

Appendix 7: Letters Received

This appendix has been redacted to remove personal data and confidential or sensitive information in line with data protection requirements. Removed content is marked as [redacted].

John Reid, Director of Education

Consultation on the Closure of Falkirk District Enhanced Provision Facilities

Dear Sir,

I note that campaigners against the Council's plan to close the 15 Enhanced Provision Facilities in local primary schools have lost faith in the consultation process.

I want to remind the Education Authority and Council of a very similar consultation process that took place a number of years ago, how the legitimate concerns of parents and staff were ignored then and how the promises made by the authorities failed to come to fruition. I fear history is about to repeat itself with potentially even more serious consequences for our children. This proposal appears to be little more than a cost-cutting exercise which will benefit no-one other than those who hold the education purse strings.

Now retired, I spent my whole career of 38 years working with pupils with additional support need. I taught first in learning support in mainstream, then in special schools where I was depute head when the decision was made to move primary pupils from special education establishments into newly established Enhanced Provision Facilities in mainstream schools. My role for a while was to help set up those facilities, completing my career teaching in one of them. I speak, therefore from considerable knowledge and experience in this area.

So many promises were made then to parents and staff about the benefits of educating children with significant needs in mainstream with enhanced provision. Some benefits certainly did occur but the fears of parents and staff were not addressed and promises made were not honoured. What had been the centralised experience and expertise of teaching and support staff and the input of therapists and medical help were then spread over 15 venues and seriously diluted. Purpose built accommodation was lost. Specialist equipment and resources had to be widely distributed. Promises of training for staff and additional resources were absolutely minimal. (My training to teach in the special educational sector consisted of a full-time intensive post graduate year back in college. Why is it thought teachers need so much less training now when the needs of children are even greater?)

It seems to me that the Council propose a similar further dilution of the very specialist educational environment and teaching that these children need and deserve. Depending on their individual needs, most of the children currently in enhanced provision facilities will not thrive in mainstream classrooms. The majority need far more one-to-one adult input than they would be able to receive. Their needs are complex and diverse and they work on individually designed programmes. How will this be achieved in a busy classroom where the majority of the pupils will be working on a different curriculum at a different level? Many children will not cope with the noise and general busyness of the environment. Most need a very structured day with short concentrated spells of work interspersed with more relaxed times when personal and social skills can be developed. Many children with communication difficulties need an environment where Makaton supports spoken language. Some children will not be able to learn seated at a

desk but will need to physically move about, at times outwith the classroom. Some children will present very challenging behaviour requiring a high level of skilled adult intervention.

How can such a variety of need be met in a busy classroom where the mainstream children also need teacher time and attention and who deserve to follow their curriculum without what will be constant demands on the adults present? By all accounts from colleagues and friends, primary staff are already stretched to near breaking point.

I fully accept that there are very many children with additional support needs already in mainstream classes who need more specialist input than they currently receive. The answer is surely not to take from those who need it most and who are thriving in their specialist environment with hopefully trained, experienced staff. Rather, to cope with the increased number of children who need additional support, more enhanced provision facilities need to be provided, ideally one in every primary school. For the children whose needs are perhaps not so all-encompassing their mainstream class needs to be smaller and more flexibly organised with more trained adults.

I hope those most closely involved will be listened to and their concerns addressed. The current and future lives of all our children are at stake.

Yours sincerely

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally register my objection to Falkirk Council's consultation on the proposed model for *Enhanced Provision in Falkirk Primary Schools*.

While I support the principle of improving inclusion and ensuring that all children can access the support, I have significant concerns about both the **consultation process** and the **substance of the proposal** itself.

The attached letter sets out these concerns in detail, and as such I respectfully request that **the current consultation be withdrawn** and that a revised, transparent, and fully accessible process be developed in genuine partnership with parents, carers, schools, and specialists. I would be grateful for written confirmation that my objection has been received and recorded as part of the consultation process. Regards,

26th October 2025

Falkirk Council – Education Department
Sealock House
2 Inchyra Road
Grangemouth
FK3 9XB

Dear Sir or Madam

RE: Enhanced Provision Consultation – Formal Objection

I write to formally object to Falkirk Council's *Enhanced Provision Consultation (2025)* on the grounds that the consultation process, documentation, and governance are procedurally flawed, legally unsound, and inconsistent with statutory and best practice standards governing educational change in Scotland.

1. Grounds for Objection

The consultation fails to comply with multiple legislative and policy frameworks that safeguard children's rights, equitable access to education, and fair consultation processes. Specifically, I raise the following concerns:

1.1 Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010

This Act requires that any proposal involving a significant change to educational provision must include a balanced *Educational Benefits Statement*, meaningful consultation with affected pupils, and full publication of supporting evidence.

The Council's consultation does not meet these statutory standards:

- The *Educational Benefits Statement* lists potential advantages but fails to identify any disadvantages or risks, in breach of Section 3(2)(a) of the Act.
- Transition and mitigation plans are non-specific, lacking details of which schools or pupils will be affected, or how continuity of support will be maintained.
- Consultation with children and young people is not evidenced or described in sufficient detail to meet the requirements of Section 5(2)(b).
- The process for correcting inaccuracies or omissions is vague, undermining procedural fairness.

These omissions make it impossible for consultees to make an informed judgement on the proposals — rendering the process *potentially unlawful* under the Gunning Principles of fair consultation.

1.2 Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)

Under Section 149 of the Equality Act, the Council must demonstrate that it has had *due regard* to eliminating discrimination and advancing equality for disabled children and their families. No *Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)* has been published, nor has any baseline data on current inequities been provided. The use of inaccessible language and complex documentation isolates consultees without formal knowledge or understanding of the terminology or context impacting their ability to participate and effectively response to the consultation proposals. This may also indirectly discriminate against disabled parents and carers.

This constitutes a procedural breach of the PSED and undermines the consultation's credibility as an inclusive process.

1.3 Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act 2004

The proposals envisage significant redistribution of ASN resources, yet provide no school-byschool model of support, staffing, or funding.

Without clarity on minimum provision standards, the Council cannot demonstrate compliance with its duty to provide adequate and appropriate support under Section 4 of the ASL Act. The absence of clear dispute resolution mechanisms also fails to meet statutory expectations for parental recourse.

1.4 Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 and UNCRC

The proposals fail to evidence how the *best interests of the child* (Article 3, UNCRC) or the *child's right to be heard* (Article 12) have informed the process.

No *Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment (CRWIA)* or UNCRC Impact Assessment has been published. This omission contravenes both the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014* and the Scottish Government's rights-based approach to policy-making, as set out in *All Learners in Scotland Matter*.

1.5 Consultation Process and Accessibility

The consultation process itself has been equally flawed, with the following key shortcomings highlighted:

1.5.1 *Communication & Awareness*: Confirmed by Falkirk Council's Communications Officer, *Paul Wilcox* (email dated 9 October 2025), the Council's initial Groupcall electronic message — issued on 29 August 2025 to launch the consultation — failed to send successfully. As a result, a significant number of parents were not informed of the consultation's existence and therefore unable to participate from the outset.

In the weeks following, a series of sporadic, inconsistent, and fragmented communications were issued by individual schools through various digital channels — including emails, school apps, and newsletters — each on different dates and with differing levels of information. This patchwork approach failed to achieve comprehensive or equitable reach, leaving many

parents, both within Enhanced Provision (EP) settings and mainstream schools, unaware that a consultation was even taking place.

A second Groupcall message was not issued until 22 September 2025, by which time three of the public consultation meetings (Braes, Denny, and online) had already taken place. Parents who were unaware of the consultation prior to this date were therefore excluded from key opportunities to attend and contribute.

If all parents were not informed of the consultation's existence until 22 September 2025, then the consultation period cannot reasonably be considered to constitute a full eightweek consultation period as claimed. In practical terms, the effective consultation period was only five weeks, two of which coincided with the October school holidays — a time when many families are on leave or out of the country. It is unfair and unreasonable to expect meaningful participation during this period, rendering the consultation procedurally defective under the requirements of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*, which demands both adequacy and fairness in consultation duration and accessibility.

Despite repeated requests for transparency regarding the Groupcall failure — and multiple requests for a reissued communication to ensure that all parents were properly informed — senior officers (*Jon Reid* and *Deborah Davidson*) continued to insist that parents had been notified, despite clear evidence to the contrary.

At no stage were physical letters or printed notifications distributed. This omission effectively excluded families without reliable digital access — in direct conflict with inclusive communication duties under the *Equality Act 2010* and contrary to best practice standards in public consultation.

In summary, these systemic communication and accessibility failures mean that the consultation has not been conducted in an open, fair, or legally compliant manner. The process therefore cannot be considered valid under statutory consultation standards or Scottish Government best practice expectations.

1.5.2 Quality & Content of Consultation Materials: The consultation materials themselves are opaque, inconsistent, and inaccessible to lay readers. The language used throughout is technical, jargon-heavy, and lacks clear explanation, excluding parents and carers from meaningful engagement. No glossary or explanatory notes are provided, and key terms are used inconsistently or interchangeably, creating confusion and undermining public understanding of what is actually being proposed.

Moreover, the proposals lack substantive detail, supporting evidence, and logical rationale for the chosen model. There is no explanation of alternative options that were considered and discounted, nor any transparent justification for why this particular approach was selected. The documents also fail to outline the practical implementation process, including essential operational matters such as how resources will be transferred, how mainstream schools will be assessed for capacity and capability to receive high-needs pupils, and what safeguards will be in place to ensure safety, welfare, and educational continuity.

While “case studies” are presented in the appendices, they are inconsistent in content and depth and do not provide sufficient information on critical factors such as educational

methodology, class sizes, staffing ratios, or levels of pupil need. As such, they cannot be relied upon as meaningful evidence of feasibility or best practice.

In sum, the consultation materials fail to meet the standards of transparency, clarity, and sufficiency expected under the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the *Equality Act 2010*, and do not support informed participation by the public or stakeholders.

1.5.3 *Inconsistencies & Amendments to Consultation Documents*: At the first public meeting held at Braes High School, Education officials contradicted key elements of their own published consultation proposals. The original consultation document explicitly stated:

*“The current Primary Enhanced Provision model will be restructured so that every primary school in Falkirk Council will be supported to develop the capacity to provide an appropriate level of **Enhanced Support**.*

*Current pupils who attend an Enhanced Provision, which is not within their catchment school, **will return to their catchment school** and be educated in their local community, with an appropriate level of enhanced support”*

This position itself caused considerable stress and concern to parents and carers. However, at the Braes meeting, Education officials stated that this was not the intended meaning, causing widespread confusion. Attendees pressed for a revised consultation document that accurately reflected the true intent of the proposals. Subsequently, on 22 September 2025, Falkirk Council amended their website, but not their consultation document, mid-consultation — to read as follows:

*“We want to provide clarity around some wording in the consultation paper, particularly relating to the suggestion that all children who currently attend an Enhanced Provision would be required to return to their catchment school. We would like to be very clear that **no child will be forced to move school**. The proposal sets out the ambition that, if every school is equipped with the staff and resource to provide enhanced support, children could be educated in their local school and community. This remains a goal in the proposal that could be achieved through careful transition, planning and collaboration.”*

The Council's restated proposal now reads:

*“Every Falkirk Primary School would embed enhanced Additional Support Needs support in their school. There would be a move away from 15 Enhanced Provisions to a model where all 47 Primary Schools are resourced to **support enhanced Additional Support Needs support**.*

*Pupils who currently have a place in an Enhanced Provision **may have to return to their local school with support.**”*

This updated wording introduces an internal contradiction that fundamentally undermines the credibility of the proposals:

- On the one hand, the Council asserts that *“no child will be forced to move school.”*
- On the other, it states that *“pupils who currently have a place in an Enhanced Provision may have to return to their local school.”*

These two statements cannot both be true. Either movement is optional and entirely voluntary (as the first suggests), or children *may have to move* (as the second explicitly states). The ambiguity continues to create confusion, erode trust, and makes it impossible for consultees to understand the actual intent or likely impact of the proposals. This ‘correction’, on top of the original statement further undermines parental understanding, clarity and trust.

Furthermore, the amendment of the published consultation text midway through the consultation period constitutes a material alteration under the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. The Act is explicit that where an inaccuracy or omission is identified, the authority must:

- issue a correction notice,
- formally notify all consultees and Education Scotland, and
- extend the consultation period to allow proper consideration of the corrected information.

Consequently, parents who viewed or downloaded the consultation materials before 22 September 2025 were working with substantially different information from those accessing it later, compromising the fairness, transparency, and legality of the consultation process.

This inconsistency and lack of procedural compliance have undermined confidence in both the integrity of the consultation and the credibility of Falkirk Council’s assurances to parents. Given the material nature of these contradictions, the consultation should be immediately paused and reissued with accurate, consistent, and legally compliant information to ensure a fair and lawful process.

1.5.4 *Confidence in the Participate Plus Platform:* Throughout the consultation period, serious concerns have been raised by both parents and staff regarding the anonymity and data protection integrity of the Participate Plus consultation platform.

When a formal request was submitted to Falkirk Council’s Data Protection Team seeking independent and qualified assurance on these matters, the enquiry was inappropriately redirected to the Education Department — specifically to the officer directly responsible for leading the ASN project and consultation process. This decision represents a clear conflict of interest and falls short of accepted data governance standards. Matters relating to data privacy and survey anonymity should be reviewed and responded to by a neutral and competent authority, not by the department under scrutiny.

By allowing the Education Department to respond to a complaint about its own consultation process, the Council has undermined both the impartiality and credibility of its assurances. No evidence has been provided of a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) or independent verification of the Participate Plus platform’s capacity to guarantee respondent anonymity — despite the high likelihood of indirect identification through school-level and role-specific responses.

Furthermore, it must be recognised that responses collected through Participate+ may not represent the full body of stakeholder sentiment. In particular, teachers and Support for Learning Assistants (SfLAs) working within Enhanced Provision settings may have been reluctant to participate — or to express their views candidly — due to fear of professional repercussions or identification. This introduces a serious risk of response bias, calling into question the validity and representativeness of the consultation findings.

As a result, consultees have no substantiated assurance that their responses are truly anonymous or that their personal data are being processed in compliance with UK GDPR Article 35 and the principles of data protection by design and default. This failure has eroded trust in the consultation process and raised legitimate concerns about its procedural fairness, data governance, and overall legitimacy.

1.5.5 Professionalism of Falkirk Council's Education Department: Throughout the consultation process, representatives of Falkirk Council's Education Department have, at multiple points, demonstrated conduct that falls significantly below the standard of professionalism and respect expected of public officials engaging with the community.

The tone and manner adopted during both the in-person and online public meetings were widely perceived as dismissive and condescending. Parents and carers were often spoken over, talked down to, or met with defensive and inconsistent answers, rather than genuine engagement or transparency.

In several instances, concerns raised by parents were met with laughter, eye-rolling, or dismissive remarks. Some staff and children were referred to using inappropriate or derogatory language, which caused considerable distress among attendees. The overall atmosphere of these meetings was one in which parents were made to feel patronised, belittled, and treated as if they were being “put in their place,” rather than respected as equal partners in shaping decisions about their children's education and wellbeing.

Throughout these meetings, parents and carers repeatedly asked direct questions about the proposals, their implementation, and the potential impact on their children. However, these questions were frequently left unanswered or were met with evasive responses. This persistent lack of substantive answers further contributed to the frustration and sense of exclusion experienced by attendees, reinforcing the perception that genuine dialogue and accountability were lacking within the consultation process.

Such behaviour is unacceptable in any professional or public setting, but particularly within a consultation that directly affects vulnerable children and families. It undermines the credibility of the Education Department, erodes public confidence in the consultation process, and raises serious questions about whether the consultation was conducted in the spirit of fairness, respect, and co-production required under both the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 and Scottish Government best practice guidance.

1.5.6 Efficiency Concerns: At the Falkirk Council Meeting of December 2024, the Director of Education, Mr. Jon Reid, made several statements on public record (video recorded) which directly raise concerns that the ASN/Enhanced Provision Review is being pursued primarily as a cost-saving measure, rather than an educational improvement initiative.

In that meeting, Mr. Reid stated:

“We are always looking for operational efficiencies...”

*“We have other reviews underway, that may **deliver significant savings in the years to come, specifically our ASN review...**”*

*“...I would give **no assurance that there not be a significant negative impact** as a result of those [proposals] being implemented...”*

These remarks explicitly link the ASN Review — of which the current Enhanced Provision proposals form a central part — to the Council’s wider budget efficiency programme, rather than to a child-centred rationale.

Further evidence of this is contained within Falkirk Council’s Financial Strategy 2025/26 to 2029/30 (Agenda Item 5, October 2024 Update), which lists the following potential “efficiency measures” under Children’s Services:

- *“Reductions in support services for learners with additional needs, limiting the assistance available to pupils who rely on these services for their educational progress and well-being.*
- *Scaling back of centralised and specialist education teams, which will reduce the support available to schools, affecting teachers' ability to deliver tailored and inclusive education*
- *Removal of transport and discretionary services, limiting travel options for pupils, particularly those in rural areas or attending specialised programmes in schools/College”*

Taken together, these statements strongly indicate that the Enhanced Provision proposals are financially motivated, with educational reasoning appearing secondary.

Currently, approximately £3.1 million is allocated across the existing 15 Enhanced Provision Units (EPUs). Expecting this same finite budget to be distributed across 47 primary schools is wholly unrealistic. Such redistribution will inevitably dilute the quality and intensity of support, particularly for pupils with complex or high-level ASN, resulting in an erosion of both outcomes and wellbeing.

Furthermore, the expectation that this already stretched funding will now also cater for Levels 1–3 ASN pupils currently in mainstream settings — as well as accommodate an increasing number of new ASN learners each year — is fundamentally unsustainable.

Even if the total budget were nominally protected (and not explicitly reduced as the Council’s wider financial strategy suggests), this continued dilution of finite resources constitutes a budget cut in real terms. Over time, such attrition will significantly weaken the capacity of schools to maintain specialist environments, specialist staffing, and the high-quality interventions currently available through existing EPUs.

This lack of transparent cost modelling and assurance of adequate resource provision raises serious questions about compliance with the Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act 2004, which places a duty on education authorities to make adequate and efficient provision

for additional support needs, and the Equality Act 2010, which requires public bodies to take steps to avoid placing disabled learners at a substantial disadvantage.

Until transparent financial modelling is published, accompanied by clear guarantees of protected and sufficient resources to maintain existing standards of support, these proposals cannot credibly claim to promote inclusion. Instead, they appear to represent a redistribution and dilution of essential specialist support, pursued under the guise of equity but in practice resulting in a significant regression for Falkirk's most vulnerable learners.

2. Legal and Procedural Consequences

Given these cumulative failures, the consultation cannot be regarded as lawful or procedurally compliant.

Under Section 17(2) of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*, the Education Authority must ensure any consultation is conducted in accordance with statutory procedure. Failure to do so may render the outcome invalid and open to legal challenge or referral to the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO).

3. Formal Request

I therefore request that Falkirk Council:

- i. Immediately suspend the current consultation process pending a full procedural and legal review.
- ii. Reissue a revised consultation only after publishing the missing impact assessments (Educational Benefit, EqIA, UNCRC, GIRFEC) and providing accessible, balanced, and fully evidenced documentation.
- iii. Engage directly and meaningfully with parents, carers, and advocacy groups — including those representing disabled and neurodivergent children — to co-design a lawful, inclusive, and transparent proposal and process.
- iv. Appoint an independent officer to oversee compliance and ensure impartiality.

4. Petition

Details are attached of a public petition supporting the concerns outlined within this objection.

The petition has already received over 5,450 signatures, with numbers continuing to grow daily as awareness grows. This substantial and rapidly increasing level of support demonstrates the depth and strength of feeling across Falkirk and beyond regarding the Council's Enhanced Provision proposals and the way in which this consultation has been conducted.

Parents, carers, education professionals, and community members are united in calling for the immediate suspension of this flawed process and for the Council to engage meaningfully and transparently with stakeholders to co-design a lawful, evidence-based, and inclusive model of support for children with Additional Support Needs.

5. Conclusion

The Enhanced Provision proposals are ambitious in aspiration but fundamentally flawed in both process and substance. While we fully support the underlying vision — ensuring that every child with Additional Support Needs receives the *right support, in the right place, at the right time* — this proposal and its consultation process fail to achieve that goal in any meaningful or lawful way.

They do not meet statutory consultation duties, breach equality and children's rights obligations, and have severely undermined public trust and confidence in Falkirk Council's ability to safeguard and promote the educational interests of its most vulnerable learners.

Until these deficiencies are addressed, the consultation should be formally halted and reissued, ensuring full compliance with legislation, best practice standards, and the core principles of fairness, inclusion, transparency, and genuine co-production with families.

Yours faithfully

Petition Status, as at 26 October 2025
(<https://c.org/YGTHbBJZkM>)

STOP THE CLOSURE OF ENHANCED PROVISION UNITS FOR ASN KIDS!



5,455

Verified signatures

Copy link

Send via WhatsApp

Share on Facebook

Nextdoor

Send via email

I am write in response to your proposed Enhanced Provision Proposal and after having read your document and FAQs, attended multiple consultations and having face-to-face discussions with FC staff I still have the remaining questions unanswered or comments I feel need to be considered.

1. What is the proposal for when children meet the exception for presumption of mainstream? Where will they attend?

There appears to be a huge step from mainstream to a stage 4 provision. Your FAQs mention other council setting taking a similar approach to your proposal but without considering their whole offering a comparison is pointless. For a child who needs small group settings this proposal removes any option.

2. How will they manage to support children who struggle to access the loud and busy mainstream setting?

This is a massive concern. Many children in EP struggle with loud busy environments. Whilst they may wish to be part of mainstream it may not be a suitable learning environment for them. My daughter attends EP in the morning and mainstream in the afternoon - the learning she achieves in the morning far outweighs the afternoon where she struggles to retain any information. This is part of her diagnosed conditions - a difficulty with selective attention and memory recall. Forcing her to attend busy classrooms would be failing to make reasonable adjustments for her conditions and would breach her rights to achieve all she can in her education.

3. Does moving my child not disrupt the continuity of their education?

My child is in [redacted] at present - being a care experienced child transitions do not come easily and we are very aware that she will be transitioning to high school in a little over 2 years after having a very traumatic transition into EP 2 years ago. Why has there not been a consideration to leave upper EP classes as they are and transition lower EP classes first to minimise disruption to children leaving for high school? Why is it all or nothing?

4. What will the support look like for unstructured times like break and lunch?

Unstructured times are hard in any school but what consideration has been made to supporting EP children during these times? My children have had access to quiet areas and support during these times. Where will the support come from? Simply expecting them to cope in the playground isn't suitable and often playground staff are not the regular teaching staff.

5. What are the specifics of the additional support being made available to headteachers to meet the new level of need within each school

After 6 weeks in consultation I am still no further forward to understanding what an 'EP like setting' would mean for my child. She currently spends every morning in EP, a

further 20-30 mins in the afternoon in EP and does a small group activity one afternoon. By my count out she is only in mainstream between 6-8 hours a week. Does that mean that her 'EP like setting' would also ensure that she has this level of small group working? It feels very much like FC are trying to remove a legal pupil teacher ratio from my child and replace with something 'EP like' but with no legal guarantee and purely left at the discretion of the school/council approving/allocating the staff they can afford that year. Will there be any legal guarantee on what will be provided?

How is access to the 'EP like setting' allocated? If the school loses staff or has a pupil with a 'greater need' does that mean my child can lose their allocated support purely based on the headteachers discretion? Our current school attempted to start a skills for life room which was small group working focusing on social/emotional challenges my son was allocated an hour a day which was removed after 4 months because of insufficient staffing - nothing to do with his need or how beneficial it was to him purely lack of staff and others with greater need. What I would also say is that although the skills for life time was massively beneficial it was only because of the EP support he received the rest of the time that it made the difference.

My son has a CSP however my daughter cannot get one - not because she does not need one but purely because the services she needs to support her are not available long waiting lists and lack of resources. Legally she is already very vulnerable and this will leave her further exposed when what she really needs is stability and scaffolding.

I have read and re-read your FAQs and am saddened they haven't been updated since early October as I was hoping for more clarity over the course of this consultation:

In relation to your FAQ 1: in relation to SFLA - you state that this is decided centrally and based on a number of factors. I find the situations with SFLAs deeply concerning. Our experience over the last 7 years shows that FC consistently and deliberately waits to the last possible moment to allocate SFLA hours knowing that recruitment takes time and saves them wages in the meantime. Our son was in EP fulltime (not in mainstream at all), on stage 4 intervention, on a CSP and on multiple part time timetables. We requested exceptional hours given he was in a stage 3 provision and a move wasn't suitable and it was rejected; instead we were told the school had to use their base allocation to support him. If a child in such crisis as this could not be allocated even a couple of SFLA hours then how can you expect parents to accept that SFLA will be available as needed? There is often references to fair and equal distribution and very little reference to our child's rights and timely support. I would ask that you make available the number of SFLA hours requested versus, the number of SFLA hours approved and the number of SFLA actually provided. We have seen there is a history of approving hours after the summer holidays, the staff are lucky to be in post by Christmas and by Easter they have taken a post elsewhere as FC will not commit to long term contracts. For children who depend on consistency, familiar faces and routines this is simply unacceptable. To suggest based on these historical facts that SFLA will be centrally allocated and for parents to have any faith that requests will be

approved is absolutely ridiculous. The standard line from schools when any parent asks about additional SFLA hours is that there is no point as you won't get them which is part of the reason we applied for EP in the first place as we had no faith in securing and retaining SFLA hours - why should we believe any different now?

In relation to you FAQ 6: We have 3 EP classes in our primary school and if an EP teacher is absent, they can reorganise the classrooms to still support the children. If you distribute staff across more schools there will become a key person dependency and when that person is off there is no alternative to support the children in EP. History has shown that our daughter does not cope well with new teachers or supply staff and this will be a common theme with many EP children. Our children both have FASD - something which is not trained on within even EP teachers despite being arguable more prevalent than autism or ADHD! We had to get staff specifically trained due to the breadth of behaviours and needs and yet there has not been any discussion about what training would be provided and to how many staff members.

The traits associated with attachment disorders are also something which have not been mentioned. It appears FC is focusing on building a provision for those children who have learning disabilities and trying to integrate them rather than accepting that some children have learning difficulties where environment, staff ratios and tailored curriculums are key to the children's success.

In relation to you FAQ 8: My children moved from {School A} to [School B] playground is not secure it has 3ft fences at places and no fences in other places leading onto a road. My child left the playground and the police were called. [school b] has 6 foot high fences and the only exit is via the secure entry at the front door. The physical security of these two schools cannot be compared yet there is no budget to alter the schools? I also know that [school a] has had to turn its library into a classroom to accommodate another class and has had to turn their office into a nurture space which is tiny! The classrooms are all open plan facing onto each other and the only breakout space is the dining hall/gym hall. The physical space between the 2 schools is night and day!

In relation to FAQ 11 - we were told August 26 at the consult (we have a recording) There was no mention of phased introduction and we were told staff are already being trained despite no decision having been reached.

In relation to FAQ19 - no child will be made to move. What happens to school transport? Will this remain in place? It is grossly unfair to expect a child to move from a school that they are settled and thriving in if the council will no longer provide transport when they placed them there in the first place? Will consideration be made for those in upper school as another move so close to a high school transition could be very disruptive if a parent is unable to provide transport themselves.

In relation to FAQ37 - I do not believe that the views of young people have been fairly or accurately represented. A list of questions was issued to primary schools and they were to obtain feedback. Please can these questions be shared? A recent comment from FC that a child shared that they 'want to ride their scooter to school' seemed to be a very rose tinted view. My daughter would like to ride her bike to school - the fact is that whether it is her EP or catchment school she does not have the risk awareness to do this and putting this concept in her head is just cruel. Asking children what they would like without considering what they are capable of it completely wrong. My daughter has a rights worker at [redacted] and she shared that for previous consults such as these they would normally have been asked to apply for funding and run a project to gather independent views - she was quite surprised that this hadn't been the case but instead the consult was relying on FC staff to collect views. I have asked the [redacted] worker to work with my child and submit her view and am disappointed that other children don't have the same opportunity unless their parents push for it. It is not on the parents to share their children's views - it should be on the council to obtain them independently.

In relation to FAQ 50 - this absolutely is about saving money. FC admit that there is children in mainstream who need EP and they cant afford to pay for it. This is about spreading the money currently allocated to EP children further. This is about removing the legal protection on staffing and ratios afforded to children within an EP setting and leaving their support at the discretion of the headteacher to utilise whatever resource is available - often not enough!

In relation to FAQ 53 - FC leave staffing details so late we are often told of our children's teacher for the next academic year in the last week of term. Whilst this is far from ideal on a normal transition where any kind of transition is planned to move away from the current EP setting there should be at least 3 months notice by rights. How can this possible be achieved before summer if a decision isn't being taken until Feb? If this proposal is accepted I would urge the council to consider pushing out the timescales to allow for buildings to be converted, staff to be trained and children and families to be prepared.

As a parent I can understand the sentiment behind the proposal. We all want our children to belong, to succeed, to flourish and be part of society. We have grieved the loss of the normal life and been on a very long journey to get to this point; which we know is far from perfect as every day remains a battle. I understand that there are children being failed by the education system due to lack of funding and I understand that the current cut throat hunger games process for an EP place is very unfair, resource heavy and entirely broken. I do however also understand that robbing Peter to pay Paul wont work. If you want to prove that this proposal will work then you should invest in the all schools, build the support and knowledge in all schools so the kids that aren't in EP get the support they need in their schools and then look to transition EP children at that stage once there is something concrete in place. One step at a time.

I hope with all my heart that whatever way this plays out that it is a success as it is my child's future that is on the line and nobody wants more for her than I do

Regards

[redacted]

My son currently attends an Enhanced Provision within Falkirk Council. He has attended here since [redacted], he was previously at his catchment ELC but we were advised that he would not be able to attend mainstream class and EP would be better for him. He has since had a diagnosis of Autism and is still largely non verbal with communication and social challenges.

We therefore applied and got given a school out with our regular catchment. He has thrived here ever since. The EP has been so good for him and has really played to his strengths, therefore helping overcome the challenges he faces. I have several questions and points I would like to raise and will give explanation of why I think this is important.

- You state in your proposal that this is “not a budget cutting proposal” – how exactly do you defend Jon Reid stating in December 2024 at the Committee Meeting “ We have other reviews underway that may deliver significant savings in the coming years. Specifically our ASN review”. Can you explain how only 10 months later you are having a consultation of EP services yet it’s not a budgetary driven?

1 – What is your plan b if this doesn’t go the way you think? Ie what if children are too overwhelmed, not thriving, behaviour decline, lack of engagement from kids, safety concerns (a lot of children with ASD need constant supervision and don’t understand danger). By this point the EP services will cease to exist. So what is the next step? Home schooling? – I brought this up at the Denny High meeting and Deborah Davidson could not answer this question. That to me shows extreme short sightedness and a serious lack of care for these children as you have not thought of a back up. There should always be contingencies in place.

2 – In your proposal and at the face to face meeting you speak of comprehensive teacher training. This is great because working with children who do have additional needs, ASD is very challenging. I have since found out from a teacher in Falkirk Council that the delivery of this training will be an online learning module. Do you really think that a few hours on a computer is sufficient training to deal with these complex children? They need one to one in person training, proper strategies and support from more SLA’s to back them up when a child needs support. This is not some mandatory data protection course you need to renew once every couple years, this is our children’s education and wellbeing.

3 – At the meeting Deborah Davidson state teachers have been consulted and their opinions matter. Yet I have heard from more than one teacher that they have been told “not to comment on the proposal”, “don’t ask questions” and if they do attend meeting “they should not contribute”. They have been threatened with their jobs. I thought teachers were the ones who are going to be implementing this so why can’t they contribute? And the fact they have been threatened with their jobs if they speak up is deplorable. This was again confirmed at a parent council meeting by a teacher (my daughters school) that teachers must remain “neutral”.

5- How will main stream non ASN children be supported? If there are multiple EP children within the class how is a teacher going to split their time? It’s hard enough for teachers with the way class sizes are just now splitting their time between 30 non ASN children. How can you ensure that the non ASN kids will not suffer? This is a worry for me as we have a daughter who is in mainstream.

6 - Concern of the long term impact . It has been proven that a children early schooling shapes them not only for high school but for further education and adulthood. If this does not work out, we face generations of children who at primary level are low achievers, struggle with basic reading & writing,

emotionally disregulated and socially inept. This results in teenagers who are not achieving, not getting apprenticeships, jobs, college or university spaces. This would undoubtedly result in adults who are unable to work or have a fulfilling career. This will then put pressures onto the social system, benefits system, NHS & health care and criminal justice system. As again it has been proven young children who are not supported and nurtured are more likely to commit crimes. How happy are you being responsible for this ? and how do you explain this to the government in the coming years?

7. House hold impact – if our children do not cope with this change, what kind of support will you be able to offer for families who's children are disregulated when they are at home? Having a child with additional needs is very hard but is made harder when your child is not getting the support and regulation they need at school. The impact on the house, siblings and other activities. My son goes to an ASN swimming class and he gets on very well within this class. If he was disregulated at school persistently that is going to affect his ability to attend this class. Why should your proposal affect his out of school activities? We had to wait a very long time to get him into an ASN class and we don't want to give this up. Learning to swim is a life skill he needs to have.

8. Lack of SFLAs's – at the meeting on 01.10.25, Kerry Drinnan admitted a lot of SLA's leave because "they can make more money in Tesco". Is that really appropriate? I mean what a thing to say to parents of ASN kids. She also stated the reason they struggle with the management of SLFA's is because a lot are on temp contracts. Can this not be resolved by giving them permanent contracts? If this proposal is to work, you need stability of the SLA support. The changes of SLA is also not good for kids they respond better to the same faces day in day out.

9. future consultation – why cant we have more meetings after you have collated all this data ? do you not think it would be beneficial to help us see what your vision is? As parents and carers i feel we have all been very vulnerable and open with our questions, yet we haven't had any transparency back. These are our children, they have names, and they are real people not just a number on your spread sheet. If you want us to support this, be honest !!

Over all I feel your proposal is lose and not well thought out. I have attended several meetings and the questions not only I myself asked but the questions of other attendees were not answered. The team just went round in circles and didn't actually answer the questions directly. This is a complete disregard for the parents and carers of the children that will be affected by this significant change.

Please consider all of the points I have brought up. I can appreciate fully that you will have a lot of correspondence from parents and carers to go through on top of the participate plus data. I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards

[redacted]

Dear Mr Wilcox,

I am writing to seek clarification regarding the Groupcall message that was sent to schools and parents about the Enhanced Provision consultation.

During a recent Parent Council meeting, you made a statement indicating that the Groupcall message dated 29th August had not worked effectively to inform all parents and support the consultation launch.

I would appreciate it if you could confirm this is the case, shed any light on the reason for the failure and indicate when the Council became aware of this problem.

Clear communication is essential to ensure meaningful participation in the consultation process, and I would be grateful for your prompt response to help clarify these issues.

Kind regards

[redacted]

Hello,

I have attended an in person consultation last week and today's online consultation. I sent an email last week but didn't receive a response. Most of my questions have now been answered through the consultations, however I still have questions regarding staffing numbers.

I have raised concerns that the redistribution of staff will not meet demand. Your reply was that funding for SFLA's are reviewed annually. My concern is that schools are already experiencing a shortage of SFLA's and are not meeting demand as it is. So how can we believe that you will meet demand under this new model?

Can you please detail how schools calculate how many SFLA's they will need? And are they always guaranteed to receive the number needed?

Please respond

[redacted]

Good evening

I would like to understand that as my child will not be moving to mainstream catchment and will reside in EP at [redacted] will EP facility close all together and therefore my [redacted] would have to attend mainstream class with the support of an SFLA ?

My][redacted] needs an ASC placement such as Ladeside but due to lack of space [redacted] is in EP. Should [redacted] be placed in mainstream with the proposal being passed I want to move [redacted] to an ASC placement.

How would I go about that? And should a space arise I was told [redacted] would be continuously assessed in [redacted] current school and should a space arise in ASC [redacted] would be eligible.

Kind regards

[redacted]

Some questions raised about changes to EP

What will building work look like in schools that already utilise all free space to make adjustments to create more space for more children and how will this disturb the school? What impact will it have on mainstream children i.e doors locked at higher levels for EP child safety?

How can children in mainstream school received same amount of teaching when EP are in class who might require more of the teachers time?

Some EP children can have out bursts how are you going to protect EP children in amongst mainstream children and how are mainstream children being protected from out burst, this will cause disruption to both which creates an unsettled environment?

Why not create/improve separate fully staffed cluster EP units/classes where EP children have maximum support and learning catered to their needs maximising their education and protecting their well being.

Kind Regards

Hi,

In your proposal you state that ' Every Falkirk primary school would embed Enhanced Additional Support Needs in their school'.

Can I ask how you propose to do this?

Will schools receive extra staff appropriate to the number of ASN pupils? As I can assure you schools do not currently have sufficient staff to support the needs of the pupils in mainstream at present - many of whom should be in an Enhanced Provision. If this is going to around staff training, there is absolutely no training you can give that will enable teaching staff to support more needs within mainstream. It is completely impossible! You will see a larger number of teachers with mental health problems, more dysregulated pupils, lowering of attainment across the board and a crippled education system...

Regards,

Dear Deborah,

Before addressing wider issues, I must highlight two points of immediate confusion which require urgent clarification (please see attached screenshots for reference):

1. Consultation Meeting Links: Parents have received emails referring to the online consultation on Thursday 25th September, but the Teams link provided stated Tuesday evening. Parents are understandably asking whether the Thursday meeting has now been cancelled. This inconsistency is causing unnecessary distress and undermines confidence in the process.
2. Contradictory Closure Dates: The Participate+ survey completion page states the consultation closes on 20th October 2025, while the statutory consultation notice issued by the Council states 27th October 2025. These are official documents, yet they provide two different dates. Parents need urgent clarification on which is correct.

Thank you for your reply to my recent email and for setting out the Council's position.

I will of course relay this information back to parents, though I must stress that I do not believe it will satisfy the anger and frustration that continues to grow. Many parents are already gathering evidence that they did not receive a Groupcall regarding this consultation. This remains a serious issue of fairness and communication which has yet to be adequately addressed.

As noted before, the Q&A sessions at consultation meetings are vital, yet the answers we have heard so far often differ from the written consultation paper. The meetings have not consistently matched the paperwork, which makes it very difficult for parents to have confidence in the process.

I believe many parents will be deeply disappointed by this update, and some are already expressing a wish to pursue legal action if the consultation is not run with full transparency and fairness. Transparency around the budget also remains one of the biggest complaints from parents. Despite repeated reassurances, families feel that financial pressures are at the heart of this proposal and that this has not been explained openly or in sufficient detail. If budget is found to be a driving factor in this consultation, then — given the way the process has been presented — parents will challenge this under the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. Any legal action pursued by our committee would be done by way of group proceedings, reflecting the collective concern of parents across Falkirk.

Further, the proposed closure date of February 2026 has already been raised as a highly contentious issue. Many parents perceive that this date has been deliberately aligned with the 2026 budget cycle and is already factored into financial planning. If that is the case, it calls into serious question whether this consultation is a genuine attempt to gather views, or simply a process to confirm a pre-determined outcome.

Parents are now actively gathering evidence of past budget-related statements made by Council representatives, which are being shared with legal teams. To progress this formally, we would appreciate being given the correct Council contact for receipt of correspondence from our legal representatives.

In addition, there is a growing view among parents to move towards a stationary protest as part of their legal right to peaceful assembly. As advised by legal counsel, it is prudent that we notify the Council in advance. Could you therefore also provide the correct Council

contact for notice of a stationary protest, as permitted under the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982.

I will, however, continue to encourage parents to share their views on the Participate+ platform, as I believe their feedback must be heard and formally recorded.

Yours sincerely,

Hi Deborah,

I'm looking forward to hearing from you or your team regarding the points I raised below. As we prepare for next week's online meetings, could you please share the transcripts for both Braes and Denny High School, along with the statement of corrections to the proposal and presentation slides, as a priority?

If possible, I would also appreciate receiving a copy of the meeting held today with the head teachers and stakeholders.

I was saddened to read the recent news about Struan School. It does raise concerns for the future of EP placements, as I worry families may increasingly feel limited to mainstream options that don't always align with parental wishes.

I've reached out to [redacted], to learn more about their specific training, budget for SFLAs and inclusion teachers, and the expected timeline for receiving funding to support nursery children who may require EP in the future.

I'd also like to highlight an opportunity to improve parent engagement with these meetings. Many parents are unaware of how to sign up, as information posted in school apps is often overlooked. I've tried sharing details on local pages, but this doesn't always reach everyone. Would it be possible to re-issue a statement asking all head teachers to send emails directly to parents? This would help ensure mainstream parents' voices are heard as well.

Lastly, regarding next week's online meeting, we haven't yet received a link. Could you kindly confirm whether this will be on Teams or Zoom, so parents can download the appropriate platform and be fully prepared? I'd also like to share the link on our platform once it's available.

I look forward to your update and to our discussion next week.

Warm regards,

Dear Kerry, Kirsty, Deborah, and Jon,

Firstly, thank you for hosting tonight's open debate and consultation. Many parents appreciated the opportunity to share their views, and it was particularly brave of those who spoke openly about their personal experiences. Please find attached questions that we have gathered from a public group of currently 306 members with the Action against Falkirk Councils Enhanced Provision Proposal.

That said, it is important to be clear that the majority of parents left the session feeling less reassured than they had hoped. The discussion raised more concerns than it resolved—particularly regarding training, funding, and the lack of clarity on how proposals would be implemented. Not one parent in the room expressed confidence in this plan, which speaks volumes.

Trust was further undermined when you admitted that elements of the consultation need to be reissued due to contradictory statements. Parents are asking: if contradictions exist now, how can they be confident that the February publication will not contain the same issues? For transparency, we request both the full transcripts of tonight's meeting and the promised presentation slides.

You emphasised that the £3.1 million budget is not linked to the £58.5 million deficit Falkirk Council is facing. However, this directly contradicts previous reports, such as the Falkirk Herald article (24 November 2024), in which it was suggested that changes to the asymmetric school week were being used to offset financial pressures in order to protect ASN services. Parents are struggling to reconcile these conflicting messages, and this inconsistency has created further mistrust.

On inclusion and integration, parents were particularly concerned that the research underpinning this proposal did not adequately consult those most affected families of children in stage three enhanced provision, or indeed families of mainstream children who share classrooms with ASN pupils. Teachers' and ASN staff views are valuable, but they cannot replace parental perspectives, especially where children are masking at school and struggling at home.

Jon, you stated that current children in enhanced provision would not be forced to move. However, as an audience member highlighted, if none of these children transfer to mainstream catchments, the £3.1 million budget and associated resources would remain tied to the 15 existing enhanced provisions. This raises a fundamental question: how will the rollout of "shadow" enhanced provision across the remaining schools be funded? With the Council already facing such a significant deficit, parents need clarity on exactly where the money will come from.

You also referred to £850,000 allocated by the Scottish Government for training and additional support staff. Parents want transparency: what is the precise allocation plan? What specific training will be delivered? What level of support will be guaranteed? Without this detail, assurances feel empty.

It was also troubling to hear the claim that 58% of stage three learners in mainstream are currently having their needs met. That is not the lived reality of many parents. A thorough survey of parents—not just teachers—must be undertaken to assess whether needs are genuinely being met, academically and socially. Equally, mainstream parents deserve to be consulted about whether their children's learning is being disrupted by a lack of resources.

Another area of deep concern is the safeguarding of children in mainstream settings. Parents of ASN pupils fear their children will be placed in classrooms without adequate support, while parents of non-ASN pupils are worried about classroom safety and disruption. Both perspectives are valid, and neither is being adequately addressed under the current proposal. Deborah, as mentioned, could you please provide more specific details of the roll out plan for moving Stage 4 pupils into Carronrange by 2027. You mentioned this will support capacity to make space for break out spaces and hives, but what about schools that don't have a Thistle wing etc? Where will the funding come from to make space for those spaces?

There was also discussion around the Council's wider school estate review and the replacement of outdated, inefficient buildings. Could you provide the most recent update on this review, as well as the measures being taken to create further savings? Alongside this, parents request a clear breakdown of Falkirk Council's budget: if 70% is allocated to education and social care, what proportion is specifically ring-fenced for education?

Kirsty, you mentioned that one-to-one, full-time SFLA support requires a "medical need." Could you please provide the exact criteria for this classification, so that parents understand what qualifies? Too often, we see SFLAs spread too thinly across multiple children, leaving both pupils and teachers unsupported in the current mainstream setting.

In addition, we ask for further data on ASN reviews, including evidence from headteachers, pupils, and families. You also referenced the creation of safe playgrounds with fencing—please provide details of which schools have received these adjustments, the safeguarding rationale, and the budget allocated for each.

Parents also noted that 23 schools last year made no enhanced provision placements, despite repeated reports that places are increasingly difficult to secure without legal escalation. This leaves families feeling they must "fight" for basic educational support to get an EP placement, and many will simply give up in exhaustion as their child is not the most at need. An ASN parent survey, led directly by families, would be a meaningful step to measure outcomes more accurately.

Finally, on staffing and training: while case studies from St Margaret's and another school are in the report, these represent only two examples. This is not sufficient evidence to reassure parents across Falkirk. Parents also noted that neither the EIS nor teachers themselves support the proposal as it stands, raising further concerns about capacity and delivery.

In summary, tonight's meeting revealed:

- A serious lack of parental reassurance.
- Confusion and contradiction around funding sources.
- Insufficient consultation with parents directly affected.
- Ongoing mistrust due to unclear and conflicting information.
- Widespread anger that children's needs will not be met under the current plan.

Parents are united in asking for clarity, transparency, and above all, adequate funding to meet every child's needs. Without this, the proposal will only deepen distrust and risk failing the very children it is supposed to serve.

I look forward to your detailed response on the questions and data requested above, which I will share with the parent action group.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Dear Mr Reid,

Thank you for your reply and for providing further detail on Falkirk Council's position. While I recognise the intention of this consultation, there remain significant legal, financial, and practical concerns which have not been adequately addressed.

Consultation Process and Accessibility

Parents request full clarity on who is attending the consultation meetings. Please confirm:

- Which senior staff members (by name and position) will be present at each meeting.
- Whether sound equipment (microphone, speakers) will be set up to ensure parents' questions and concerns are clearly audible and recorded accurately.
- Whether the full transcripts of meetings will also be shared directly with parents. I would be grateful if these could be emailed to me at [\[redacted\]](#) so that I can distribute them to other parents who are unable to attend.

Transparency is essential if parents are to have confidence in this process.

Statutory Rights of Children

Under the **Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000**, every child has the right to an education "directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential" (Section 2). The **Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act 2004**, reinforced in 2009, requires local authorities to identify and provide the additional support needs of each child and to review provision regularly.

The **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (Articles 23, 28 and 29)**, which the Scottish Parliament is incorporating into domestic law, obliges authorities to provide inclusive education in a safe environment, with the resources and staffing to ensure every child can thrive. These are not optional aspirations; they are legal duties.

Funding Reality

You have stated that "resources will follow pupils," but the reality is that many schools are already struggling to provide even current levels of support. Parents and teachers are witnessing cuts in practice, despite reassurances of "protected" budgets.

The Council's own budget and performance reports show an estimated funding gap of £58.5

million over the next five years. In this financial context, parents cannot accept verbal assurances that Enhanced Provision budgets will remain untouched. We ask:

- Who is accountable for these financial shortfalls?
- What legal safeguards will prevent ASN funding from being diluted to plug wider gaps?

Capacity Concerns at Kinnaird

You note that Kinnaird Primary is operating at 88% capacity. If that is the case, then please explain:

- Why children cannot mix with peers in other year groups due to staggered breaks and lunches.
- Why families face a **four-year waiting list** for the after-school care provider Go Kids, and the council rental increases are unreasonable.
- Why we have classrooms in the playground in cold portacabins, a newly build Early Learning Centre nursery to ease pressure, and a recent school extension, yet we apparently have additional space for an increased number of required nurture rooms and nappy changing facilities.

These are not theoretical issues. They show the day-to-day reality of a school under extreme pressure and teachers soon to become even more overwhelmed with incident paperwork. These parents can not simply come and pickup their child from school, it is the duty of the school to teach them and have the resources to cope when incidents occur.

Safeguarding and Equity of Support

You highlight that one-to-one support is only in exceptional circumstances. Yet in my own community, my neighbour's P2 child was granted exceptional one-to-one support across all primary years, only to have it withdrawn at the end of P1, forcing the family to pursue legal action to secure their child's rights. Why should access to support depend on which parents have the resources, confidence, or time to "fight loudest"? That is neither fair nor lawful. When resources are split between children, when a child kicks off *out with* their "allocated time," it falls to the teacher and the detriment of our kids mainstream learning.

Meanwhile, my own child — who is academically thriving but has high-functioning autism and reduced social awareness — has been hit repeatedly in the playground. The school does not have the playground staffing capacity to manage this consistently. At home, we can afford a one-to-one tutor, but not all families are in this position. I have received **no updates or input from Speech and Language Therapy** attached to the school, despite it being a vital part of his social support plan. Teachers are overstretched by paperwork, compliance requirements, and teaching demands, leaving them unable to provide parents with timely updates. They cannot challenge the system as they are expected to remain neutral.

This is the reality for families: overstretched staff, insufficient expertise, and children at risk.

Removal of ERG Oversight

You state that the ERG will no longer be required for Stage 3, as support would be “embedded” in all schools. Can you please explain in **practical terms**:

- How consistency of decision-making will be guaranteed across 47 primaries.
- What happens if a child’s promised one-to-one support is withdrawn.
- How additional Stage 3 pupils requiring support will be funded if resources are already at full stretch.

Without clear answers, parents cannot accept the removal of this layer of oversight. The **2009 amendments to the Additional Support for Learning Act** strengthened parental rights of appeal for precisely this reason: to avoid inconsistency, unfairness, and erosion of children’s entitlements.

Trust and Accountability

While the consultation is statutory, families cannot ignore Falkirk Council’s wider financial crisis and governance challenges, we all feel the 15.61% council tax increase and the highest increase in Scotland. Parents are angry because we are being asked to place trust in a system that is already failing to deliver consistent provision.

Conclusion

In theory, the proposal may aspire to deliver equity. In practice, the current reality in Falkirk schools — waiting lists, withdrawn support, overstretched teachers, and children left vulnerable — demonstrates that the system is not working even at present levels.

We therefore request that Falkirk Council:

- Publish a **school-by-school breakdown** of how the £3.1m will be distributed.
- Guarantee in writing that ASN budgets will be ringfenced and legally protected from the wider £58.5m budget gap.
- Clarify the **appeals and complaints route** for Stage 3 decisions post-ERG.
- Provide transparent evidence of how safeguarding will be upheld in mainstream settings.

Until these assurances are delivered in a binding and transparent way, parents cannot support this proposal.

If Falkirk council decide to remove the separate provision, we will be challenging the decision by a complaint to the [SPSO](#) and then by judicial review in the Court of Session, due to breach of statutory duty under the 2004 Act, or equality laws.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Jon Reid, Kerry Drinnan and Kirsty Ferguson

Thank you for taking the time to talk through the proposal at the recent executive meeting [here](#). As a parent of a child in a mainstream Primary [redacted] class, I would like to raise the following points and kindly ask for your response and clarification.

Teachers in mainstream classrooms are already working under significant pressure, and while additional training is welcome, it will not, on its own, be sufficient—additional people and resources will be required. Parents are eager to understand how this will be addressed in practice.

It is important that this consultation process is transparent and inclusive. In the previous exercise two years ago, opportunities to ask questions were limited, which was very frustrating for families. Could you please confirm whether you will both attend every in-person and online public meeting, and whether these sessions will be recorded for accountability and accurate minute transcripts?

At the Executive meeting on 21st August, Jon, you were noted in the minutes as saying:

“The overall occupancy across our primary schools ... around 60%, so the vast majority of schools have spaces where you can use breakout spaces or nurture spaces or small group spaces. Even in schools where there are high occupancies, there are other spaces they have been able to utilise and use. We would absolutely make sure that schools are supported to implement whatever it is they need to do.”

Could you please provide further detail on how the 60% capacity figure was calculated? For example, at Kinnaird Primary the school is operating beyond capacity, with five portacabins, split breaks and lunches, and no obvious additional spaces available. Families are also concerned that children at Stage 3 mainstream are already experiencing reduced one-to-one support due to funding constraints. This £3.1m funding is meant to support the complex stage 3 children currently in EP. How will schools like Kinnaird receive specific and sufficient funding to ensure they can meet the additional needs of current, future pupils and not need to dip into their PEF funding for creative resourcing.

Parents have also raised serious safeguarding concerns. In other regions (though not Falkirk), there have been incidents where children with significant needs were placed in mainstream without the appropriate level of support, which led to easy overstimulation, expressions through physical behaviour such as biting and sexual abuse. Could you clarify how Falkirk Council will ensure that staff training and supervision are robust enough to protect all children, and that the safety and wellbeing of pupils with ASN and their peers are not compromised?

Linked to this, how will the needs of children who may require personal care (e.g., nappy changing) or who are easily overstimulated and may display physical behaviours, be managed in mainstream settings without disrupting the education of other children? Families strongly believe that all children—both ASN and mainstream—deserve the right level of support, including input from Educational Psychologists and trained support staff.

The ERG previously provided oversight and consistency in ASN placements. Could you explain why it is being removed, what process will replace it, and what the appeals process will look like for parents who disagree with decisions?

Stage 4 provision is already underfunded, and in some cases pupils who should be in Stage 4 are being placed at Stage 3 instead. What provision will exist for children who do not meet the criteria for mainstream placement?

Has Falkirk Council already received the £850K government allocation for ASN support, and if so, how has this been allocated across schools?

In addition, could you clarify:

- The impact that the removal of charity status has had on private SEN schools in the council area, and how Falkirk is supporting families who can no longer afford private fees.
- How the council plans to support children with complex needs who struggle in busy, overstimulating environments.
- What specific resources, training, and physical spaces will be provided to each of the 47 primary schools to meet the increased needs.

Finally, I would like to highlight a communication issue. Many parents did not receive information in time to register for the first public meeting, as the details were only circulated 24 hours before. This left families feeling excluded from the process. While I appreciate unforeseen circumstances may occur, could you confirm what measures will be put in place to ensure that all parents receive timely communication going forward?

Parents and carers remain committed to working constructively with Falkirk Council to ensure the best outcomes for all children. We would greatly appreciate a clear response to the above points, as many of us have further questions that we would like to raise with you in person.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Best regards,

Good morning,

I attended the consultation meeting at Denny High School last night and don't believe anyone left with any clarity to your proposal. I have some questions that I would like an answer to.

1. Considering the proposed plan to establish an Enhanced Provision Unit (EPU) in every school, what specific measures will be implemented to ensure adequate staffing levels? Given the existing and rising demand for Additional Support Needs (ASN) provision, a redistribution of current staff will not be sufficient. Could you clarify how this new model will avoid creating a shortage of Support for Learning Assistants (SFLAs) in mainstream classrooms and instead guarantee that all students, both within and outside the EPU, receive the necessary support?
2. Will the criteria for different stages of intervention be revised under this new model? There is a concern that any change in criteria could inadvertently create barriers to accessing the appropriate level of support, potentially resulting in students being placed in mainstream classrooms who would be better served by enhanced provision. How will the council ensure that the criteria remain focused on meeting the individual needs of each child?
3. The issue of teacher burnout and its impact on staff well-being and student learning is a significant concern across the profession. What specific strategies does the council plan to implement to address the current high levels of teacher stress and excessive workload? How will this new initiative be introduced in a way that avoids placing additional strain on an already over-burdened teaching staff?
4. Considering the space constraints in many of our schools, what specific plans does the council have to create the physical space required for the proposed Enhanced Provision Units?
5. Parents have expressed significant concern regarding the proposed 'train-the-trainer' model for specialized staff training. Can the council provide a more detailed plan outlining how it will ensure teachers and support staff receive the comprehensive, specialized training required to effectively support students with additional needs? Recognizing that specialized training is crucial for the success of these new units, can the council elaborate on its strategy for delivering comprehensive professional development that goes beyond a single in-service day to all relevant staff?
6. My final question is more personal to my own family's circumstances but will also be relative to many of our families within the council area. [redacted].

So with the increasing number of children with ASN entering mainstream primary education, what specific assurances can the council provide that individual pupils will receive the necessary support to thrive, even in classrooms with a high number of children who require additional help?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your response.

Hi Jon, Kerry, Kirsty and Deborah

As requested, please prioritise providing the *full transcripts of the meeting* and the *presentation slides* by COB today to ensure we have an update prior to tonight's public meeting.

Parent Action Group – Follow-up Requests Request Responsible

		Notes / Deadline
Provide full transcripts of the meeting	All	Transparency
Share presentation slides	All	Transparency
Clarify how “shadow” EP rollout will be funded if current pupils remain in existing EPs	Jon	Budget clarity
Provide detailed allocation of £850k Scottish Gov. funding (training, support, guarantees)	Jon	Funding transparency
Explain funding for breakout spaces/hives in schools without Stage 4 Thistle wing spaces	Deborah	Linked to Stage 4 rollout
Provide exact criteria for one-to-one SFLA support under “medical need”	Kirsty	Parents need clarity
Share safeguarding details: schools with fenced playgrounds, rationale, budget	Kirsty	Safety concerns
Supply parental evidence on whether Stage 3 needs are being met (not just teachers)	All	Parent-led survey requested
Provide further ASN review data incl. headteachers, pupils, families	All	Broader evidence
Confirm which 23 schools made no EP placements last year & reasons	All	Access to placements
Provide more case studies beyond St Margaret’s & TP	All	Evidence base
Explain how contradictions in consultation will be avoided in Feb. publication	All	Trust issue
Confirm how parental perspectives will be directly included in consultation	All	Inclusion issue
Update on wider school estate review & planned savings	Deborah	Linked to capacity/funding
Provide rollout plan for moving Stage 4 pupils into Carrongrange by 2027	Deborah	Capacity planning
Provide clear budget breakdown: if 70% = education & social care, Deborah what proportion is ring-fenced for education		Budget transparency

Best regards,

Dear Kerry, Kirsty, Deborah, and Jon,

Firstly, thank you for hosting tonight's open debate and consultation. Many parents appreciated the opportunity to share their views, and it was particularly brave of those who spoke openly about their personal experiences. Please find attached questions that we have gathered from a public group of currently 306 members with the Action against Falkirk Councils Enhanced Provision Proposal.

That said, it is important to be clear that the majority of parents left the session feeling less reassured than they had hoped. The discussion raised more concerns than it resolved—particularly regarding training, funding, and the lack of clarity on how proposals would be implemented. Not one parent in the room expressed confidence in this plan, which speaks volumes.

Trust was further undermined when you admitted that elements of the consultation need to be reissued due to contradictory statements. Parents are asking: if contradictions exist now, how can they be confident that the February publication will not contain the same issues? For transparency, we request both the full transcripts of tonight's meeting and the promised presentation slides.

You emphasised that the £3.1 million budget is not linked to the £58.5 million deficit Falkirk Council is facing. However, this directly contradicts previous reports, such as the Falkirk Herald article (24 November 2024), in which it was suggested that changes to the asymmetric school week were being used to offset financial pressures in order to protect ASN services. Parents are struggling to reconcile these conflicting messages, and this inconsistency has created further mistrust.

On inclusion and integration, parents were particularly concerned that the research underpinning this proposal did not adequately consult those most affected families of children in stage three enhanced provision, or indeed families of mainstream children who share classrooms with ASN pupils. Teachers' and ASN staff views are valuable, but they cannot replace parental perspectives, especially where children are masking at school and struggling at home.

Jon, you stated that current children in enhanced provision would not be forced to move. However, as an audience member highlighted, if none of these children transfer to mainstream catchments, the £3.1 million budget and associated resources would remain tied to the 15 existing enhanced provisions. This raises a fundamental question: how will the rollout of "shadow" enhanced provision across the remaining schools be funded? With the Council already facing such a significant deficit, parents need clarity on exactly where the money will come from.

You also referred to £850,000 allocated by the Scottish Government for training and additional support staff. Parents want transparency: what is the precise allocation plan? What specific training will be delivered? What level of support will be guaranteed? Without this detail, assurances feel empty.

It was also troubling to hear the claim that 58% of stage three learners in mainstream are currently having their needs met. That is not the lived reality of many parents. A thorough survey of parents—not just teachers—must be undertaken to assess whether needs are genuinely being met, academically and socially. Equally, mainstream parents deserve to be consulted about whether their children's learning is being disrupted by a lack of resources.

Another area of deep concern is the safeguarding of children in mainstream settings. Parents of ASN pupils fear their children will be placed in classrooms without adequate support, while parents of non-ASN pupils are worried about classroom safety and disruption. Both perspectives are valid, and neither is being adequately addressed under the current proposal. Deborah, as mentioned, could you please provide more specific details of the roll out plan for moving Stage 4 pupils into Carronrange by 2027. You mentioned this will support capacity to make space for break out spaces and hives, but what about schools that don't have a Thistle wing etc? Where will the funding come from to make space for those spaces?

There was also discussion around the Council's wider school estate review and the replacement of outdated, inefficient buildings. Could you provide the most recent update on this review, as well as the measures being taken to create further savings? Alongside this, parents request a clear breakdown of Falkirk Council's budget: if 70% is allocated to education and social care, what proportion is specifically ring-fenced for education?

Kirsty, you mentioned that one-to-one, full-time SFLA support requires a "medical need." Could you please provide the exact criteria for this classification, so that parents understand what qualifies? Too often, we see SFLAs spread too thinly across multiple children, leaving both pupils and teachers unsupported in the current mainstream setting.

In addition, we ask for further data on ASN reviews, including evidence from headteachers, pupils, and families. You also referenced the creation of safe playgrounds with fencing—please provide details of which schools have received these adjustments, the safeguarding rationale, and the budget allocated for each.

Parents also noted that 23 schools last year made no enhanced provision placements, despite repeated reports that places are increasingly difficult to secure without legal escalation. This leaves families feeling they must "fight" for basic educational support to get an EP placement, and many will simply give up in exhaustion as their child is not the most at need. An ASN parent survey, led directly by families, would be a meaningful step to measure outcomes more accurately.

Finally, on staffing and training: while case studies from St Margaret's and another school are in the report, these represent only two examples. This is not sufficient evidence to reassure parents across Falkirk. Parents also noted that neither the EIS nor teachers themselves support the proposal as it stands, raising further concerns about capacity and delivery.

In summary, tonight's meeting revealed:

- A serious lack of parental reassurance.
- Confusion and contradiction around funding sources.
- Insufficient consultation with parents directly affected.
- Ongoing mistrust due to unclear and conflicting information.
- Widespread anger that children's needs will not be met under the current plan.

Parents are united in asking for clarity, transparency, and above all, adequate funding to meet every child's needs. Without this, the proposal will only deepen distrust and risk failing the very children it is supposed to serve.

I look forward to your detailed response on the questions and data requested above, which I will share with the parent action group.

Dear Mr Reid,

Thank you for your reply and for providing further detail on Falkirk Council's position. While I recognise the intention of this consultation, there remain significant legal, financial, and practical concerns which have not been adequately addressed.

Consultation Process and Accessibility

Parents request full clarity on who is attending the consultation meetings. Please confirm:

- Which senior staff members (by name and position) will be present at each meeting.
- Whether sound equipment (microphone, speakers) will be set up to ensure parents' questions and concerns are clearly audible and recorded accurately.
- Whether the full transcripts of meetings will also be shared directly with parents. I would be grateful if these could be emailed to me at **victoria.pope@thermofisher.com** so that I can distribute them to other parents who are unable to attend.

Transparency is essential if parents are to have confidence in this process.

Statutory Rights of Children

Under the **Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000**, every child has the right to an education "directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential" (Section 2). The **Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act 2004**, reinforced in 2009, requires local authorities to identify and provide the additional support needs of each child and to review provision regularly.

The **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (Articles 23, 28 and 29)**, which the Scottish Parliament is incorporating into domestic law, obliges authorities to provide inclusive education in a safe environment, with the resources and staffing to ensure every child can thrive. These are not optional aspirations; they are legal duties.

Funding Reality

You have stated that "resources will follow pupils," but the reality is that many schools are already struggling to provide even current levels of support. Parents and teachers are witnessing cuts in practice, despite reassurances of "protected" budgets.

The Council's own **budget and performance reports show an estimated funding gap of £58.5 million over the next five years**. In this financial context, parents cannot accept verbal assurances that Enhanced Provision budgets will remain untouched. We ask:

- Who is accountable for these financial shortfalls?
- What legal safeguards will prevent ASN funding from being diluted to plug wider gaps?

Capacity Concerns at Kinnaird

You note that Kinnaird Primary is operating at 88% capacity. If that is the case, then please explain:

- Why children cannot mix with peers in other year groups due to staggered breaks and lunches.
- Why families face a **four-year waiting list** for the after-school care provider Go Kids, and the council rental increases are unreasonable.
- Why we have classrooms in the playground in cold portacabins, a newly build Early Learning Centre nursery to easy pressure, and a recent school extension, yet we apparently have additional space for an increased number of required nurture rooms and nappy changing facilities.

These are not theoretical issues. They show the day-to-day reality of a school under extreme pressure and teachers soon to become even more overwhelmed with incident paperwork. These parents can not simply come and pickup their child from school, it is the duty of the school to teach them and have the resources to cope when incidents occur.

Safeguarding and Equity of Support

You highlight that one-to-one support is only in exceptional circumstances. Yet in my own community, my neighbour's P2 child was granted exceptional one-to-one support across all primary years, only to have it withdrawn at the end of P1, forcing the family to pursue legal action to secure their child's rights. Why should access to support depend on which parents have the resources, confidence, or time to "fight loudest"? That is neither fair nor lawful. When resources are split between children, when a child kicks off *out with* their "allocated time," it falls to the teacher and the detriment of our kids mainstream learning.

Meanwhile, my own child — who is academically thriving but has high-functioning autism and reduced social awareness — has been hit repeatedly in the playground. The school does not have the playground staffing capacity to manage this consistently. At home, we can afford a one-to-one tutor, but not all families are in this position. I have received **no updates or input from Speech and Language Therapy** attached to the school, despite it being a vital part of his social support plan. Teachers are overstretched by paperwork, compliance requirements, and teaching demands, leaving them unable to provide parents with timely updates. They cannot challenge the system as they are expected to remain neutral.

This is the reality for families: overstretched staff, insufficient expertise, and children at risk.

Removal of ERG Oversight

You state that the ERG will no longer be required for Stage 3, as support would be "embedded" in all schools. Can you please explain in **practical terms**:

- How consistency of decision-making will be guaranteed across 47 primaries.
- What happens if a child's promised one-to-one support is withdrawn.
- How additional Stage 3 pupils requiring support will be funded if resources are already at full stretch.

Without clear answers, parents cannot accept the removal of this layer of oversight. The **2009 amendments to the Additional Support for Learning Act** strengthened parental rights of appeal for precisely this reason: to avoid inconsistency, unfairness, and erosion of children's entitlements.

Trust and Accountability

While the consultation is statutory, families cannot ignore Falkirk Council's wider financial crisis and governance challenges, we all feel the 15.61% council tax increase and the highest increase in Scotland. Parents are angry because we are being asked to place trust in a system that is already failing to deliver consistent provision.

Conclusion

In theory, the proposal may aspire to deliver equity. In practice, the current reality in Falkirk schools — waiting lists, withdrawn support, overstretched teachers, and children left vulnerable — demonstrates that the system is not working even at present levels.

We therefore request that Falkirk Council:

- Publish a **school-by-school breakdown** of how the £3.1m will be distributed.
- Guarantee in writing that ASN budgets will be ringfenced and legally protected from the wider £58.5m budget gap.
- Clarify the **appeals and complaints route** for Stage 3 decisions post-ERG.
- Provide transparent evidence of how safeguarding will be upheld in mainstream settings.

Until these assurances are delivered in a binding and transparent way, parents cannot support this proposal.

If Falkirk council decide to remove the separate provision, we will be challenging the decision by a complaint to the [SPSO](#) and then by judicial review in the Court of Session, due to breach of statutory duty under the 2004 Act, or equality laws.

Dear Jon Reid, Kerry Drinnan and Kirsty Ferguson

Thank you for taking the time to talk through the proposal at the recent executive meeting [here](#). As a parent of a child in a mainstream Primary [redacted] class, I would like to raise the following points and kindly ask for your response and clarification.

Teachers in mainstream classrooms are already working under significant pressure, and while additional training is welcome, it will not, on its own, be sufficient—additional people and resources will be required. Parents are eager to understand how this will be addressed in practice.

It is important that this consultation process is transparent and inclusive. In the previous exercise two years ago, opportunities to ask questions were limited, which was very frustrating for families. Could you please confirm whether you will both attend every in-person and online public meeting, and whether these sessions will be recorded for accountability and accurate minute transcripts?

At the Executive meeting on 21st August, Jon, you were noted in the minutes as saying:

“The overall occupancy across our primary schools ... around 60%, so the vast majority of schools have spaces where you can use breakout spaces or nurture spaces or small group spaces. Even in schools where there are high occupancies, there are other spaces they have been able to utilise and use. We would absolutely make sure that schools are supported to implement whatever it is they need to do.”

Could you please provide further detail on how the 60% capacity figure was calculated? For example, at Kinnaird Primary the school is operating beyond capacity, with five portacabins, split breaks and lunches, and no obvious additional spaces available. Families are also concerned that children at Stage 3 mainstream are already experiencing reduced one-to-one support due to funding constraints. This £3.1m funding is meant to support the complex stage 3 children currently in EP. How will schools like Kinnaird receive specific and sufficient funding to ensure they can meet the additional needs of current, future pupils and not need to dip into their PEF funding for creative resourcing.

Parents have also raised serious safeguarding concerns. In other regions (though not Falkirk), there have been incidents where children with significant needs were placed in mainstream without the appropriate level of support, which led to easy overstimulation, expressions through physical behaviour such as biting and sexual abuse. Could you clarify how Falkirk Council will ensure that staff training and supervision are robust enough to protect all children, and that the safety and wellbeing of pupils with ASN and their peers are not compromised?

Linked to this, how will the needs of children who may require personal care (e.g., nappy changing) or who are easily overstimulated and may display physical behaviours, be managed in mainstream settings without disrupting the education of other children? Families strongly believe that all children —both ASN and mainstream—deserve the right level of support, including input from Educational Psychologists and trained support staff.

The ERG previously provided oversight and consistency in ASN placements. Could you explain why it is being removed, what process will replace it, and what the appeals process will look like for parents who disagree with decisions?

Stage 4 provision is already underfunded, and in some cases pupils who should be in Stage 4 are being placed at Stage 3 instead. What provision will exist for children who do not meet the criteria for mainstream placement?

Has Falkirk Council already received the £850K government allocation for ASN support, and if so, how has this been allocated across schools?

In addition, could you clarify:

- The impact that the removal of charity status has had on private SEN schools in the council area, and how Falkirk is supporting families who can no longer afford private fees.
- How the council plans to support children with complex needs who struggle in busy, overstimulating environments.
- What specific resources, training, and physical spaces will be provided to each of the 47 primary schools to meet the increased needs.

Finally, I would like to highlight a communication issue. Many parents did not receive information in time to register for the first public meeting, as the details were only circulated 24 hours before. This left families feeling excluded from the process. While I appreciate unforeseen circumstances may occur, could you confirm what measures will be put in place to ensure that all parents receive timely communication going forward?

Parents and carers remain committed to working constructively with Falkirk Council to ensure the best outcomes for all children. We would greatly appreciate a clear response to the above points, as many of us have further questions that we would like to raise with you in person.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Best regards,

[redacted]

Good morning,

I have a few questions regarding the current EP proposal so that I can fully understand what is being suggested before I complete the questionnaire.

1. What are the definitions of Stages 1-4 used in the document? I'm not familiar with this area of education and do not know what these terms refer to.
2. How many teachers currently in the 15 EP units will be redeployed to primary schools?
3. How many teachers will be left at these 15 EP units, as presumably they will make up part of the new 47 unit provision?
4. What is the expected time frame for completing the continuous professional development required for existing primary teachers to be able to facilitate EP within their schools?
5. Will all schools be required to offer EP immediately or will schools be added in phases with the 15 EP remaining but with reducing capacity until the remodelling is achieved?
6. What will happen to the children requiring EP but whose catchment school does not have the facilities or capacity to accommodate them. Will they still be able to make a placing request to a more suitable school?

Many thanks for your time in responding to these questions.

Dear Jon Reid, Kerry Drinnan and Kirsty Ferguson

Thank you for taking the time to talk through the proposal at the recent executive meeting [here](#). As a parent of a child in a mainstream Primary [redacted] class, I would like to raise the following points and kindly ask for your response and clarification.

Teachers in mainstream classrooms are already working under significant pressure, and while additional training is welcome, it will not, on its own, be sufficient—additional people and resources will be required. Parents are eager to understand how this will be addressed in practice.

It is important that this consultation process is transparent and inclusive. In the previous exercise two years ago, opportunities to ask questions were limited, which was very frustrating for families. Could you please confirm whether you will both attend every in-person and online public meeting, and whether these sessions will be recorded for accountability and accurate minute transcripts?

At the Executive meeting on 21st August, Jon, you were noted in the minutes as saying:

“The overall occupancy across our primary schools ... around 60%, so the vast majority of schools have spaces where you can use breakout spaces or nurture spaces or small group spaces. Even in schools where there are high occupancies, there are other spaces they have been able to utilise and use. We would absolutely make sure that schools are supported to implement whatever it is they need to do.”

Could you please provide further detail on how the 60% capacity figure was calculated? For example, at Kinnaird Primary the school is operating beyond capacity, with five portacabins, split breaks and lunches, and no obvious additional spaces available. Families are also concerned that children at Stage 3 mainstream are already experiencing reduced one-to-one support due to funding constraints. This £3.1m funding is meant to support the complex stage 3 children currently in EP. How will schools like Kinnaird receive specific and sufficient funding to ensure they can meet the additional needs of current, future pupils and not need to dip into their PEF funding for creative resourcing.

Parents have also raised serious safeguarding concerns. In other regions (though not Falkirk), there have been incidents where children with significant needs were placed in mainstream without the appropriate level of support, which led to easy overstimulation, expressions through physical behaviour such as biting and sexual abuse. Could you clarify how Falkirk Council will ensure that staff training and supervision are robust enough to protect all children, and that the safety and wellbeing of pupils with ASN and their peers are not compromised?

Linked to this, how will the needs of children who may require personal care (e.g., nappy changing) or who are easily overstimulated and may display physical behaviours, be managed in mainstream settings without disrupting the education of other children? Families strongly believe that all children —both ASN and mainstream—deserve the right level of support, including input from Educational Psychologists and trained support staff.

The ERG previously provided oversight and consistency in ASN placements. Could you explain why it is being removed, what process will replace it, and what the appeals process will look like for parents who disagree with decisions?

Stage 4 provision is already underfunded, and in some cases pupils who should be in Stage 4 are being placed at Stage 3 instead. What provision will exist for children who do not meet the criteria for mainstream placement?

Has Falkirk Council already received the £850K government allocation for ASN support, and if so, how has this been allocated across schools?

In addition, could you clarify:

- The impact that the removal of charity status has had on private SEN schools in the council area, and how Falkirk is supporting families who can no longer afford private fees.
- How the council plans to support children with complex needs who struggle in busy, overstimulating environments.
- What specific resources, training, and physical spaces will be provided to each of the 47 primary schools to meet the increased needs.

Finally, I would like to highlight a communication issue. Many parents did not receive information in time to register for the first public meeting, as the details were only circulated 24 hours before. This left families feeling excluded from the process. While I appreciate unforeseen circumstances may occur, could you confirm what measures will be put in place to ensure that all parents receive timely communication going forward?

Parents and carers remain committed to working constructively with Falkirk Council to ensure the best outcomes for all children. We would greatly appreciate a clear response to the above points, as many of us have further questions that we would like to raise with you in person.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Dear Kerry Drinnan/education services

Please find a list of questions for yourselves in relation to the proposed EPU changes. I currently have two children at Stenhousemuir enhanced provision unit.

1. What is the proposal for when children meet the exceptions for the presumption of mainstream? Where will they attend?
2. How will you manage to support my children who struggle to access the loud and busy mainstream school setting?
3. Does moving my children not disrupt the continuity of their education?
4. What will the support look like for unstructured times like break and lunch?
5. What are the specifics of the additional support being made available to headteachers to meet the new level of need within each school?
6. When you placed my son, [redacted], in the EPU did you know that you were going to be making this proposal and sending our children back to mainstream schools with redistributed epu funds? Two years ago you told me there will no longer be enhanced provisions as it was changing. This is a reason you rejected my sons application. However you then overturned the decision when I started the tribunal process. How can you reconcile this? This will cause a huge impact on his mental health given the reasons he was allocated a place in the EPU to begin with!

I look forward to your response which I'm sure will be in a timely manner.

I am writing in relation to the current consultation on the proposal to restructure Enhanced Provision within Falkirk Council primary schools.

I note from the Proposal Paper that a series of public meetings are planned between September and October 2025. I would be grateful if you could confirm whether parents / carers will have the opportunity to ask questions directly at these meetings, and whether these questions will be formally recorded as part of the consultation process.

As this is a matter of significant importance to many families, it is essential that the consultation process is open, transparent, and fully inclusive. I would therefore also appreciate clarification on how questions raised at these meetings will be documented, and how they will be reflected in the final consultation report presented to the Council.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response.

I am writing as I was to start with I was not informed as a ep parent anything was even considered to change.

Also I want to know why Falkirk council think they can just fail my child and others?.

Why they think they can just put every child into one category?

Why they think disrupting every child's education within Falkirk council schools is even a good idea?

{redacted} I want a straight answer to how Falkirk council thinks they can individually support him one to one in mainstream?

Because my sons school can't even answer that as they know themselves he couldn't be supported mainstream.

Are Falkirk council just going to want to get rid of our asn children? As that's what this looks like from every point of view from this information.

I work for Falkirk council currently in Education services and me as a worker and parent are even more concerned I am possibly having to leave my job as are other teaching and support staff to care for their child's education cause Falkirk council won't.

Are Falkirk council going to support parents that need to pull kids with additional support needs from school when they remove Epu's or fail the kids?

If yourself or someone within education services could answer my questions in person or via email that would be very much appreciated as I am a parent literally at my lowest point as there seems to be absolutely no confidence in the education system within Falkirk council at this point after receiving this information.

Dear Kerry / Additional Support Services,

I am writing regarding the forthcoming public consultation on the restructuring of Enhanced Provision within Falkirk schools.

Under Section 4(1) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, Falkirk Council is required to hold a public meeting on the proposal during the consultation period. The accompanying statutory guidance makes clear that the purpose of this meeting is to provide consultees with a genuine opportunity to participate in the process, which includes raising questions and having their views recorded.

Given this, I would be grateful if you could confirm:

That members of the public will be permitted to ask questions at the consultation meetings, both in-person and online.

That all questions and comments raised will be formally noted and included in the final consultation report, as required by the Act.

The process Falkirk Council will use to ensure that responses and questions are conscientiously considered before any final decision is made.

The legislation and guidance are clear that consultation must be meaningful, not a “tick-box exercise.” Ensuring consultees have the opportunity to ask questions, and see them fairly recorded, is essential to meeting both the letter and the spirit of the Act.

I would appreciate your confirmation on these points at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Good evening,

I am writing in relation to the proposed changes to Enhanced Provision (EP), which will directly and negatively impact my son. He is currently a Primary 2 pupil attending school within an Enhanced Provision Unit (EPU).

At present, there are 15 primary schools in Falkirk offering enhanced provision. These settings are already significantly understaffed and under-resourced. The proposal to extend these limited resources across 47 schools, when they are already stretched to breaking point, does not seem practical or sustainable.

The plan also suggests returning children to their catchment schools and placing them back into mainstream classes. However, children are placed in enhanced provision because they are unable to cope in mainstream settings—whether academically, socially, or for their own health and safety. Removing them from environments where they have established trust and meaningful relationships with staff would be deeply detrimental.

I strongly urge you to spend time within each of the current 15 EPU classes to gain a genuine understanding of the children's needs and the support required. Parents like myself need to know how such children could realistically be supported in mainstream classes. Furthermore, as a mother of children also in mainstream education, I seek reassurance that my other children's learning will not be disrupted when classmates require additional space and time to regulate.

When I went through the application process for my son's place in enhanced provision last year, I was informed that once a child secured a placement, it would remain in place until Primary 7. It is concerning to now learn that, at the time, there were already plans underway to bring forward this proposal—meaning that the information provided to parents was misleading.

This proposal is fundamentally flawed. While I appreciate the council must look for ways to reduce costs, this should never come at the expense of our most vulnerable children.

Good Afternoon.

>

> I am emailing you as a mother to a [redacted], who will be directly impacted negatively by the proposed changes.

>

> At the moment there is a total of 15 Primary Schools in Falkirk that provide Enhanced Provision to our children, whose disabilities/difficulties vary on a very large spectrum. Those 15 settings currently are hugely under resourced, under staffed and lacking any real backing or support from the council. The proposal that the council has suggested is to spread those already insufficient resources across a total of 47 schools. Myself along with other parents and teachers can't understand how anyone would think this could work? To add to the already disastrous proposal you are wanting to put our children into mainstream classes which quite frankly is ridiculous.

>

> If our children could cope within a mainstream setting don't you think that's where they would be? As parents we aspire for nothing more than our kids to fit in within in a mainstream setting and be able to build relationships with their peers - this simply is not possible due to their varying needs and the way they deal with social interactions. This leads me to one of 'benefits' the council has put into their proposal - "for children who are placed in non-catchment EP, their relationships and connections with their local community can be lost due to the compulsory transit option out of their catchment area". Have any members of the education board sat within an EP class for a day? Or even for a few hours? Have you spent time with our children? Because what you will find is the social aspect of their school life will be very much the same as their social life - almost non existent due to their many needs and social issues. A lot of the children in EP could not cope with nursery classes due to the amount of children in them but have adapted to their much smaller, inclusive classes within their EP settings.

>

> The most important change that will come of this proposal is the risk factor to our children if moved into mainstream classes. Will you be giving them their own designated playgrounds? Their own places to eat lunch? Will an over stimulated child be able to access the playground when needed, or a quiet space, jump around to self stimulate so they can feel comfortable again? If the answer is yes, then how? As that pretty much sounds like the current EP settings so why change them? If not, what can you do to guarantee my child's along with the others safety? They are children who have minimal risk/danger awareness with the added risk of eloping. How can the council guarantee our children will be safe within a mainstream setting? Because as a parent i know my sons risks and i know he simply would not be safe within a mainstream setting - therefore he simply will not attend.

>

> The council as the same with everything is thinking of their budgets and how to cut back - DO NOT use our children as the resolution to your budget issues.

>

> This will affect mainstream children as well. They will be disrupted when our children get over stimulated and need assistance or even when they need their pull ups changed or help at the toilet (yes they still wear them and no that wont change after being dumped into a mainstream setting). >

- > Our children are the future and you are failing them with this proposal.
- >
- > I look forward to your reply and hope you can answer my questions.

I'm writing to you to discuss the failed education in which you have been provided to young people of Falkirk area education program it doesn't meet the need of one single person there is catastrophic feelings.to pupils more so with additional needs zero support is given to these kids over the past 30 years there has been zero upgrade and corrected understand still hasn't be updated you are still 30 years on trying to fix a guess you still haven't understood i would like to Enlight you on how to fix this issues I have [redacted] kids with additional needs and have been fight with yourself for over 9 years to receive support for my children to be in school getting a education my mother fighting for 11years to get support now I can't work because of your failed education system so let's stop letting kids leaving school without basic education shame on you Falkirk council for not dealing with this issues 30 years ago when it first became a highlighted issue and still to this date my kids not in school because Falkirk council inability to give people support when needed.

Hi there, I'm emailing regarding the plans surrounding the enhanced provisions being closed and what that means for my family. I watched the meeting on YouTube. I have a daughter [redacted] aged almost [redacted] years old she currently attends [school a] in the EHP she's just entered primary [redacted].

We live in [redacted] and she receives transport to and from school [redacted] needs one to one support and supervision as she puts things in her mouth that's a choking hazard it's taken almost a year for [redacted] to come out her shell, she does not like crowds or loud noises her class is very small and only has 6 children this is perfect for her. [redacted] would not cope in mainstream no matter what the setting or supports were my daughter needs exactly what she has although my daughter has a disability she deserves a safe environment to learn and she has it. I'm worried sick about my daughters future since hearing these plans and what it means for her I speak for myself and other parents with disabled children when I ask please take all this into consideration.

Thank you I look forward to hearing from you

Regards

Good afternoon,

I am a parent of a non-verbal child with support needs.

He currently attends an enhanced provision unit.

I am horrified to see the proposal to close these units, it is completely unacceptable. Yes I agree every mainstream school should have its very own Enhanced Provision unit within it, absolutely...then all children with ASN or support needs can be offered the support they need at their local school. I am very lucky that my son attends an EP unit [redacted]. I have seen the classmates of my son develop and thrive as I see them most days and interact with them and their parents. We parents of children with support needs also need the support of the enhanced provision staff so we can encourage and support their learning journey outside school. They don't just teach our children, they are an emotional support to the parents and will give feedback, suggestions or give us advice on what to do with education or other support needs concerns. They bond and invest their time in our children, they know them so well they know the limits with every individual child, they know the happy, the sad the annoyed, they know what works and what does not work for each and every child. They are passionate with working with our children and know how to encourage them to interact and learn. These bonds are so important for the children who have communication needs and are more vulnerable than others. We as parents have to see the relationships established and trust that the staff get to know our children as well as we know them so we can walk away and know they are safe and getting their needs met. However, it is not the council's place to withhold or remove a child from this environment when they have been assessed as requiring the educational environment and support there. The movement or progression of levels/groups of a pupil is based on their learning needs alone and the teacher has the knowledge and skills to do what is best for the education of the child. ASN children or children with support needs can be supported in the mainstream environment with support yes, but they may need additional support in certain areas of their education that is not met within mainstream, they may not settle with the amount of people and noise level in one space, they may struggle with social cues and domestic duties and following routine. They may need more sensory based environments and learning materials to develop and understand. The enhanced provision supports teaching and promotes the confidence of the children to learn new skills and prepare them for mainstream with or without additional support, but they need the assessment and building block to achieve the ability to cope in mainstream learning environments. Most ASN children will also have their emotional and mental needs to be supported, they may need more time outside, or quiet time or sensory time throughout the day when they are feeling overwhelmed or over stimulated and if they get distressed and upset the EP units have areas where they can have privacy and their dignity upheld, mainstream would offer an audience of 30 watching a vulnerable child whilst they go through the motions of de-escalation.

For the mainstream children they will have daily and frequent interruptions and disturbances to their learning due to how the ASN children act with vocals, quirks and stims, they will have to share already stretched time with the teacher as they educate children with higher support needs. You are putting very vulnerable kids in environments where their needs will be missed as a class of 30 children would be very daunting to someone with no voice, or who is not able to communicate themselves over the noise and presence of other children, big groups do not work for support children with issues communicating their wants, preferences and needs. Some children require

additional support like personal care, which can be managed on a more private level in a smaller class size. Supporting with things like eating and drinking again the smaller class size is a must. Safety! These children usually have no personal awareness and need supervised at all times otherwise injuries will happen or they will eat things they shouldn't, they need enclosed areas and hands held when moving around.

From a mother of a child with ASN and additional needs the main point is enhanced provision units cannot be closed. The Enhance Provision provides all levels of disabled children to get an education in a sensory led environment. They are supported and taught skills to move in in their education journey at their own speed and ability. They may thrive at numeric work at a mainstream level but require full support with social cues, routine or using a pencil to write/draw. The results would be our children would not receive an adequate education and would be rushed at a level they will not tolerate. Rushing that development will cause regression of skills, negative impact to confidence and reduced interest and interaction in their education journey and development. They will be set up to fail! It will also cause emotional upset which in turn will increase anxiety irritation and them being overwhelmed and over stimulated, in other words it will make our kids unwell and uneducated.

The additional support needs in schools are stretched as it is. The enhanced provision should be a separate unit in all schools so all children who need the additional support receives it. I do not understand how the solution would be to remove the best thing developed for children with additional needs, should it not be that we continue to develop what actually works and not what is cheaper or good for the budget?

And we are all thinking it, there is other areas the council could be saving the extra money from what we see in the news at the moment but I'm not doing to dive into a debate on that topic it gets too much attention and money as it is

We should be concentrating and funding what really matters, for our future for our children, and that is education. The bare minimum in life for ALL children are entitled in this country is a free inclusive education so that's where the funding should be put, into the future for our country and that includes all children with additional needs.

It is madness to even consider depriving our children of the current Enhance provision units and put them in mainstream. It will not work and by the time the results show that the education of many will be affected and for some ruined.

I am very passionate about this cause. So please anything that can be done for this cause don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]