

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received

From: [Airth Parent Council](#)
To: [EducationServices](#)
Subject: Airth Primary Parent Council Response to FC proposed changes to Enhanced Provision
Date: 27 October 2025 09:59:49
Attachments: [shield-advisory.png](#)
[chevron-light.png](#)
[Airth Parent Council Survey Report on Falkirk Council Proposed changes to EP.docx](#)

External email

Dear Falkirk Council,

Please take into account the views of the parents of Airth Primary School as part of the consultation on proposed changes to Enhanced Provision.

We have surveyed our parents and have provided this report. (Attached).

I am grateful to the parent volunteer who has taken the time to conduct this research on our behalf.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this. Best wishes,

[REDACTED]
Chairperson

Airth Parent Council & PTA airthparentcouncil@yahoo.com
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1509029326064725>
<https://www.facebook.com/AirthPTAFundraising>
<https://bsky.app/profile/airthparentcouncil.bsky.social> <https://linktr.ee/airthpc>

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received



Airth Parent Council's Survey Report on Falkirk Council's proposed changes to Enhanced Provision

October 2025

This report has been compiled from the survey responses of 21 parents or guardians of Airth Primary School pupils. This is representative of our school roll of 143 pupils for the year 2025/26. The survey was open from 1/10/25 to 15/10/25 and was advertised to parents via the school app, parent council social media and parent WhatsApp groups.

Key points

The majority of our respondents (86%) are not in support of the existing proposals.

There was a predominant feeling that the process has not been well conducted by the council and significant concerns were raised regarding the impact of this on all pupils and staff within the school community.

Representation

The households who responded represented 29 children ages 3 years to 16 years. There were predominantly primary age children with 22 out of the 29 aged between 5 and 13 years. And 5 children in preschool ages 3-4 years.

76% of respondents replied their children had no known additional support needs, 19% advised their child had a diagnosis or was awaiting assessment for ASN (Additional Support Needs) and 5% were unsure.

Resources

Respondents reported their children already make use of a number of the school's resources which would require to be accessed more widely by children with ASN.

42% were aware their child made use of the hub – a separate classroom space out-with the pupil's year group classroom, staffed throughout the day by a floating teacher or support for learning assistant.

Information from the school is that this space is used in a variety of ways throughout the school day, and all pupils make use of it at some point. One parent commented their child utilises the hub for "*quiet time with friends*" and another advised of "*quiet time to prevent frustration*".

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received

25% of respondents were aware their child made use of the cabin. This is a smaller enclosed space within the playground containing sensory equipment and offering a more relaxed environment.

25% reported their child made use of Support For Learning Assistant time. One parent advised their child's requirement for SFLA has varied over the years, but it was around 90% of the time during one schoolyear. 8% responded their child needed 1 to 1 supervision.

The parent council is aware of one unfilled SFLA post at Airth Primary at present.

There has been no detail provided by the council as to how they envision resources being distributed for this proposal beyond a statement that "*the resources shall follow the child*".

With the current information available, all respondents felt the school would require additional resources to deliver the proposals.

19% felt more teaching staff would be needed, 23% felt more support for learning staff, 17% felt staff training was required, 22% felt more break out spaces would be needed, 17% thought changes in the playground would be needed, extra janitorial and clerical support and more physical space were also mentioned.

Opinion on the Proposal

As mentioned above, the majority of respondents (86%) were not in support of the proposals. 10% stated they were in support of them and 5% was undecided.

When asked if they could foresee any benefits to their family or the school from the proposals, 94% (16/17 respondents) felt they could not.

One respondent felt a benefit for the school would be creating a more inclusive culture in the learning and greater understanding of additional support needs. Another stated, "*keeping the kids local, but the kids have specialised needs that not every school can accommodate*".

Four comments were concerned about meeting the needs of both ASN and non ASN pupils.

"I don't believe it will be fair to either the child with needs or not. The disruptions for kids and also the needs will not be met for the kids with needs either".

"No, I can see only negatives as you over stretch teaching and support staff to the detriment of ASN and non ASN pupils".

"No. This is not a positive change for our family, our school, our community or children who need extra support and individualised care".

When asked if they had any concerns regarding the proposals, 21 responses covered concerns about meeting children's educational and emotional needs and impact on staff morale.

"I cannot see how this proposal is going to benefit any Falkirk council child or staff member".

13 of the responses mentioned concerns about meeting children's educational needs, 7 cited concerns about emotional wellbeing of all pupils, 8 commented about the limited resources available

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received

to achieve the proposal and 8 identified the difficult and demoralising position staff would be put in by these proposals.

Some quotes below to illustrate further :

"Stretching already over worked staff. Concerns re emotional well-being of current 'mainstream' children. Children with greater needs deserve to be getting greater care and attention at enhanced provisions, we should be leaning into this and not letting these children down."

"Yes, this will affect non ASN kids as well as ASN kids as we have been told 1 teacher to 10, some schools might have 5 kids some might have 17 but only 1 teacher, no one can confirm where the budget to change schools and make adaptations to schools is coming from."

"I feel for staff having to teach several pupils in different ways in the same class. I worry about the impact of this."

Consultation Process

The feeling around the consultation process was mostly negative, with most respondents feeling it had not been conducted well; 38% responding "extremely not well" and 14% "somewhat not well".

33% felt neutral on this matter and 14% felt it had been conducted "somewhat well". 0% felt it had been conducted "extremely well".

Most of our respondents were not notified by the proposals via the council's group call email. 37% were informed via our parent council correspondence, 17% via social media, 14% a piece via the school app, word of mouth and the group call email.

55% of our respondents reported also completing the council's own Participate Plus survey.

Only 19% had attended one of the council's information sessions on the proposals, 81% had not.

Conclusion

From those who engaged with the survey at Airth, there is an overwhelmingly negative opinion about the Falkirk Council proposals. Concerns include the educational and emotional impact of these proposals on both ASN and non ASN pupils; how schools can achieve this without significant change to their physical spaces, personnel, resources and training, and the knock-on effect of the proposal on the morale of an already stretched staff.

There is a feeling this proposal is not consistent with GIRFEC principles and would be letting our children both with or without ASN down.

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received

Submissions through Participate + platform

Nethermains Parent Council

Please see statement on behalf of Nethermains Parent Council: the consultation document clearly states that EP pupils would be expected to return to their catchment schools. However, at the meeting we were told something very different:

- EP pupils will not be required to return to their catchment school.
- The 15 current EP schools will remain in place with the same level of funding.
- The 47 primary schools will receive additional funding to build capacity to support ASN/EP children locally, including those transitioning from ELC.

This is a very different message from what was written in the proposal, making it almost impossible for parents to know what they are actually being asked to respond to. Falkirk Council suggested that misinformation is coming from word of mouth and Facebook groups, but in reality the confusion comes from their own proposal not matching what they are now saying. Before the consultation can go any further, and from the general feeling and feedback from last nights meeting, Falkirk council need to:

- Reissue the proposal with a clear and consistent statement of intent.
- Explain in plain terms what the proposal actually means for children currently in EPs and for families considering support in non-EP schools.
- Set out the rationale: why this change is being proposed, and what evidence supports it.
- Provide detail on what additional resources, staffing, and facilities the 47 schools will receive, and how this will be monitored.
- Reissue the survey, as the responses already completed are based on inaccurate information and might not be considered valid.

My view is that councillors are being asked to approve a major change to ASN support without clear data, without evidence of success elsewhere, and without a full understanding of the educational and wellbeing implications for children. The promise of training and personalised support across 47 primary schools is very ambitious, but Falkirk Council can't tell us how it will be delivered. Many parents spoke about their fears for their children and shared stories of how they have thrived in Enhanced Provision after very difficult starts in mainstream. The worry in the room was very clear and instead of easing those concerns, the council's 180-degree shift in message left families even less certain. While we now know that EP will remain for children at Nethermains, there is no clarity about what this will mean for ELC if the proposal goes ahead. Right now, the whole process feels muddled. Parents need clarity, schools need honesty, and our children deserve better than a proposal that changes depending on who is explaining it. In short:

- The rationale remains unclear.
- The impact on children and families is uncertain.
- No data or evidence has been presented to show this will deliver better educational or wellbeing outcomes.

I think Falkirk Council should pause this process, reissue a clear proposal, and engage in genuine, transparent consultation with parents, schools, and professionals. Only then can any decision be evidence-based and centred on the needs of children.

SSTA Union

This proposal suggests removing all enhanced provision and that all primary schools will have capacity for enhanced support. This is not a proposal that the SSTA would support. Important questions must be asked about appropriate educational and physical support for CYP with the most complex needs, resourcing, training and, vitally, staffing. In 2024, the SfL review was published and in 2025, Audit Scotland produced a report on ASN in Scotland. Both were damning reads for the current state of ASN in our education system. This proposal is yet another example of how important educational decisions are being made based not on the need of Scotland's children, but on budget restrictions. This proposal goes against the important changes that need to be made to improve the education of all CYP with ASN; better, more appropriate provision, more resources, greater opportunities for suitable training and more highly trained, specialist ASN staff. The SSTA's greatest

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received

concern is around the impact on our members when pupils affected by this proposal start within Secondary. Our members will be working with children with ASN who have not had the resourcing, support or learning experience that they would have had in a specialised provision, with highly trained staff. Mainstream teachers cannot, and should not, be trained to work with children with complex needs. Both reports mentioned above, highlight that teachers are already expected to support more and more complex needs within their classrooms and that this model is not sustainable. Teacher workload is already unmanageable, as are the expectations of mainstream teachers to personalise learning for each individual in the class. Secondary subject teachers should be able to concentrate on the teaching and learning of a curriculum. This proposal will pull away from this, leading to poorer teaching and learning for all as well as a greater workload. To finish, SSTA cannot support a proposal that will further reduce the specialist education that our most vulnerable CYP are entitled to and will lead to a negative impact on and a greater workload for our members.

Appendix 9: Organisation Letters Received