s also important for schools to have support from the LA in dealing with poor attendance when reaching a legal process.” **MAT employee, Strongly agree**

Among the parents who left text responses, there were similar comments between those who agreed and disagreed. These included that the proposed expectations of local authority services did not go far enough to address individual pupil mental health and

wellbeing, or to meet the needs of those pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities.

Question 6: Are the proposed components for Local authority attendance services sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support which pupils, parents and schools receive?

Table 7. *Are the proposed components for Local authority attendance services sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support which pupils, parents and schools receive?*

Option	Total	Percent
Entirely sufficient	151	9%
Somewhat sufficient	493	30%
Unsure	251	15%
Somewhat insufficient	237	14%
Entirely insufficient	475	29%
No rating scale response recorded	33	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In support of their answers to proposal two question 6, around half of respondents also provided a text response. Where the total percentage does not add up to 100%, this is due to a rounding error.

39% of respondents agreed that the proposed components for local authority attendance services were entirely or somewhat sufficient. 43% of respondents thought they were entirely or somewhat insufficient. The majority of local authority employees (85%), employees of schools or academy trusts and school governors and trustees (72%) responded that the proposed components for local authority attendance services were entirely or somewhat sufficient. A minority of employees of local authorities (7%), schools or academy trusts and school governors and trustees (17%) responded that the proposal was either entirely or somewhat insufficient.

Where respondents felt the draft components were entirely or somewhat insufficient, including the majority of parents (62%), the most common themes in text responses included that there may be a lack of funding or resource for some local authorities or a need for them to reprioritise their resource. Respondents also commonly referred to the need for consistency across schools and local authorities, and the need for multi-agency working with other children and families services to manage attendance.

Other comments were around the need for new guidance to use clear and specific language, and that steps should be taken to ensure schools and local authorities apply the guidance and provide the support to pupils and families. Some respondents

suggested the areas for inclusion did not go far enough to address individual pupil SEND or mental health issues.

“...Training of staff to ensure that they can interrogate their absence data to be able to identify pupils and cohorts at risk and agreeing target actions and access to services for those pupils. We need to have agencies such as health and police on board and we need to make sure we are all joined up and sharing information...” **Local authority employee, Somewhat sufficient**

“[Guidance should] include a clear expectation on all schools to work with the local authority ... local authorities should have access to attendance data for all schools in their area, regardless of governance”. **Association of Directors of Children’s Services**

Government response

DfE welcomes the broad support across respondent groups for setting minimum components for local authority attendance services, and particularly that the majority of employees of schools, trusts and local authorities thought the proposed components were somewhat or entirely sufficient to improve the consistency of attendance support.

We also welcome the support for our proposal to improve joined up working between schools, local authority attendance services, early help workers, and wider local services. As such, the new guidance will stipulate that these organisations should work together to provide intensive whole family support to address barriers to attendance. We hope this proposal, and those in the recently published green paper [SEND Review: Right Support, Right Place, Right Time](#), will help address the concerns raised by the majority of parent respondents that there needs to be greater join up between services. Further, we will expect schools and local authorities to have an agreed joint approach for all severely absent pupils.

We recognise the importance that local authority respondents and the Association of Directors of Children’s Services put on having access to all schools’ attendance data in order to identify and support pupils and schools with, or at risk of, low attendance. DfE has been working to establish a better, more timely flow of pupil level attendance data across schools, trusts, local authorities and DfE, without placing any additional administrative burdens on schools. Most schools have already signed up, but once fully established, this will allow data to be collected directly from all schools’ electronic registers. Collection happens via a secure data aggregator at no cost to schools and without requiring any manual inputting of information. Following a voluntary trial earlier this year, all schools are now strongly advised to sign up to this service which, subject to Parliamentary approval, the Secretary of State intends to make a statutory requirement for all schools. Longer term DfE’s intention is for this new method of data sharing to replace existing statutory data returns to local authorities and DfE, including the school census. This will reduce the burden on schools and improve our collective understanding

of attendance patterns at local, regional, and national levels to identify issues and challenges more quickly.

We noted the issue of local authority funding which was raised by a number of respondents. DfE has conducted a full new burdens assessment in conjunction with local authorities, the Association of Directors of Children's Services, the Local Government Association and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities which shows the proposal does not constitute a new burden and can be delivered within existing budgets. In some local authorities this is already the case, in part through reducing duplication across different agencies and services including better alignment with early help.

We do, however, recognise that delivering this proposal is contingent on current levels of dedicated schools grant and as more schools join or make plans to join strong multi-academy trusts, funding will need to be secured on a more sustainable basis. DfE will therefore take two additional steps. Firstly, in line with the move to support first and only using legal intervention where support does not work or is not engaged with, the Secretary of State intends to remove the current restriction on local authorities' use of monies collected through penalty notices. This will mean rather than being restricted to using the money to issue more penalty notices and prosecute for the original offence, the money can be used for preventing the need for their use in the first place through better support to remove the underlying barriers to attendance. Secondly, we intend to consult later this year on which local authority services should be funded through the Central Schools Services Block in future. We will further consider how local authority attendance services are funded longer term as part of that consultation.

The Secretary of State is now publishing new guidance on a non-statutory basis ahead of academic year 2022-23, and will legislate at the earliest opportunity to put this on a statutory footing (this will come into force no sooner than September 2023). DfE has used the text responses from the consultation to help develop the specifics of the guidance document.

Proposal 3: Introducing a clearer more consistent national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence

Question 7: Do you agree that a national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence should be set?

Table 8. Do you agree that a national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention, including a new regulatory framework for issuing fixed penalty notices for absence should be set?

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	454	28%
Somewhat agree	218	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	96	6%
Somewhat disagree	127	8%
Strongly disagree	715	44%
No rating scale response recorded	30	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: In response to this question, around two thirds of respondents also provided a text response. Where the total percentage does not add up to 100%, this is due to a rounding error.

A small majority of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagreed that a national framework for the use of attendance legal intervention should be set (51%). Conversely, the majority of local authority employees (87%) and school or academy trust employees (81%) strongly or somewhat agreed. The most common reason being that there needs to be consistency in the use of legal intervention, including across local authority areas. It was also noted that efforts should be made to ensure schools and local authorities follow the framework when introduced.

“In our LA [local authority] we have always used penalty notices and legal interventions regularly when the need has arisen. The problem with the issuing of penalty notices is that each LA has a different criteria. This can therefore be confusing for parents and professionals alike. It would be welcome for this to be standardised.” **Local authority employee, Strongly agree**

41% of other organisations strongly or somewhat disagreed with the proposal, whereas 30% strongly or somewhat agreed. Meanwhile, a clear majority of parents (75%)

somewhat or strongly disagreed. In the text responses from respondents who disagreed, common themes were disagreement with the wider policy of fixed penalty notices being used at all, agreement with the need for flexibility in how fixed penalty notices are applied depending on family and pupil circumstances, and a concern that the proposal does not address SEND or mental health issues that may underpin school absences.

“It is critical to recognize that some neurodiverse children are simply overwhelmed by attending school full-time. If these children are refusing to attend due to crippling stress/anxiety, the school or LA would be unfairly punishing parents with threat of, or actual, legal action. Flexible approaches are needed.” **Parent, Strongly disagree**

Question 8: Are the proposed areas for inclusion in the new regulatory framework for fixed penalty notices sufficient to improve the consistency of them being issued?

Table 9. *Are the proposed areas for inclusion in the new regulatory framework for fixed penalty notices sufficient to improve the consistency of them being issued?*

Option	Total	Percent
Entirely sufficient	187	11%
Somewhat sufficient	367	22%
Unsure	366	22%
Somewhat insufficient	147	9%
Entirely insufficient	523	32%
No rating scale response recorded	50	3%
Total	1640	100%

Note: Around a third of respondents to this question provided a text response. Where the total percentage does not add up to 100%, this is due to a rounding error.

Similarly to question 7, the majority of local authority employees (83%), multi-academy trust employees (78%), and school employees (68%) felt that the proposed areas for inclusion in the national framework for fixed penalty notices were entirely or somewhat sufficient to improve consistency in the issuing of fixed penalty notices. Of these, many respondents noted that there is a need for more specific guidance on the issuing of fixed penalty notices. A number of local authority employees also commented that there should be flexibility in how fixed penalty notices were issued.

“Clearer more detailed guidance from the DfE will be welcomed to ensure consistency of approaches across the country however guidance still needs to allow for discretion and flexibility. There may be local issues that need to be taken into account ...” **Local authority employee, Entirely sufficient**

41% of respondents thought that the proposed areas for inclusion in the new regulatory framework were somewhat or entirely insufficient to improve consistency. This included a small minority of local authority employees (10%) and a majority of parents (58%). As in response to question 7, the main reason was the view that fixed penalty notices should not be used at all and do not work to improve school attendance. Again, parents who disagreed also commented that the proposal did not address SEND, mental health or wellbeing issues that may underpin school absences and that pupils and families should be offered more support instead of receiving fixed penalty notices.

“Fining does not help families who need more support for children with send...” **Parent, Entirely insufficient**

Government response

Whilst we note that a small majority of respondents, predominantly parents, did not agree with the proposal, the vast majority of school, trust and local authority employees did agree with it. This was largely on the grounds it would improve consistency and reduce confusion for both families and professionals which is the policy intention.

Taken together our proposals here – and more broadly in our recent SEND green paper and schools white paper - are intended to make sure that the right support is provided to pupils and parents, in the right place and at the right time, so that fewer pupils get to the point at which legal intervention is needed. We have taken time to analyse and understand the concerns of respondents who disagreed with replacing individual codes of conduct with a national framework on attendance legal intervention. We are aware that rather than disagreeing with the specifics of the proposal, many such respondents were not in favour of the wider policy of using fixed penalty notices at all. That was not, however, part of the proposal and the government is clear that there is a place for the use of fixed penalty notices and other forms of legal intervention to secure children’s right to an education as a last resort when support does not work or is not engaged with, or when it is not appropriate such as in the case of term time holidays.

Moreover, rather than increasing use of legal intervention, the proposal is intended to address many of the concerns raised by respondents which the government shares. The new statutory guidance for schools, trusts and governing bodies will underline the importance of supportive approaches being explored first. This will move away from overreliance on fixed penalty notices and end the application of blanket policies by some local authorities which respondents raised as a concern. Whilst the ultimate decision on whether to use legal intervention will remain at the local authority’s discretion as many respondents noted it should, it is the government’s position that local authorities should consider which (if any) parental responsibility measure is most appropriate on an individual case-by-case basis, including taking into consideration any public interest and, the Equality Act 2010.

We also share the view raised by many respondents that parents should not be penalised for their child's absence if it is because of sickness (mental or physical), disability, or because of met or unmet special educational need. The law is clear that a parent is not guilty of the offence of failing to secure their child's regular attendance if their child was unable to attend because of sickness, and therefore fixed penalty notices and other legal intervention must not be used in such circumstances. Moreover, the recent green paper for improving the special educational needs and disabilities and alternative provision systems in England includes commitments to increase our total investment in schools budgets by £7 billion by 2024-25, compared to 2021-22, including an additional £1bn 2022/23 alone for children and young people with high needs. It also committed to £30 million for 10,000 additional respite places, alongside £82 million to create a network of Family Hubs, so more children, young people and their families can access wraparound support. Additionally, we are taking immediate steps to stabilise local special educational needs and disabilities systems by investing an additional £300 million through the Safety Valve Programme and £85 million in the Delivering Better Value programmes over the next 3 years.'

Alongside the improvement in support, the Secretary of State now intends to proceed with the measure to improve the consistency of approach in the use of attendance legal interventions where they are used. This will formalise the principle that fixed penalty notices should only be used where support has been exhausted or was not appropriate. Therefore, we will legislate at the earliest possible opportunity to remove local authorities' legal duty to develop two code of conduct and replace it with a national framework for issuing fixed penalty notices set out in secondary legislation.

This is likely to be achieved, subject to Parliament, through revoking and replacing the Education (Penalty Notices) (England) Regulations 2007 with an expanded set of new regulations to cover the circumstances in which a penalty notice must be considered, a requirement for those with authority to issue a penalty notice to check with the local authority before issuing a penalty notice, a maximum number of penalty notices that may be issued to one parent in a fixed period before considering prosecution at the next offence and a requirement for local authorities to make arrangements for coordination with neighbouring authorities and the police.

A number of respondents raised the importance of consulting on any proposed thresholds and DfE therefore intends to run a public consultation later this year.

Proposal 4: Bringing the rules for granting leaves of absence in academies in line with other state funded schools

Question 9: Do you agree there should be consistency in the rules around granting leaves of absence across all state funded schools?

Table 10. Do you agree there should be consistency in the rules around granting leaves of absence across all state funded schools?

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	719	44%
Somewhat agree	365	22%
Neither agree nor disagree	232	14%
Somewhat disagree	80	5%
Strongly disagree	207	13%
No rating scale response recorded	37	2%
Total	1640	100%

Note: Around a third of respondents also provided a text response to this question.

There was broad agreement across groups of respondents for this proposal. Around two thirds (66%) of all respondents somewhat or strongly agreed that there should be consistency in the rules around granting leaves of absence across all state funded schools. This included the majority of school and multi-academy trust employees (88%), local authority employees (93%), school governors and trustees (77%), and parents (53%).

“A consistent approach would support schools with families with children in different schools and provides clarity to parents.” **School employee, Strongly agree**

Of the respondents who agreed or disagreed with the proposal, a common theme in their text responses was that there needed to be flexibility and understanding in the rules to respond to unique pupil and family circumstances.

“Needs to be some flexibility in this and some autonomy for the school to grant leaves knowing the context and situation of the request, and for our pupils the nature and severity of their medical condition” **Other organisation or representative body, Somewhat agree**

Of the parents who somewhat or strongly disagreed (24%), common reasons were that the proposed rules would not go far enough to meet the needs of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities, mental health or wellbeing issues, or allow holidays in term time.

Government response

We welcome the considerable support across all groups of respondents for this measure and the recognition that this should improve consistency for parents, particularly for those who have children at multiple schools.

We note that respondents recognised the importance of discretion being retained by headteachers around what constitutes an exceptional circumstance in the granting of leaves of absence. This measure does not seek to change that; headteachers know their pupils best and are therefore best placed to make the required judgements on a case-by-case basis, considering the merits of each request for leave and deciding whether it is exceptional. All parents will be able to request a leave of absence in advance for their child, and headteachers will be able to make individual case-by-case decisions taking into account the circumstances of the family and the exceptional circumstances behind the request. This will provide the flexibility that respondents agreed was important, whilst ensuring that only exceptional circumstances warrant a leave of absence from school from all state funded schools.

From September 2022, academies will be expected to follow this principle and the Secretary of State intends to legislate to require this when parliamentary time allows (this will not come into effect before September 2023).

Public Sector Equality Duty

Question 10: What do you consider to be the equalities impacts of the proposals on protected characteristics?

Respondents were asked to give a text response to this question, with around two thirds doing so. Respondents more commonly mentioned potential impacts on those pupils with disabilities, particularly those suffering long term mental ill health. A smaller number of respondents mentioned potential impacts on pupils and parents because of their religion or belief, impacts for gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, sex, sexual orientation and age. A small number of respondents also mentioned impacts on parents because of their marriage and civil partnership status. While not a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010, impacts on pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds were also raised. Some respondents also felt there would not be any impact on protected characteristics.

Across these numerous protected characteristics, and particularly disability, a key issue raised was that some groups face greater barriers to attendance and there were concerns that school policies, the new guidance, and the national framework for legal intervention would not recognise this nor allow for flexibility in meeting individual needs. There was therefore a call for greater support for such pupils and parents.

“It is important to note that some groups of pupils may be at particular risk of poor attendance, particularly if action is not taken to identify and provide appropriate support before attendance becomes an issue. These groups of pupils include those with SEND; those struggling with school academically, socially, or emotionally; and pupils experiencing problems at home, such as domestic violence.” **Other organisation**

Similarly, concern was raised that the parents of those groups who have historically had lower levels of attendance, such as Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils, may be disproportionately impacted if the number of fixed penalty notices issued increases.

General concerns were also raised about existing guidance and attendance practice in schools, for example inconsistent approaches between schools on the granting of leaves of absence for religious observance or maternity.

“...It is possible that a religious belief could impact [attendance], although usually these are very easily discussed at school and individual level and there is usually a good understanding and flexibility for this - hopefully that would be maintained in a new policy - ie the ability to grant leave in exceptional circumstances for an approved Religious event that falls within the term.” **School employee**

“Reasonable adjustments need to be built into the proposals if poor attendance arises as a result of a protected characteristic for example Pregnancy and Maternity where there is a lack of consistency and guidance as to how much leave should be authorised for

teenage expectant mums/parents. Employment law is very clear around maternity/paternity provision” **School employee**

Government response

The law entitles every child of compulsory school age to an efficient, full-time education suitable to their age, ability, aptitude, and any special educational need they may have. The barriers to accessing education are wide and complex, both within and beyond the school gates, and are often specific to individual pupils and families. A key element of securing good attendance is therefore school being a calm, orderly, safe, and supportive environment where all pupils want to be and are keen and ready to learn.

DfE recognises that some pupils (including those with and without particular protected characteristics) face greater barriers to attendance than others. Equalities considerations have been at the forefront of the development of these proposals and the responses to this consultation have, and will continue to, inform and progress our thinking. We have noted views from respondents on potential disproportionate impacts of the measures on pupils with certain protected characteristics, particularly pupils with disabilities (including some of those with special educational needs and disabilities and mental health conditions), pupils who may be more likely to experience bullying (for example because of their sexual orientation), and those who undertake religious observance. It is DfE's view that these proposals will in fact improve the individual and collective support available to such pupils to help overcome the barriers they face to attendance earlier. This includes expectations in guidance for better use of attendance data to spot issues earlier and target interventions, more joined up working between schools, parents and local services, and increased sharing of effective practice.

Specific concerns raised in this consultation have also been reflected in the development of the new guidance and will continue to be used as we develop the measures further. These include ensuring guidance is clear that blanket approaches to attendance management should not be taken, and that policies, processes and the use of legal interventions should always consider individual circumstances. Further, clearer guidance has been given on supporting religious observance and supporting pupils with medical conditions and special educational needs and disabilities. We also noted the concern from some respondents that the proposals, particularly 3 and 4, could disproportionately impact families from a lower socio-economic background and/or families of certain races who may be more likely to travel abroad during term time, for example due to having family overseas. However, there remains a significant amount of time for trips outside of term time which would prevent any lost learning and the negative impacts that creates for pupils. Moreover, as outlined under proposal 4, it is not DfE's intention to remove headteacher discretion to grant leaves of absence in exceptional circumstances, for example a family emergency abroad.

This is not a comprehensive list of all the concerns raised, however DfE has undertaken a full Equalities Assessment, Child's Rights Assessment and Families Test, including considering the possible impact for each protected characteristic. We believe the proposals will have a positive impact on eliminating any discrimination in attendance processes, advancing equality of opportunity, and fostering good relations between those who do and do not share particular protected characteristics.

Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation

- Abbey Multi-Academy Trust
- ABC Children's Therapy
- Abraham Moss Community School
- Academy Transformation Trust
- Achieving for Children
- Adoption UK
- Alderwood School
- Aldryngton Primary School
- Aletheia Anglican Academy Trust
- Alexandra Junior School
- All Saints Catholic Primary School
- Alston Moor Federation
- Alternative Learning Trust
- Ambitious About Autism
- Anti-Bullying Alliance
- Arden Forest Infant School
- ARK Schools
- Ash Manor School
- Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS)
- Association of Education Welfare Management (AEWM)
- Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)
- Astrea Academy Dearne
- Astrea Academy Trust
- Atlantic Academy
- Attendance Matters Limited
- Attleborough Academy
- Bacton Primary School
- Ball Green Primary School
- Barnardo's
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Beatrix Potter Primary School
- Bedford Borough Council
- Bedminster Down School
- Beechcroft Infant School
- Berry Hill Primary School
- Beverley High School
- Birmingham City Council
- Blackburn with Darwen Council

- Blackpool Council
- Blueberry Park Primary School
- Blundeston Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School
- Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
- Boughton Leigh Junior School
- Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council
- Bracknell Forest Council
- Bradfields Academy
- Bradford Diocesan Academies Trust
- Braunton Academy
- Brewster Avenue Infant School
- Brighter Futures for Children
- Brighton and Hove City Council
- Brimble Hill Primary School
- Brine Leas School
- Bristol City Council
- Broadway Junior School
- Brockenhurst Church of England Primary School and Pre-School
- Brompton Academy
- Brooke Hill Academy Trust
- Brunswick House Primary School
- Buckinghamshire Council
- Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
- Buttershaw Business and Enterprise College
- Byrchall High School
- Cabot Learning Federation
- Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council
- Callington Community College
- Calmore Junior School
- Cambridge Meridian Academies Trust
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Campaign for Change Suffolk Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
- Canons High School
- Carlton Digby School
- Carterton Primary School
- Castle Bromwich Junior School
- Castleton Primary School
- Catholic Education Service (CES)
- Cedar Road Primary School
- Central School Attendance and Welfare Service
- Cheddington Combined School

- Cheshire East Borough Council
- Cheshire West and Chester Council
- Chiddingstone Church of England School
- Childhood Bereavement Network
- City of London Corporation
- Clean Air Bradford
- Cognus Limited
- Coleridge Community College
- Collingwood College
- Confederation of School Trusts (CST)
- Contact Ealing
- Co-op Academy Smithies Moor
- Copperfield Academy
- Cornwall Council
- Corpus Christi Catholic High School
- Cottage Grove Primary School
- Court Moor School
- Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust
- Coventry City Council
- Crowdys Hill School
- Cumbria County Council
- David Ross Education Trust
- Davison Church of England High School
- Derby City Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Derby Pride Academy
- Devon County Council
- Disability Rights UK
- Dixons Academy Trust
- Dorchester Primary School
- Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Dunstable Icknield Lower School
- Durham County Council
- East Anglian Schools Trust
- Eastfield Primary School
- East Rainton Primary School
- East Riding of Yorkshire Council
- Eastrop Infant School
- East Sussex County Council
- Eaton Park Academy
- Educational Equality

- Education Welfare Limited
- Ellwood Community Primary School
- Elmbridge Primary School
- Engayne Primary School
- Essex County Council
- Essex Primary School
- Exhall Cedars Infant School
- Exhall Junior School
- Fairfield Endowed Church of England Junior School
- Fairfield Road Primary School
- Federation of Stoke Hill Schools
- Ferndown First School
- Finham Park 2
- Five Islands Academy
- Fonthill Primary Academy
- Forest Park Primary School
- Four Acres Academy
- Framlingham Sir Robert Hitcham's CEVA Primary School
- Franche Primary School
- Fresh Start Care
- Frome Valley Church of England First School
- Fylde Coast Academy Trust
- Galton Valley Primary School
- Gateshead Council
- Georgeham Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School
- Gloucestershire County Council
- Gorse Hall Primary and Nursery School
- Grange Infant School
- Grange Junior School
- Grantham College
- Grimsdyke School
- Grove Academy
- Guildford County School
- Hall Cross Academy
- Halton Metropolitan Borough Council
- Hanbury Primary School
- Harris Federation
- Harris Professional Skills Sixth Form
- Haydon Bridge High School
- Hazelbury Primary School
- Health Conditions in Schools Alliance

- Heartsease Primary Academy
- Heathfield Primary and Nursery School
- Herefordshire Council
- Hertfordshire County Council
- Herne Bay High School
- Highley Primary School
- Hillcross Primary School
- Hillsborough Primary School
- Holmbush Primary Academy
- Holy Trinity Church of England Academy
- Holy Trinity Junior School
- Honington Primary School
- Houndsfield Primary School
- Hoylandswaine Primary School
- Huish Academy Trust
- Humber Education Trust
- Hull City Council
- Ilfracombe Academy
- Impington Village College
- Independent Provider of Special Education Advice (IPSEA)
- Independent Schools Council
- Ivy Learning Trust
- James Montgomery Academy Trust
- John Taylor Multi-Academy Trust
- Joy Lane Primary School
- Kenmore Park Junior School
- Kenton Bar Primary School
- King Edward VI Five Ways School
- King Edward VI School, Bury St Edmunds
- Kings Langley School
- King's Oak Primary Academy
- Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council
- Kite Academy Trust
- Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Lady Hawkins' School
- Laithes Primary School
- Lakenham Primary School
- Lancashire County Council
- Langley Park Learning Trust
- Leicester City Council
- Leicestershire County Council

- Lewis Charlton School
- Limehurst Academy
- Lingfield Primary School
- Liverpool City Council
- Local Government Association
- London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
- London Borough of Barnet
- London Borough of Brent
- London Borough of Bromley
- London Borough of Camden
- London Borough of Hackney
- London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
- London Borough of Harrow
- London Borough of Islington
- London Borough of Merton
- London Borough of Redbridge
- London Borough of Southwark
- London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- London Borough of Wandsworth
- Longsands Academy
- Lord Derby Academy
- Luton Borough Council
- Lydiard Park Academy
- Manchester City Council
- Manorfield Church of England Primary School
- Manor Green School
- Manor Hall Academy Trust
- Marpool Primary School
- Marsh Infant and Nursery School
- Matravers School
- Mazahirul Uloom London
- Meadowfield School
- Medway Council
- Middlesbrough Council
- Milecastle Primary School
- Mind
- Minerva Learning Trust
- Milton Keynes Council
- Moorside Community Primary School
- Moorside High School
- Morton Trentside Primary School

- Mountford Manor Primary School
- Muscliff Primary School
- NASUWT – The Teachers’ Union
- National Association for Hospital Education
- National Association of Headteachers (NAHT)
- National Association of Special Educational Needs (NASEN)
- National Association of Support Workers in Education (NASWE)
- National Children’s Bureau
- National Deaf Children’s Society
- National Education Union
- National Governance Organisation
- National Network of Parent and Carer Forums
- Nene Education Trust
- Netherwood Academy
- Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council
- Newlands Primary School
- Norfolk County Council
- North East Women and Men Against Domestic Violence
- Northern Star Academies Trust
- Northgate School Arts College
- Northleach Church of England Primary School
- Northumberland County Council
- Northumberland Heath Primary School
- North Lincolnshire Council
- North Yorkshire County Council
- North West Association of Directors of Children’s Services
- North West Kent Alternative Provision Service
- Not Fine in School
- Nottingham City Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Oakgrove Primary and Nursery School
- Oasis Community Learning
- Oathall Community College
- Ofsted
- Old Oak Primary School
- Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Olive Academies
- Orchard School Bristol
- Our Lady and St John Catholic College
- Our Lady Immaculate Catholic Academies Trust
- Outward Academy Shafton

- Overleigh St Mary's Church of England Primary School
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Palmerston School
- Park Academy West London
- Parklands High School
- Parentkind
- Parents and Carers Together Community Interest Company
- Pearsewood Primary School
- Penhale Infant School
- Peninsula Education Limited
- Peterborough City Council
- Philips High School
- Pinner Wood School
- Plume, Maldon's Community Academy
- Portsmouth City Council
- Plymouth City Council
- Pond Meadow Academy Trust
- Positive Leap
- Poverest Primary School
- Primary Advantage Federation
- Prospect
- Queen's Park Primary School
- Raw Learning
- Raynes Park High School
- Reculver Church of England Primary School
- Red Balloon Cambridge
- Red Balloon Educational Trust
- Rettendon Primary School
- Robert May's School
- Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rosslyn Park Primary and Nursery School
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Roxeth Primary School
- Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
- Rudgwick Primary School
- Safeguarding and Child Protection Association (SACPA)
- Salford City Council
- Sandling Primary School
- Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
- Sarah Bonnell School
- Scotholme Primary School

- Seacroft Grange Primary School
- SEND Action
- Sensational Steps
- SG Education Welfare Consultancy
- SHARE Multi-Academy Trust
- Shaw Ridge Primary School
- Sheffield City Council
- Sherdley Primary School
- Shirehampton Primary School
- Shire Oak Academy
- Silverstone University Technical College
- Smithdon High School
- Smithdown Primary School
- Solihull Academy
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
- Southbury Primary School
- Southend on Sea Borough Council
- Southfield School
- South Gloucestershire Council
- Southampton City Council
- South View Community Primary School
- Southwark Park Primary School
- Southwater Junior Academy
- South Wirral High School
- Spalding Parish Church of England Day School
- Special Educational Needs Consortium
- Springfield Infant School and Nursery
- Spring Meadow Infant and Nursery School
- Square Peg
- Staffordshire County Council
- Standish Community High School
- St Anne Stanley School
- St Albert's Catholic Primary School
- Star Academies
- St Augustine Catholic Primary School
- St Celia's Catholic Infant and Nursery School
- St Dominic's School
- Stepgates Community School
- St Francis de Sales Catholic Infant and Nursery School
- St Gabriel's Church of England Academy
- St Gregory's Catholic Academy

- St John Rigby College
- St John the Evangelist Primary School
- St John's Primary School
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
- Stockport NHS Foundation Trust
- Stockton on Tees Borough Council
- Stoke on Trent City Council
- St Oswald's Church of England Primary School
- St Patrick's Church of England Primary Academy
- St Peter's Catholic Primary School
- St Peter's Catholic School
- St Margaret Mary's Catholic Infant School
- St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School
- St Mary's Church of England Primary School
- St Michael's Church of England Primary School
- St Stephen's Church of England Primary School
- St Thomas More Catholic Primary School
- St Thomas More High School
- St Willibrord's RC Primary School
- St Winifred's Roman Catholic Primary School
- Suffolk County Council
- Summerhill Primary Academy
- Sunshine Support
- Surrey County Council
- Swavesey Village College
- Swindon Borough Council
- Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
- Taverham High School
- Telford and Wrekin Council
- Temple Moor High School
- The Academy of St Francis of Assisi
- The Baird Primary Academy
- The Beaconsfield School
- The Bishop Konstant Catholic Academy Trust
- The Bishop Wand Church of England School
- The Black Curriculum
- The Castle School
- The Catholic School of St Gregory the Great
- The Children and Young People's Mental Health Coalition
- The Children's Society
- The Deepings School

- The Excel Academy
- The Gateway Learning Community
- The Harefield Academy
- The Independent Schools Association
- The King's School
- The Midlands Academy Trust
- The Place Network
- The Ripley Academy
- The Royal Alexandra and Albert School
- The Rydal Academy
- The Sigma Trust
- The Traveller Movement
- The Wells Free School
- Thinking Schools Academy Trust
- Thomas Tallis School
- Thorpe Willoughby Community Primary School
- Thornhill Primary School
- Three Towers Alternative Provision Academy
- Threeways School
- Throckley Primary School
- Thurrock Council
- Together Learning Trust
- Toner Avenue Primary School
- Torbay Council
- Tower Hill School
- Trafford Council
- Transform Trust
- Trauma Stop UK Community Interest Company
- Tupton Hall School
- Two Counties Trust
- Ullswater Community College
- University of Birmingham School
- Venture Academy
- Vision West Nottinghamshire College
- Voice Community
- Wadebridge School
- Wadworth Primary School
- Wakefield Council
- Wales High School
- Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
- Wanborough Primary School

- Warmsworth Primary School
- Warrington Metropolitan Borough Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- Waterloo Primary School
- Waterside Primary Academy
- Werneth School
- Westerings Primary Academy
- Westfield Primary School
- Westminster City Council
- Westminster Primary Academy
- West Specialist Inclusive Learning Centre
- West Sussex County Council
- Wexham School
- Whitehall Junior School
- Whitley Bay High School
- Whittingham Church of England Primary School
- Widney Junior School
- Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council
- William Edwards School
- William Law Church of England Primary School
- Wilmcote Church of England Primary School
- Wiltshire County Council
- Wiltshire SEND Advocacy and Support Service
- Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council
- Wokingham Borough Council
- Woking High School
- Wolvey Church of England Primary
- Wood Green Academy
- Woodhey High School
- Woodland Academy Trust
- Worcestershire Children First
- Worcestershire County Council
- Wroughton Infant School
- Wyvern College
- Yew Tree Primary School
- Youth Justice Board

Annex B: List of self-reported local authority area of the 1,523 online consultation respondents

Option	Total	Percent
Barking and Dagenham	2	0.12%
Barnet	7	0.43%
Barnsley	8	0.49%
Bath and North East Somerset	6	0.37%
Bedford	5	0.31%
Bexley	9	0.56%
Birmingham	15	0.93%
Blackburn with Darwen	7	0.43%
Blackpool	3	0.19%
Bolton	2	0.12%
Bournemouth	3	0.19%
Bracknell Forest	2	0.12%
Bradford	14	0.86%
Brent	1	0.06%
Brighton and Hove	6	0.37%
Bristol City of	27	1.67%
Bromley	5	0.31%
Buckinghamshire	17	1.05%
Bury	19	1.17%
Calderdale	11	0.68%
Cambridgeshire	37	2.29%
Camden	1	0.06%
Central Bedfordshire	13	0.80%
Cheshire East	14	0.86%
Cheshire West and Chester	13	0.80%
Cornwall	16	0.99%
Coventry	6	0.37%
Croydon	5	0.31%
Cumbria	8	0.49%
Darlington	3	0.19%
Derby	8	0.49%
Derbyshire	15	0.93%
Devon	30	1.85%
Doncaster	4	0.25%
Dorset	15	0.93%
Dudley	6	0.37%
Durham	24	1.48%
Ealing	2	0.12%
East Riding of Yorkshire	6	0.37%
East Sussex	12	0.74%
Enfield	11	0.68%

Option	Total	Percent
Essex	32	1.98%
Gateshead	4	0.25%
Gloucestershire	21	1.30%
Greenwich	3	0.19%
Hackney	4	0.25%
Halton	1	0.06%
Hammersmith and Fulham	4	0.25%
Hampshire	35	2.16%
Haringey	2	0.12%
Harrow	10	0.62%
Hartlepool	2	0.12%
Havering	2	0.12%
Herefordshire	6	0.37%
Hertfordshire	29	1.79%
Hillingdon	7	0.43%
Hounslow	3	0.19%
Isle of Wight	4	0.25%
Islington	4	0.25%
Kensington and Chelsea	2	0.12%
Kent	35	2.16%
Kingston upon Hull City of	5	0.31%
Kingston upon Thames	3	0.19%
Kirklees	14	0.86%
Knowsley	8	0.49%
Lambeth	1	0.06%
Lancashire	24	1.48%
Leeds	16	0.99%
Leicester	4	0.25%
Leicestershire	18	1.11%
Lewisham	3	0.19%
Lincolnshire	21	1.30%
Liverpool	17	1.05%
Luton	2	0.12%
Manchester	10	0.62%
Medway	10	0.62%
Merton	6	0.37%
Middlesbrough	5	0.31%
Milton Keynes	9	0.56%
Newcastle upon Tyne	5	0.31%
Newham	3	0.19%
Norfolk	25	1.54%
North East Lincolnshire	3	0.19%
North Lincolnshire	6	0.37%
North Somerset	6	0.37%
North Tyneside	3	0.19%
North Yorkshire	17	1.05%
Northamptonshire	22	1.36%

Option	Total	Percent
Northumberland	13	0.80%
Nottingham	9	0.56%
Nottinghamshire	23	1.42%
Oldham	5	0.31%
Oxfordshire	24	1.48%
Peterborough	3	0.19%
Plymouth	4	0.25%
Poole	4	0.25%
Portsmouth	3	0.19%
Reading	3	0.19%
Redbridge	2	0.12%
Redcar and Cleveland	2	0.12%
Richmond upon Thames	8	0.49%
Rochdale	6	0.37%
Rotherham	6	0.37%
Rutland	4	0.25%
Salford	3	0.19%
Sandwell	13	0.80%
Sefton	8	0.49%
Sheffield	17	1.05%
Shropshire	10	0.62%
Slough	3	0.19%
Solihull	13	0.80%
Somerset	20	1.24%
South Gloucestershire	12	0.74%
South Tyneside	3	0.19%
Southampton	5	0.31%
Southend-on-Sea	3	0.19%
Southwark	5	0.31%
St. Helens	4	0.25%
Staffordshire	16	0.99%
Stockport	20	1.24%
Stockton-on-Tees	4	0.25%
Stoke-on-Trent	9	0.56%
Suffolk	38	2.35%
Sunderland	5	0.31%
Surrey	74	4.57%
Sutton	6	0.37%
Swindon	20	1.24%
Tameside	5	0.31%
Telford and Wrekin	5	0.31%
Thurrock	4	0.25%
Torbay	6	0.37%
Tower Hamlets	4	0.25%
Trafford	4	0.25%
Wakefield	9	0.56%
Walsall	4	0.25%

Option	Total	Percent
Waltham Forest	3	0.19%
Wandsworth	6	0.37%
Warrington	7	0.43%
Warwickshire	40	2.47%
West Berkshire	0	0.00%
West Sussex	26	1.61%
Westminster	2	0.12%
Wigan	8	0.49%
Wiltshire	13	0.80%
Windsor and Maidenhead	4	0.25%
Wirral	10	0.62%
Wokingham	5	0.31%
Wolverhampton	8	0.49%
Worcestershire	19	1.17%
York	7	0.43%
Not Answered	96	5.93%



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2022

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk