



Additional Support Needs

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

FTS/HEC/AR/24/0262

List of witnesses

For the appellant:

The appellant

For the respondent

Head Teacher of School B (Witness A)

Quality Improvement Manager (Witness B)

Principal Teacher – ASN and Inclusion at School B (Witness C)

Educational Psychologist (Witness D)

Reference

1. This is a reference by the appellant in her capacity as the mother of the child. The appellant made a formal placing request for the child to attend school A for the academic year 2025/26 and beyond to the local authority who is the respondent. The respondent refused the appellant's request in terms of paragraph 3(1)(b) and 3(1)(g) of Schedule 2 of the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004.

Decision

2. We confirm the decision of the respondent to refuse the placing request, in accordance with section 19(4A)(a) of the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (**the 2004 Act**). We therefore do not require the respondent to place the child in school A.

3. We are satisfied that: (i) one or more grounds of refusal specified in paragraph 3(1) of schedule 2 to the 2004 Act exist; and (ii) in all the circumstances it is appropriate to do so, confirm the decision of the education authority.

Process

4. The hearing took place at the Glasgow Tribunal Centre in June 2025. Witnesses A, C and D gave oral evidence remotely by video link. A further hearing day to conclude oral evidence took place remotely as agreed by parties in September 2025. The child's views were obtained by way of an advocacy report that was directed by us and made available to all parties prior to the evidential hearing. The child also elected to attend the remote hearing in September 2025 to provide their updated views directly to us. Prior to the hearing, there were a series of case management calls with directions issued by the legal member in order to manage the pre-hearing process efficiently. Witness statements and a joint minute of agreed facts were lodged prior to the evidential hearing. All of the foregoing documents were included in the 238-page electronic bundle of written evidence numbered T1-58, A1-A010 and R001-166:

- witness A, Head Teacher of School B, written statement [R141 – R153]
- witness B, Quality Improvement Manager [R121 – R130]
- witness C, Principal Teacher - ASN and Inclusion at School B [R154 – R161]
- the appellant, child's mother [A009 – A010]
- witness D, Educational Psychologist [R131- R140]
- joint minute of agreed facts [A008]
- advocacy report of the child [T044-T058]

5. Following the conclusion of the oral evidence, parties exchanged written submissions before lodging these with us. Before reaching our decision, we considered the oral and written evidence and written submissions. We are grateful to both representatives for their careful preparation of the hearing papers and detailed written submissions.

Findings in Fact

General Findings

The child

6. The appellant is the mother of the child. The child was born in January 2013 and is 12 years old. The child lives in the parental home.
7. The child attended a mainstream primary school from Primary 1 until the end of Primary 7.
8. The child commenced Secondary 1 (**S1**) at school B in August 2025. School B is a mainstream high school with additional support needs provision.
9. The child has been diagnosed with visual impairment, hyperacusis, eczema, central sleep apnoea, autism spectrum condition (**ASC**) and dyslexia.
10. The child has been placed on a waiting list with the Childhood and Adolescent Mental Health Service (**CAMHS**) to be assessed for an intellectual disability, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (**ADHD**) and foetal alcohol syndrome.
11. The child can at times become emotionally dysregulated. The child requires routine and predictability to feel secure and can become dysregulated if any changes to routine are not shared in advance.
12. The child was emotionally regulated throughout their time in primary school for the majority of the time.
13. When the child became emotionally dysregulated at primary school the child would sit out in the playground, refuse to come into the school building or refuse to go into a class. These events were uncommon and when they occurred lasted from half an hour to around two hours.
14. The child can struggle to focus. The child needs support in organising belongings and their workspace. The child has poor fine motor skills which makes writing by hand difficult.

15. Over the course of primary school the child required and benefitted from consistent relationships with a key or trusted adult for emotional support. The child was also provided with access to a nurture room to regulate after break time transitions, support for significant transitions and changes in routine, movement breaks as necessary, fiddle toys, use of a chew toy, a sloping board to support writing, Google Meet on an Ipad for direct teaching, a large screen Ipad or Chromebook for visual support, access and use of ear defenders, alternative space for lunch times, chunking of tasks or choice of task order where possible, use of a visual timetable and access to some specialist resources for digital literacy tasks.
16. The child sustains conversations articulately around complex and mature topics. The child demonstrates a strong memory and can keep up with their peers during classroom games.
17. The child developed positive and nurturing relationships with staff and peers at primary school.
18. At primary school the child worked within First Level of Curriculum for Excellence (**CfE**) at both P6 and P7 stages. At the point of transitioning from P7 to S1 the child was working at the beginning of Second Level.
19. The child has been assessed as having literacy difficulties, including a significant difference in scores for decoding and speed of reading in comparison to her comprehension skills. The child's comprehension skills are significantly higher than their literacy skills.
20. The child can have a fixed mindset and preconceived ideas around the provision of their education. In particular the child has a fixed mindset around certain subjects being boring and will at times resist engaging in these subjects. If the child has had a negative experience in a particular subject or class the child will have a fixed mindset around not engaging in future such classes. The child's fixed mindset can create a barrier to the child's ability and willingness to engage in a particular subject or class in future.
21. The child does not require an Individual Education Plan (**IEP**). The child is able to work alongside and access the mainstream curriculum that was provided to their peers over the course of their primary education. The child is at the lower end of the cohort of their

peers in terms of academic attainment. The child demonstrates independence in line with children of their age.

22. The child does not require one to one support for practical life skills or care needs. The child benefits from the support of a trusted adult in meeting their emotional needs most days.

Findings on the Education Resource Group (ERG)

23. The appellant's placing request for the child to attend school A was referred to the respondent's ERG. The ERG makes decisions in relation to placing requests for placement of children in complex needs provision across their authority such as is provided within school A.

24. The ERG comprises of a range of educational and health professionals with particular knowledge and experience of children with additional support needs and in particular complex needs.

25. The ERG refused the appellant's request in August 2024. This decision was made in terms of section 3(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of the 2004 Act.

26. The appellant subsequently indicated that there was information relating to the child's health needs which had not been considered by the ERG and a further request was made to the ERG to reconsider the decision. In March 2025 the ERG made a second decision to refuse a placement for the child at school A in terms of sections 3(1)(b) and (g) of Schedule 2 of the 2004 Act.

The child's transition to school B

27. A number of transition planning and assessment meetings for the child took place between May 2024 and June 2025 with a view to the respondent assessing the child's needs and making arrangements for the child to transition to S1 at school B.

28. School B staff arranged an enhanced transition program for the child and the child's family. This consisted of a number of formal (with other P7 pupils) and informal visits to

school B over and above the general transition for P7 pupils before the child was due to commence at school B.

29. The appellant was encouraged to discuss and raise any concerns or issues with staff at school B over the course of this enhanced transition and on an ongoing basis.
30. The child attended a number of supported transition visits to school B before the summer break including visits in June 2025 which included a number of meetings with the staff who would be working with the child at school B.
31. The child commenced education at school B in August 2025. The child has settled well in school. The child has developed positive relationships with staff members and peers. The child has enjoyed engaging in more practical subjects since starting at school B.
32. The child has at times travelled independently on the school bus to school B.
33. The child has been provided with access to a learning assistant when the child is in a mainstream class. The child has access to a trusted adult.
34. The child has been dysregulated on two known occasions since starting school B in August 2025. On each of these occasions the child was able to regulate and re-engage in school learning with the support of a trusted adult. The child's behaviours on these occasions did not present as a significant disruption or safety risk to the child or the child's peers.
35. The child has been dysregulated at home after school since starting at school B.

Findings on school A and the child

36. School A is known as a Complex Needs Provision school. School A generally provides education to children with complex needs. This includes children with significant or substantially delayed developmental progress, significant difficulties in communication, difficulties in cognitive functioning, complex health conditions, difficulties in social interactions and sensory processing and challenges with emotional regulation. Children attending school A will also include those who may be physically reliant on staff for the majority of their care needs.

37. The majority of children and young people who attend school A have limited verbal communication skills.
38. The children within school A are generally working on Milestones, or at Pre-Early or Early level of CfE.
39. The profile of learners at school A will generally have significantly higher educational needs than the child.
40. The environment of school A can be loud and unpredictable.
41. The average class size at school A is eight. School A comprises of four classes. Each class has one teacher and two pupil support assistants (**PSAs**).
42. There is secure fencing around the outside classrooms within school A which is open during the school day and is safe and secure from the rest of the playground.
43. The appellant and the child have visited school A on one occasion at a time when no pupils were present.

Findings on school B and the child

44. School B is a mainstream high school.
45. The Creative Learning Department (**CLD**) within school B provides support for children and young people such as the child with additional support needs within the mainstream school.
46. The CLD is staffed full-time with seven teachers, four youth workers and eight learning assistants. The CLD has four classrooms.
47. The profile of many of the children and young people within the CLD where the child attends are at similar level as the child developmentally and academically or lower.

48. The child has been allocated a trusted adult for emotional support namely witness C who works within the CDP. The child has developed a positive relationship with witness C over the course of the transition process from P7 to S1.
49. The child has a Communication Passport which is a document that assists the child's teachers in mainstream class to understand the child's needs.
50. The child has been accessing some mainstream classes and lessons, including home economics, sciences, and social studies.
51. The child has access to a learning assistant when in mainstream classes. The child is also being provided with education within the CLD.
52. The child has managed at times to travel on the school bus independently to school B.
53. The child is able to navigate safely around school B.

Reasons for the Decision

General remarks on the legal tests

54. Parties are agreed that the young person has additional support needs in terms of Section 1 of the 2004 Act. We agree that is the case. The onus of establishing the grounds of refusal (and each of their component parts) lies with the respondent. The appropriate assessment point is at the time of the hearing which in this case was in September 2025.
55. Even if a ground of refusal exists then we still have to consider whether or not in all of the circumstances it is appropriate to confirm the decision (section 19(4A)(a)(ii) of the 2004 Act).

The first ground of refusal

2004 Act, Schedule 2, paragraph 3(1)(b): the education normally provided at the specified school is not suited to the age, ability or aptitude of the child)

56. This ground of refusal is established when there is sufficient evidence for us to conclude that the education normally provided at school A is not suited to the age, ability or aptitude of the child. The onus rests with the respondent to establish this ground.
57. Our task in determining this ground is to consider the education actually provided at school A and its suitability for the child's age, ability and aptitude.
58. We considered the child's needs and whether or not school A was suited to meet those needs in terms of the child's age, ability and aptitude. Having regard to all of the available evidence we concluded that school A would not meet the child's needs and was not suited to the child's ability and aptitude.
59. The cohort of pupils who would work alongside the child at school A would limit the child in her ability to have appropriate social interactions. Witness B was able to speak to the profile of the learners who would be placed with the child were they to attend school A. The child's needs were described as "significantly less complex" than those other learners. The majority of learners who would be attending school A in S1 had significant communication and sensory challenges. We considered that the child would not have the opportunity to develop social relationships in a manner that would benefit the child and support her to develop friendships. The child has become accustomed to social interactions with their peers and developed relationships in their mainstream primary setting. We accepted the evidence of witness B that social interaction with peers is a key aspect of development.
60. The profile of other learners within school A would also limit the child's progress in developing their language skills. The child is articulate and engages well in discussions with others. School A would not be well placed to support the child to develop in this regard given the profile of the children being taught alongside the child.
61. We also concluded that school A would not be able to adequately provide for the child's academic needs. The child works broadly at First Level and has moved towards Second Level of CfE. Many of learners at school A are working at pre-Early and Early Level of CfE. There is less likelihood of these learners being able to progress. Witness B predicted the child having limited academic progress in this environment.

62. We did not consider that school A would be a suitable learning environment for the child. The evidence from witnesses B and C suggested that the physical environment of school A can be loud and unpredictable. Many of the learners are non-verbal and communicate through screaming. School A can be a noisy environment with children becoming distressed at times. The child requires predictability and routine and we did not consider that the environment of school A was a suitable one for the child in terms of her needs.
63. We considered that the evidence of witness B of particular assistance in its consideration of this ground. Witness B was closely involved in the allocation of complex need provision for pupils with complex needs. Witness B's daily role involves the strategic management of ASN, Inclusion & Wellbeing. Witness B has extensive knowledge and oversight of the complex needs provisions across the respondent's authority. Although witness B had only visited school A on one occasion; witness B had knowledge and experience of the profiles of school A's pupils, the curriculum and some of the facilities and teaching provision that was available. Critically witness B was familiar with the profile of the learners who would be placed alongside the child in S1 having considered these children's profiles in detail at the ERG along with the child's. We considered witness B to be a credible and reliable witness.
64. We rejected the submission by the appellant's representative that witness B's opinions rested on generalised information and limited direct inquiry. On the contrary, we were satisfied that witness B was able to provide us with direct evidence as to the environment within the Complex Needs Provision, the peer group which would be available to the child and the educational provision that could be made available.
65. The evidence of witness C was also of relevance. Witness C provided education and support to children with additional support needs in school B and attended and supported staff within school A at times when they had required an additional staff member to assist. Witness C was familiar with the child's profile and was allocated as her trusted adult at school B. Witness C spoke to the complexity of the needs of some of the children within school A and the challenging and noisy environment that the child would be exposed to were they to be placed at school. Witness C was an experienced teacher working with children with additional support needs in a senior role within school B. We considered that witness C was a credible and reliable witness.

66. We carefully considered the appellant's evidence on the provision at school A. The appellant believed that school A would provide a safer and better learning environment for the child. Much of the appellant's evidence focussed on the physical safety of school A and the fact the building provided a high level of security. The appellant believed the child to be a flight risk and that school A's secure setting would prevent this risk. We concluded from the evidence that the child was a low risk in this regard. Witnesses A and C spoke to this. There was no tangible evidence of the child being a serious flight risk. The child had during one of the transition visits left the school grounds of school B however the situation was safely managed by school staff who were present with the child. There was no evidence that the child had presented as a flight risk throughout their time at primary school.

67. The appellant also made reference to the quiet and calm environment of school A. This view appeared to us to be partly based on a visit that both the appellant and the child had made to school A at a time when there were no children present. This visit created in our view, an artificial impression to the appellant that school A would provide a calm and quiet environment were the child to attend. The evidence from witnesses B and C taken together suggested that school A could be a noisy and unpredictable environment given the profile of other learners. Although we were in no doubt that the appellant genuinely believed school A to be the best option for the child, we did not consider that the appellant was suitably qualified and knowledgeable on the provision of education at school A and the profile of other learners or its suitability for the child.

68. It was clear to us that the appellant wanted the very best for her daughter. We accepted that the appellant was genuine and sincere in the views expressed about the provision at school A. We did not consider however that we could attach weight to the appellant's evidence on the provision at school A for the reasons stated. The appellant's views around school A's suitability were likely influenced by the appellant's steadfast belief that the child's needs could never be met in any mainstream school.

Conclusion on the ground of refusal in terms of paragraph 3(1)(b)

69. We were satisfied that the education normally provided at school A is not suited to the age, ability or aptitude of the child.

The second ground of refusal:

The 2004 Act, schedule 2, paragraph 3(1)(g) Presumption of mainstream education

70. Schedule 2 paragraph 3(1)(g) of the 2004 Act sets out the ground for refusal.

Paragraph 3(1)(g) of Schedule 2 to the 2004 Act applies “where the specified school is a special school, placing the child in the school would breach the requirement in section 15(1) of the 2000 Act.”

71. The reference in this section to “the 2000 Act” is to the Standards in Scotland’s Schools etc Act 2000 (hereinafter referred to as the “2000 Act”), which is in the following terms:

“(1) Where an education authority, in carrying out their duty to provide school education to a child of school age, provide that education in a school, they shall unless one of the circumstances mentioned in subsection (3) below arises in relation to the child provide it in a school other than a special school.

(2) If a child is under school age, then unless one of the circumstances mentioned in subsection (3) below arises in relation to the child, an education authority shall, where they—(a) provide school education in a school to the child, provide it in; or (b) under section 35 of this Act, enter into arrangements for the provision of school education in a school to the child, ensure that the arrangements are such that the education is provided in, a school other than a special school.

(3) The circumstances are; that to provide education for the child in a school other than a special school—

(a) would not be suited to the ability or aptitude of the child;

(b) would be incompatible with the provision of efficient education for the children with whom the child would be educated; or

(c) would result in unreasonable public expenditure being incurred which would not ordinarily be incurred, and it shall be presumed that those

circumstances arise only exceptionally.

(4) If one of the circumstances mentioned in subsection (3) above arises, the authority may provide education for the child in question in a school other than a special school; but they shall not do so without taking into account the views of the child and of the child's parents in that regard.”

72. Section 2(1) of the 2000 Act is also relevant, when construing section 15(1) and states:

“(1) Where school education is provided to a child or young person by, or by virtue of arrangements made, or entered into, by, an education authority it shall be the duty of the authority to secure that the education is directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential.”

73. The three circumstances identified in section 15(3) of the Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000 come with the presumption that they arise only exceptionally.

74. S15(3) of the 2000 Act sets out at subsections (a), (b) and (c) the circumstances in which the presumption of mainstream education does not apply, and those circumstances arise only exceptionally.

75. Where any of the three exceptions apply in s 15(3) apply, the mainstream presumption does not, and so the related ground of refusal cannot exist.

76. The onus again rests with the respondent to establish that this ground of refusal exists as at the date of the hearing in September 2025. In discharging that burden in relation to the presumption of mainstream education, the respondent is required to prove that none of the three statutory exceptions exist.

77. There is no dispute that School A is a special school. Accordingly, this part of the ground of refusal is met.

Whether mainstream education would not be suited to child's ability or aptitude.

78. The appellant believed that the child could not be kept safe at school B as the child would struggle to navigate stairs and was at risk of absconding. There was no evidence before us to suggest that the child had been unable to safely manage or appropriately mobilise around school B over the enhanced transition visits or since the start of the school term. We rejected the argument from the appellant that school B was not a safe environment in this regard.

79. On the risk of the child absconding, we were satisfied on the evidence of witness A and witness C that the risk of the child absconding from school was very low. Further in the event that the child might seek to abscond from school B; we were satisfied that this could be safely managed at school B. Witness A as the head teacher of the child's primary school provided reliable and credible evidence around the extent of the child's emotional dysregulation in primary school. Although witness A had only been in post since December 2024 witness A had regular discussions with staff and had also observed the child himself over the course of a number of school days. Witness A was familiar with the child's needs and any risks that they may present. Witness A did not consider there was a risk of the child running away in the context of their primary education. Witness A was an experienced and suitably qualified senior educational professional with knowledge of the child. We considered that we could attach significant weight to the evidence of witness A.

80. Witness C spoke of one occasion when the child had left the grounds of school B in June 2025 during one of the enhanced transition visits. At this time the child was followed by two staff members and the situation was safely managed. We were satisfied that the risk of the child absconding was minimal and even in this event school B had sufficient supports and staff in place to safely manage any such situation should it arise.

81. We concluded from the evidence that the education provided to the child at school B would meet the child's needs. The child has been provided with a flexible timetable since starting S1. The child has access to a trusted adult with whom she has built up a positive relationship (witness C). The child has access to both the CLD and mainstream classes which allows for flexibility in the provision of their education. The child is able to interact with peers with similar abilities to her. Critically the child will have a greater opportunity to develop their language and social skills in attending school B. The child appears to

be generally happy at school B and is demonstrating an ability to be able to learn alongside their peers. The child's level of learning is consistent with other learners attending school B.

82. We acknowledged that the child's transition to school B has not been without incident or issue. We were clear that any transition to high school for a child whether they have ASN or not will never likely be perfect and without its challenges. We were made aware of an occasion at the start of the school term of school B where an error in communication resulted in no staff member meeting the child off the school bus in the morning as had been agreed and planned for. Witness C acknowledged this error and the situation has not been repeated. Further the child appeared to cope with this situation very well with no apparent dysregulation being evident. We were satisfied that the staff at school B are keen to work with the appellant and the child and respond appropriately to manage the inevitable challenges of the child moving to high school and a new way of learning. We noted that staff at school B are focussed on supporting the child to overcome their fixed mindset around particular subjects to support the child to engage in these subjects. Witness C had developed a positive relationship with the child and was optimistic that the child would be able to make positive progress in this regard.

83. The appellant invited us to consider that the child is masking her emotions at school and that her presentation at school B is not an accurate reflection of how the child actually is coping. Witness C stated that it was not unusual for any pupil to mask in this way in the early stages of transition to high school. Witness C who had observed the child and worked with her over the enhanced transition reported that the child was settling extremely well at school B.

84. We were satisfied that the education provided to the child at school B was suited to the ability and aptitude of the child.

Whether mainstream education is incompatible with efficient provision of education for the children with whom the child would be educated

85. In determining this ground we were required to assess whether education of the child at school B would be incompatible with the efficient education of other learners at school B.

86. Witness A acknowledged that in primary school the child could at times be outspoken and would directly contradict a teacher. The child would at times encourage others not to work. Witness A stated that after such events the class would return to work with minimal disruption.

87. Witness D, an educational psychologist had observed the child within their main stream primary school on two occasions and observed the child working alongside her peers appropriately and being responsive to support from trusted adults.

88. The evidence from witness C suggested that the two situations of emotional dysregulation exhibited by the child since starting S1 had been safely managed with minimal disruption to others. The child was engaged with staff and peers and there was no evidence that the education the child at school B had any negative impact on other learners.

89. We concluded from the evidence that it was not incompatible with efficient provision of education for the children with whom the child would be educated to place the child at school B

Whether mainstream education would result in unreasonable public expenditure

90. We concluded from the evidence that the required resources to provide the child with an education in school B were already in place. Specialist staff are already employed within the CLD to provide the required provision to the child. We accepted the submission of the respondent that there is no additional cost in the child attending school B which would result in unreasonable public expenditure.

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child ('UNCRC') (Incorporation) (Scotland) Act 2024

91. The appellant argued (in written submissions) that under Schedule 2, para 3(1)(b), school A is suited to the child's profile which includes high potential in some domains and marked impairment in others. The appellant argued that under s.15, of the 2000 Act the presumption of mainstream is displaced by s.15(3)(a) because mainstream is not

suiting to the child's profile and that this approach accords with UNCRC art. 29(1)(a) (education to the child's fullest potential, which is now justiciable under the UNCRC (Incorporation) (Scotland) Act 2024). We rejected this argument. We considered from the facts found that the child attending school B and not school A would provide the child with the best opportunity of reaching their fullest potential having regard to their profile. School B provided access to an appropriate curriculum and critically access to a suitable peer group and learning environment. Placing the child in school A would in our view fail to comply with the terms of article 29(1)(a) of the UNCRC.

Conclusion on the second ground of refusal

92. We are not satisfied that to provide education for the child at a school other than a special school would not be suited to the ability or aptitude of the child. Therefore the circumstances set out in Section 15(3)(a) of the 2000 Act do not apply.

93. Providing education to the child at school B is not incompatible with the provision of efficient education for the children with whom the child is educated. Therefore, the circumstances set out in Section 15 (3)(b) of the 2000 Act do not apply.

94. We conclude that providing education for the child in mainstream school does not result in unreasonable public expenditure which would not ordinarily be incurred, and therefore we conclude that this exception at Section 15(3)(c) does not apply.

95. The respondent has satisfied us that none of the circumstances set out in Section 15(3) of the 2000 Act apply and the ground of refusal exists. The three circumstances identified in section 15(3) of the Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000 come with the presumption that they arise only exceptionally. We are satisfied that none of the three circumstances arise in this case and so this ground of refusal has been established by the respondent.

The Child's Views

96. We paid particular attention to the views of the child in determining this reference. We accepted that the child had expressed a wish to attend school A. The child was noted to state that school B was "annoying" and a "living hell." The evidence from Witness C

however was that the child had settled very well in school B. The child was beginning to enjoy a number of aspects of the school day. Witness C was unable to reconcile the child's views as they were presented to us with the presentation of the child at school B. The child was engaging with peers and we noted that the child had felt a sense of pride at being able to get the bus on her own one morning to school. Although giving very careful consideration to the child's views, we were required to make a decision based on all of the available evidence. This evidence suggested that the child was settling well in school B and starting to engage in her learning in a positive way.

Appropriateness in all of circumstances - 2004 Act, s.19(4A)(a)(ii)

97. Having concluded that two grounds of refusal exist, we require to consider whether nonetheless, it is appropriate in all of the circumstances to confirm the decision to refuse the appellant's placing request or whether we should overturn the decision and require the respondent to place the child in school A.

98. We are satisfied that the refusal of the placing request should be confirmed. The respondent has made significant efforts to work with the appellant and the child with a view to both assessing the child's needs and providing the child with an education that will support the child to reach their potential. A number of professionals have been involved in this process. We acknowledge that the transition of the child to school B may not be without challenge or issue, however we observed that where any challenges have occurred the staff at school B have worked hard with the child in order to resolve matters. Staff at school B plan an ongoing review of the child's needs and the evidence suggests that school B are prepared and willing to make any required adjustments to the provision of the child's education as they progress through S1. We were satisfied that the child would be supported to develop socially and academically by continuing to attend school B.

99. Having considered all of the evidence in terms of the broad test of appropriateness we were unanimous in our conclusion that it would not be appropriate to place the child in school A. To do so would be detrimental to the child's social and academic development. The education provided in school B is more suited to the child's needs in terms of her social and academic progress.

