**Data collection method file**

The methods used for data collection in this project were focus groups, interviews and online questionnaires. The discussion topics were based on the three areas that Accessibility Plans are required to focus on, namely information delivery, physical access and curriculum.

*Data collection and analysis*

To recruit participants for the focus groups and interviews the researcher employed a snowballing method, using the Alliance for Inclusive Education (ALLFIE)’s existing contacts and applying networking and chain referral techniques; the researcher also approached regional ‘Parent Carer Forums.’ Data were collected between October 2018 and March 2019.

As a strategy for collective data generation, 12 focus groups were carried out in seven cities across five regions of England (the North East, South East, Midlands, North West and South West). Wherever possible, separate groups were held for each of the following participant categories: Disabled young people, parents of Disabled young people, and education professionals. Group size ranged from three to 14 participants. The first focus group acted as a pilot study and participants’ views were sought on the relevance of the topics and questions. With their consent, the researcher also included in the project experiences shared via email by a number of additional parents and professionals.

The interviews conducted by the researcher consisted of five in-depth semi-structured dialogues and were underpinned by voluntary responses. This method of data collection was used alongside the focus groups to enhance the investigative, exploratory aspects of the study. In the interviews, parents of Disabled young people were invited to share their own stories, as well as those of their children, on a range of school related topics.

All focus groups and interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and anonymised. The researcher applied pseudonyms for all identifiable features to ensure anonymity. To safeguard against contrivance or misinterpretation of participants’ accounts, participants were asked to read through transcripts, and to make any amendments as they saw fit. The researcher then reviewed the validated transcripts and manually coded them according to theme; themes were derived from field literature and current legislation. Once the data were organised into the various categories, they were cross-checked for accuracy. The analysis of the data involved a process of ongoing comparison between the five regions and the three participant groups to uncover emergent patterns.

In addition to the focus groups and interviews, two sets of digital questionnaires were produced and publicised on relevant online platforms. Over a three-month period, targeted groups of parents and professionals were encouraged to complete a questionnaire, choosing the survey most appropriate for their circumstances. Questionnaires could be part-completed and saved for a later date if desired, and questions were listed in order of priority. Even in cases where a respondent did not complete the entire questionnaire, the researcher was able to access responses to the most important questions. Of the 237 parents and 96 professionals who responded, one third completed the whole survey. Answers were organised into the same themes, and analysed in the same way, as in the field study.

Alongside the primary qualitative approach, the researcher also used various sources of quantitative data, including the statistical analysis of responses to Freedom of Information requests provided by local authorities (LAs) across England relating to Accessibility Plans. Percentages were created to demonstrate the engagement levels of LAs in relation to Accessibility Plans and wider accessibility strategies.