

Name of meeting: Cabinet
Date: 15th November 2016

Title of report: Report on the outcomes from the non-statutory consultation for Members consideration on proposals for changes to specialist provision for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism

Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?	Yes – this impacts on all wards across Kirklees
Is it in the Council's Forward Plan?	Yes – March 2016
Is it eligible for “call in” by Scrutiny?	Yes
Date signed off by <u>Director</u> & name	4 th November 2016 Sarah Callaghan
Is it signed off by the Assistant Director for Resources?	3 rd November 2016 Debbie Hogg (Carole Hardern)
Is it signed off by the Assistant Director - Legal & Governance?	4 th November 2016 Julie Muscroft (John Chapman)
Cabinet member portfolio	Cllr Masood Ahmed Community Cohesion and Schools

Electoral [wards](#) affected: All wards

Ward councillors consulted: All councillors have been sent a consultation document and a covering letter as part of this process.

Public or private: Public

1. Purpose of report

The report sets out the outcomes from the non-statutory consultation that took place between 16th May 2016 and 17th June 2016 for Members' consideration on proposals for changes to specialist provisions at Ashbrow School, Moldgreen Community Primary School & Thornhill Junior and Infant School and seeks a decision about the way forward.

Contents	Page
1. Purpose of report	1
2. Summary	3-5
3. Background	5
4. The proposals	5-6
5. Consultation methodology	6-8
6. Response to consultation	8-27
7. Proposed approach following the statutory consultation	27-28
8. Equalities Impact Assessment	28
9. Implications for the Council	28-29
10. Consultees and their opinions	29
11. Next steps	30
12. Officer recommendations and reasons	30-31
13. Cabinet portfolio holder's recommendations	31-32
14. Contact officers	32
15. Background papers	32-33

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Distribution List for consultation document.

Appendix B - Consultation Document.

Appendix C - Detailed feedback received in response to the consultation by stakeholder.

Appendix D – Notes of the meeting with SENCOs 20th September 2016

Appendix E – The Effectiveness of Primary SLCN Outreach evaluation questionnaire

Appendix F - The Effectiveness of Primary SLCN Outreach – questionnaire response summary

2. Summary

2.1 A four week term-time non-statutory consultation has been carried out with all key stakeholders to gather views about Kirklees Local Authority proposals to make changes to specialist provision at the following schools;

a) Ashbrow School

- Discontinue the 12 transitional places plus outreach for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN)

b) Thornhill J&I School

- Discontinue the 12 transitional places plus outreach for children with Speech Language and Communication Needs (SLCN)

c) Moldgreen Community Primary School

- Discontinue the 10 transitional places plus outreach for children with autism (This proposal enables the legal closure of this specialist provision where there have been no children in transitional places since July 2014)

d) Primary outreach provision for Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism across Kirklees

- Proposal to increase resources for a centralised primary outreach provision 'hub' to serve the whole of Kirklees for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism.

From over 1,100 consultation documents circulated, 39 responses were received. Responses have been received from parents and carers, governors, staff, residents, and other respondents. A consultation drop-in event has been held at Ashbrow School, the session was held during the non- statutory consultation period on 23rd May 2016. This was an opportunity for governors and staff at Ashbrow School and all other stakeholders to discuss the proposals with officers from the Council's Learning and Skills Service and was also designed to support parents and carers in completing consultation response forms.

The key themes drawn from the consultation are that:-

- There are concerns about the impact that the loss of dedicated support would have on children with SLCN. There are some respondents who are worried that this would mean the children become less of a priority.
- Views were expressed that children with the most complex SLCN require intense therapy and support on a one-to-one basis several times per week, many respondents are concerned that outreach does not address the needs of these children.
- Respondents showed concern at a loss of dedicated provision at Primary level in South Kirklees. They explained that a lack of early intervention and prevention could potentially mean it is too late to effectively support those with SLCN at high school age if the right provision has not been available at primary level.

- There is a general concern regarding the lack of evidence of the effectiveness of an external outreach provision, which is combined with some expressing difficulties in accessing this provision.
- Respondents who strongly opposed the proposals pointed out that demand was prevalent in Kirklees and that there were major problems with the existing referral process, parents have reported that they were never made aware of the provision.
- Respondents pointed out that changes should not be made to save money and that the needs of children should be the key consideration.
- Concern was raised that outreach staff could become de-skilled as they need to work in a specialist provision to gain knowledge, and would become isolated.

2.2 Following the four week term-time non-statutory consultation, and after analysis of the feedback received (this is detailed in Appendix C), the officer recommendations to Cabinet members are that:

- a) Approval is given for the statutory process to proceed to the next stage which is for the publication of a statutory notice and proposals (representation period) for the following proposals;

Moldgreen Community Primary School. *Discontinue the 10 transitional places for children with autism at Moldgreen Community Primary School.*

- b) **Thornhill J&I School.** *It should be noted that the school converted to become an Academy on 1st September 2016. As part of the conversion process the matter of discontinuance of the specialist provision was considered. By mutual agreement, the funding agreement signed between Focus Trust (the Multi Academy Trust that Thornhill J & I School has joined) and the Secretary of State, does not include any specialist provision places and therefore no further statutory process is required for this school. If the process of academisation had not taken place, member's approval would have been sought to move to the next stage of the statutory process also.*

Following the subsequent 4 week representation period, the proposal should be brought back to Cabinet for final decision regarding implementation of the proposals from 1st April 2017.

- c) Following the outcome of the consultation, time has been taken to reconsider and reshape the initial proposals regarding the following proposals:-

Ashbrow School. *Discontinue the 12 transitional places for children with Speech Language and Communication Needs at Ashbrow School.*

Primary outreach provision for Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism across Kirklees. *Proposal to increase resources to a centralised primary outreach provision 'hub' to serve the whole of Kirklees for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism.*

- d) Therefore, permission is sought to proceed to a 4 week period for an opportunity to seek expressions of interest for a primary school to host a combined 'Communication and Interaction' specialist provision with 12 transitional places plus outreach.

Following the 4 week 'expression of interest' period, the proposals should be brought back to Cabinet for further approval to proceed with 'recommissioning'.

3. Background

Work has been taking place since 2008 to look at the best way to meet the needs of children and young people in Kirklees who have special educational needs (SEN). Since then and following consultation, views have been given by a wide range of people, including head teachers, staff, governors, professionals and parents of children with SEN. Following the review, changes were agreed in 2012 and as part of this; the revised approach for specialist provision across the authority has been implemented.

Since the re-organisation of specialist provision for children with special educational needs was initially implemented, all specialist provisions are subject to Service Level Agreements that are reviewed regularly. Following a review of uptake as part of the monitoring of the Service Level Agreements, the need for some changes to be made to existing provisions were identified and detailed in a report to Kirklees Cabinet on the 2nd December 2014. These proposals were designed to improve existing arrangements for children in some specialist resource provisions in order to provide the best possible standards of care and education, to ensure resource was provided fairly to all Kirklees children with SEN and, to retain and improve services for children with special educational needs and their families.

4. The proposals

On 5th April 2016 Cabinet members authorised officers to develop plans for a consultation to make changes to the specialist provision for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism. The proposals that were consulted upon are;

- a) for the provision of 12 transitional places and outreach for children with speech, language and communication needs at Ashbrow School to be discontinued.
- b) for the provision of 12 transitional places for children with speech, language and communication needs and outreach at Thornhill J&I School to be discontinued.
- c) for the provision of 10 transitional places and outreach for children with autism at Moldgreen Community Primary School to be discontinued.

**Note – This proposal enables the legal closure of this specialist provision where there have been no children in transitional places since July 2014*

- d) to increase resources to a centralised primary outreach provision 'hub' to serve the whole of Kirklees for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism.

The rationale for bringing forward the proposals is because of the positive outcomes from outreach support in mainstream schools that supports children and young people to be supported in their local school, there is a reduced demand for transitional places for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism. It was proposed that the changes would be implemented from 1st December 2016.

4.1 The benefits of changes to specialist resource provisions.

By continually reviewing the specialist provision offer:-

- The overall pattern of specialist school provision in Kirklees gives a flexible range of provision and support that can respond to the needs of individual pupils and parental preferences, in a safe environment where young people can thrive in buildings and provision tailored to meet their special educational need or disability and which takes full account of educational considerations, in particular the need to ensure a broad and balanced curriculum, within a learning environment where children can be healthy and stay safe.
- Provide access to appropriately trained staff and access to specialist support and advice, so that individual pupils can have the fullest possible opportunities to make progress in their learning and participate in their local school and community.
- Supports the LA's strategy for making schools and settings more accessible to disabled children and young people and their scheme for promoting equality of opportunity for disabled people.
- Takes account of the original consultations with a wide range of stakeholders regarding the range of specialist provision in Kirklees.

5. Consultation methodology

5.1 A non-statutory consultation took place between 16th May 2016 and 17th June 2016. Consultation documents were written and produced with due regard to 'The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations April 2016' and with reference to the detail contained in the cabinet report from the 5th April 2016.

Consultation documents were made widely available. Documents were sent to the families of pupils at Ashbrow School & Thornhill Junior and Infant School. Documents were also sent to all school staff at Ashbrow School and Thornhill J&I School, and to the school governors at all schools affected by the proposals, Ashbrow School, Thornhill J&I School and Moldgreen Community Primary School.

Copies of the consultation document were also sent to Kirklees Special Schools, other Kirklees schools with specialist provisions, all elected members, trade union representatives, faith groups, neighbouring Local Authorities, local community groups and other teams affected within the Council. The consultation document was also made available on the Council's website, at the consultation event and by request. A complete list of distribution is attached at Appendix A.

During the consultation period more than 1,100 documents were distributed either via royal mail, schools, internal mail or at the consultation event. The documents and an online response form were available throughout the consultation period on the Kirklees webpage: www.kirklees.gov.uk/schoolorganisation

5.2 The consultation material consisted of the document included in Appendix B. - "Non Statutory consultation on proposals for: Changes to specialist provision for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism. Please tell us your views on our proposals"

The consultation document outlined the proposals for:

- a) Ashbrow School to discontinue the provision of 12 transitional places for children with SLCN.
- b) Thornhill J&I School to discontinue the provision of 12 transitional places for children with SLCN.
- c) Moldgreen Community Primary School to discontinue the provision of 10 transitional places for children with autism.
- d) To provide a Primary outreach provision for Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism across Kirklees.

The document detailed the proposed future provisions and the document had feedback forms for each of the 4 proposals that were designed to enable qualitative feedback, and questions to ascertain the type of stakeholder responding.

Forms could be completed in writing or electronically on the Council website. In addition, individuals were encouraged to feedback any additional views either via email or letter. A 'Freepost' address was available for returning paper forms and/or letters to maximise the opportunities for receiving feedback to the proposals.

5.3 A consultation 'drop-in session' for parents/carers and members of the community was held at Ashbrow School on 23rd May 2016. This was also an opportunity for staff and governors from Ashbrow School to discuss the proposals with officers from the Council's Learning Service.

The meeting was planned to enable individuals to speak with officers about the proposals in more detail (and in particular about the potential implications for them as individuals and their families).

Parents/carers and members of the community were invited to attend the consultation session.

Table 1 : Count of attendees at the drop-in event			
Date	Venue	Time	Number of attendees
23 rd May	Ashbrow School	16:30-18:00	26
Total			26

Further engagement has been held with the leadership of Thornhill J&I School and Moldgreen Community Primary School.

Throughout the consultation period further opinions and questions were recorded via a dedicated e-mail address (school.organisation@kirklees.gov.uk), by a freepost address and via telephone (01484 221000).

6. Response to consultation

Attached at Appendix C is a comprehensive report which details the responses received to the consultation and is organised by stakeholder.

6.1 Analysis of responses received

Table 2 : Count of responses received	
E-mail	0
On-line form	22
Response Sheet	17
Letters	0
Total	39

39 responses were received via the methods shown in Table 2 above from the range of respondents shown in Table 3 below. (Note: Some respondents are counted more than once in the main tables of responses by stakeholder, if they have declared more than one category).

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 3 (a) Type of respondent for Ashbrow School		
Respondent	Number of responses	% of responses
Parents/Carers	15	36%
Pupils	0	0%
Staff Members	12	29%
Governors	5	12%
Local Residents	2	5%
Other	4	9%
Not Stated	4	9%
42		

Some respondents have classified themselves as belonging to at least more than one stakeholder group and have therefore been counted in more than one group.

Table 3 (a) shows 36% of responses were from parents and carers, 29% of respondents were staff members and a further 12% were classified as governors.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 3 (b) Type of respondent for Thornhill J&I School		
Respondent	Number of responses	% of responses
Parents/Carers	14	41%
Pupils	0	0%
Staff Members	11	32%
Governors	4	12%
Local Residents	2	6%
Other	2	6%
Not Stated	1	3%
	34	

Some respondents have classified themselves as belonging to at least more than one stakeholder group and have therefore been counted in more than one group.

Table 3 (b) shows that 41% of responses were from parents and carers, 32% were from staff members and a further 12% were respondents classified as governors.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 3 (c) Type of respondent for Moldgreen Community Primary School		
Respondent	Number of responses	% of responses
Parents/Carers	14	41%
Pupils	0	0%
Staff Members	11	32%
Governors	4	12%
Local Residents	2	6%
Other	2	6%
Not Stated	1	3%
	34	

Some respondents have classified themselves as belonging to at least more than one stakeholder group and have therefore been counted in more than one group.

Table 3 (c) shows that 41% of responses were from parents, 32% were from staff members and a further 12% were respondents classified as governors.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 3 (d) Type of respondent for the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub		
Respondent	Number of responses	% of responses
Parents/Carers	14	41%
Pupils	0	0%
Staff Members	10	29%
Governors	4	12%
Local Residents	2	6%
Other	3	9%
Not Stated	1	3%
	34	

Some respondents have classified themselves as belonging to at least more than one stakeholder group and have therefore been counted in more than one group.

Table 3 (d) shows that 41% of responses were from parents and carers, 29% were from staff members and a further 12% were respondents classified as governors.

6.1.1 Summary of respondents by response type.

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 4 (a) Summary table by response type	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total
	3	0	2	1	30	2	38
	8%	0%	5%	3%	79%	5%	

***Note – Where respondents have been classified in more than one category, the total number of responses in this table have been counted only once.**

Table 4 (a) provides a summary of the responses received and is included in order that the overall level of support and opposition to the proposal can be clearly established, from the responses received.

Table 4 (a) shows that 8% of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposal. 5% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposal with 82% of respondents opposing or strongly opposing the proposal.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 4 (b) Summary table by response type	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	Oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total
	5	1	5	0	14	5	30
	17%	3%	17%	0%	46%	17%	

***Note – Where respondents have been classified in more than one category, the total number of responses in this table have been counted only once.**

Table 4(b) provides a summary of the responses received and is included in order that the overall level of support and opposition to the proposal can be clearly established, from the responses received.

Table 4(b) shows that 20% of respondents either supported or strongly supported the proposal. 17% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposal with 63% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal and 17% of respondents were categorised as “don't know”.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 4 (c) Summary table by response type	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	Oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total
	5	1	3	3	14	4	30
	17%	3%	10%	10%	47%	13%	

***Note – Where respondents have been classified in more than one category, the total number of responses in this table have been counted only once.**

Table 4(c) provides a summary of the responses received and is included in order that the overall level of support and opposition to the proposal can be clearly established, from the responses received.

Table 4(c) shows that 20% of respondents either supported or strongly supported the proposal. 10% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposal with 57% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 4 (d) Summary table by response type	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	Oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total
	4	2	6	3	12	3	30
	13%	7%	20%	10%	40%	10%	

***Note – Where respondents have been classified in more than one category, the total number of responses in this table have been counted only once.**

Table 4(d) provides a summary of the responses received and is included in order that the overall level of support and opposition to the proposal can be clearly established, from the responses received.

Table 4(d) shows that 20% of respondents either supported or strongly supported the proposal. 20% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposal with 50% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal and 10% of respondents were categorised as “don't know”.

6.1.2 Responses from parents/carers

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 5 (a) Responses of parents/carers with pupils at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School					4		4	25%
Ashbrow & Royds Hall Schools					1		1	7%
Castle Hill School					1		1	7%
Farnley Tyas First School					1		1	7%
Honley High Schools					1		1	7%
Lindley Infant School					1		1	7%
Meltham Moor Primary School			1				1	7%
Royds Hall Community School					1		1	7%
Shaw Cross J&I School					1		1	7%
Thornhill J&I School	1				1		2	12%
Not-stated						1	1	7%
Total	1	0	1	0	12	1	15	
	7%	0%	7%	0%	79%	7%		

- Table 5 (a) shows the distribution of responses from parents/carers, 15 responses were received.
- 7% of this group of respondents strongly support the proposal, 7% neither support or oppose the proposal, with 79% strongly opposing the proposal.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 5 (b) Responses of parents/carers with pupils at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Ashbrow School	1		1		1		3	23%
Ashbrow & Royds Hall Schools					1		1	7%
Castle Hill School					1		1	7%
Farnley Tyas First School					1		1	7%
Honley High Schools			1				1	7%
Lindley Infant School					1		1	7%
Meltham Moor Primary School			1				1	7%
Royds Hall Community School					1		1	7%
Shaw Cross J&I School					1		1	7%
Thornhill J&I School	1				1		2	14%
Not stated						1	1	7%
Total	2	0	3	0	8	1	14	
	14%	0%	22%	0%	57%	7%		

- Table 5 (b) shows the distribution of responses from parents/carers, which included 14 responses in total.
- 57% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal, 14% of parents/carers strongly supported or supported the proposal, and 22% neither supporting nor opposing the proposal.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 5 (c) Responses of parents/carers with pupils at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School	1			1	1		3	22%
Ashbrow & Royds Hall Schools					1		1	8%
Castle Hill School					1		1	8%
Farnley Tyas First School		1					1	8%
Honley High Schools			1				1	8%
Lindley Infant School					1		1	8%
Meltham Moor Primary School			1				1	8%
Royds Hall Community School					1		1	8%
Shaw Cross J&I School					1		1	8%
Thornhill J&I School	1				1		2	14%
Total	2	1	2	1	7	0	13	
	15%	8%	15%	8%	54%	0%		

- Table 5 (c) shows the distribution of responses from parents/carers, 13 responses were received.
- 23% of this group of respondents strongly supporting or supporting the proposal, with 62% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 5 (d) Responses of parents/carers with pupils at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Ashbrow School			1			2	3	22%
Ashbrow & Royds Hall Schools				1			1	7%
Castle Hill School			1				1	7%
Farnley Tyas First School		1					1	7%
Honley High Schools			1				1	7%
Lindley Infant School			1				1	7%
Meltham Moor Primary School	1						1	7%
Royds Hall Community School					1		1	7%
Shaw Cross J&I School					1		1	7%
Thornhill J&I School	1		1				2	15%
Not stated						1	1	7%
Total	2	1	5	1	2	3	14	
	14%	7%	35%	7%	14%	23%		

- Table 5 (d) shows the distribution of responses from parents/carers, 14 responses were received.
- 21% of this group of respondents strongly supporting or supporting the proposal, with 21% opposing or strongly opposing the proposal.

6.1.3 Responses from Staff.

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 6 (a) Responses from individual staff at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School					8		8	73%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	9%
Not stated			1		1		2	18%
	1	0	1	0	9	0	11	
	9%	0%	9%	0%	82%	0%		

- Table 6(a) shows the distribution of responses from individual staff members from various schools. A total of 11 responses received from staff members. 9% strongly supported or supported the proposal. 82% of these respondents strongly opposed the proposal.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 6 (b) Responses from individual staff at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	Strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Ashbrow School	1		1		4	2	8	73%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	9%
Not Stated		1	1				2	18%
	2	1	2	0	4	2	11	
	18%	10%	18%	0%	36%	18%		

- Table 6(b) shows the distribution of responses from individual staff members from various schools. A total of 11 responses were received. 28% strongly supported or supported the proposal with 36% strongly opposing the proposal.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 6 (c) Responses from individual staff at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	Strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School	1			1	5	1	8	73%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	9%
Not stated				2			2	18%
	2	0	0	3	5	1	11	
	18%	0%	0%	27%	46%	9%		

- Table 6(c) shows the distribution of responses from individual staff members from various schools. A total of 11 responses were received. 18% strongly supported the proposal and 73% opposed or strongly opposed the proposal.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 6 (d) Responses from individual staff at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	Strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School				1	5	1	7	70%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	10%
Not stated		1		1			2	20%
	1	1	0	2	5	1	10	
	10%	10%	0%	20%	50%	10%		

- Table 6(d) shows the distribution of responses from individual staff members from various schools. A total of 10 responses were received. 20% strongly supported or support the proposal and 70% opposed or strongly opposed the proposal.

6.1.4 Responses from Governors.

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 7 (a) Responses from governors at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School					3		3	60%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	20%
Not stated				1			1	20%
	1	0	0	1	3	0	5	
	20%	0%	0%	20%	60%	0%		

- Table 7(a) shows responses from Governors. A total of 5 responses were received. 20% of governors strongly supported the proposal and 80% of governors responded opposed or strongly opposed the proposal.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 7 (b) Responses from governors at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School			1		1	1	3	75%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	35%
	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	
	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%	25%		

- Table 7(b) shows responses from Governors. A total of 4 responses were received, with 25% strongly supporting the proposal and 25% strongly opposing the proposal. The low number of responses should be noted.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 7 (c) Responses from governors at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School			1	1		1	3	75%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	25%
	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	
	25%	0%	25%	25%	0%	25%		

- Table 7(c) shows responses from Governors. A total of 4 responses were received, with 25% strongly supporting the proposal and 25% stating 'don't know'. The low number of responses should be noted.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 7 (d) Responses from governors at	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	total	
Ashbrow School					2	1	3	75%
Thornhill J&I School	1						1	25%
	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	
	25%	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%		

- Table 7(d) shows responses from Governors. A total of 4 responses were received, with 25% strongly supporting the proposal and 50% strongly opposing the proposal. The low number of responses should be noted.

6.1.5 Responses from Other respondents, Local Residents and respondents not stated.

Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Table 8(a) Responses from other respondents	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Local Residents					2		2	20%
Other respondents					3	1	4	40%
Not stated					4		4	40%
	0	0	0	0	9	1	10	
	0%	0%	0%	0%	90%	10%		

- Table 8 (a) shows responses from other respondents including Local Residents. A total of 10 responses were received of which 90% strongly opposed the proposal.

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Table 8(b) Responses from other respondents	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Local Residents					2		2	40%
Other respondents			1			1	2	40%
Not stated			1				1	20%
	0	0	2	0	2	1	5	
	0%	0%	40%	0%	40%	20%		

- Table 8 (b) shows responses from other respondents including Local Residents. A total of 5 responses were received of which 40% strongly opposed the proposal.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Table 8(c) Responses from other respondents	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Local Residents					2		2	40%
Other respondents				1		1	2	40%
Not stated					1		1	20%
	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	
	0%	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%		

- Table 8(c) shows responses from other respondents including Local Residents. A total of 5 responses were received of which 60% strongly opposed the proposal.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Table 8(d) Responses from other respondents	strongly support	support	neither support nor oppose	oppose	strongly oppose	don't know	Total	
Local Residents					1	1	2	34%
Other respondents					2	1	3	50%
Not stated			1				1	16%
	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	
	0%	0%	17%	0%	50%	33%		

- Table 8(d) shows responses from other respondents including Local Residents. A total of 6 responses were received of which 50% strongly opposed the proposal.

6.2 Key themes from the consultation responses.

The feedback from the consultation features the following themes.

6.2.1. Impact of the loss of dedicated support
Summary response
Respondents who strongly opposed the proposals at Ashbrow were concerned about the impact that the loss of dedicated support would have on children with SLCN. Respondents are worried that this will see the children becoming less of a priority, struggling within a mainstream setting and that the lack of support will mean they may be labelled as ‘disruptive’ with behavioural problems.
Officer commentary
<p>The existing outreach support offer to all mainstream schools has been in place since the implementation of the reorganisation of specialist SEN provision in 2013. Prior to this time there was no specialist outreach support available from what was at the time the one LA dedicated provision (Ashbrow). The outreach support offered since 2013 has meant that many children have been able to benefit from the team’s expertise whilst continuing to attend their local mainstream schools. Outreach support has meant that many schools across Kirklees have been able to better meet the needs of children with SLCN. This was a key principle underpinning the reorganisation of specialist provision in 2013, to enable more children to have their needs met within their local school. This principle is consistent with the SEND Code of Practice 2014 which clearly outlines the responsibilities of mainstream schools with regard to identifying special educational needs.</p> <p>There will be no loss of dedicated support given that existing staff will be accommodated within the new model in order to ensure existing skills and expertise within primary SLCN specialist provision are retained. Staff already working within the system will continue to deliver support to children in their local schools as they have done since the implementation of the SEN review in 2013. The lack of take up of places at Ashbrow and Thornhill has meant that staff working as part of the specialist team have been able to direct a significant amount of time towards supporting Kirklees mainstream schools through the outreach offer to better meet the needs of children with SLCN. Over the last 2 years the team have responded to 165 referrals offering varying levels of support on a flexible basis according to the needs of the child and the setting attended. This support has ranged from consultation visits to more intensive and regular support as determined by the individual case. This will continue.</p>
Summary response
Children with the most complex SLCN require intense therapy and support on a one-to-one basis several times per week, many respondents are concerned that outreach does not address the needs of these children. Respondents felt the children will suffer from a loss of close relationships with support staff who they trust and who they depend upon. A generalised solution will not work for some children. A lack of a feeling of security affects behaviour.
Officer commentary
<p>Children with complex SLCN needs can access speech and language therapy services whilst attending mainstream schools. Centring additional SALT support around one school may be highly beneficial to the very small number of children accessing a transitional placement at that school, however it creates an inequity of</p>

provision for those children with similar levels or even greater levels of need who remain in their local school.

Specialist provision and SALT services work together where they are both involved with a child, however they are different services and as such, have a different offer. SALT give a diagnostic report of the child's needs often with recommendations for how these needs can be supported in school. The specialist provision teams are educationalists who identify barriers to learning for children with SLCN who support schools to put interventions into place which remove or minimise those barriers to learning and advice on what specific strategies and resources can be used to support these. Many children referred to specialist provision outreach do not have SALT involvement, often because they do not meet the thresholds for SALT assessment or continued SALT involvement post assessment. In those cases where SALTs are involved the outreach team will support schools to implement the recommendations made by speech therapy within the learning setting, advising on strategies and specific approaches. The responsibility on mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with SEND is clearly documented in the Code of Practice 2014. The Code is clear that therapists have important and specific roles in supporting children and young people with SEN or disabilities, working directly with children and young people, advising and training education staff and setting programmes for implementation at home and in school (para 3.63). It is anticipated that this is determined by the child's needs rather than being specific to particular schools or types of schools.

In terms of a 'one size fits all' notion, support offered through any aspect of specialist provision, regardless of strand of need, is based on a flexible offer which takes into account the child's needs, the learning environment and the support required. In terms of outreach, responses to referrals vary tremendously based on this. For example, some referrals may only require one visit to advise staff on particular strategies whereas another case may require more frequent visits to model ways of working to the key adults in the child's school, undertake some direct work with the child and offer follow up support and advice as necessary. The aim of outreach is to ensure that individual children's needs are met and to build up the skills of staff in the local school where children already have secure relationships with familiar adults and established friendship groups in a setting within their local community.

There are 3 children remaining at Ashbrow who will be supported by existing staff.

Summary response

The permanent closure of the specialist provisions removes parental choice, there are children who have been refused a place at Headlands as there is no space.

Officer commentary

Places are reduced for children with complex ASD as a result of the closure of Moldgreen. There are 6 places at Headlands for children who have complex ASD. Places are agreed as part of the statutory SEN statement/EHCP review processes. Whilst the closure of Moldgreen has reduced the number of places available, the staffing resource released has been utilised to support children more effectively in their local schools. There is no evidence to indicate that children have been refused a place as a consequence of the request being made following the statement/EHCP review.

6.2.2. Lack of continuity of dedicated provision between nursery and high school

Summary response

Respondents showed concern that the Ashbrow proposal will mean a loss of dedicated provision at Primary level in South Kirklees and that this doesn't make sense when there will still be provision available at Royds Hall for Secondary age students, especially as this is now an all-through school. Respondents raised concerns regarding impact on social skills, the effect on academic achievements and progress in speech therapy.

Officer commentary

The proposal to reallocate primary SLCN 'places' based resources to increase the outreach support is based on the low number of children taking up places. Children accessing specialist provision primary places in all strands at primary level is lower than those accessing places at secondary school, for a number of reasons. The way primary schools are organised and the particular environment are more conducive to meeting complex needs. For example, children largely remain in one room with one teacher who knows the child very well. This changes significantly at high school where children need to move around for lessons and have contact with many more teachers in an environment where there is an increased complexity of language and social situations which can result in anxieties and an increase in gaps in learning without specialist support. As such, requests for places in specialist provision high schools or even special schools increase significantly at the primary to high school transition points. The majority of children accessing KS3 specialist provision places at Royds Hall are from their local mainstream schools and have been both prior to and after the reorganisation of provision. This indicates that there are children with complex SLCN whose needs are met effectively within local mainstream primary school provision with outreach support up until the end of KS2. Royds Hall is not currently an all-through school as it goes up to Y2 at present at Primary level, this will build up year on year.

Summary response

A lack of early intervention and prevention could potentially mean it is too late to deal with SLCN at high school age if this has not been addressed at primary level as needs will be much greater.

Officer commentary

By its very nature, a key function of outreach is to ensure specialist support is available at the earliest opportunity. As soon as a child is identified as having SLCN, the school can make a referral to the specialist provision outreach team and have a response within 2 weeks. This response includes an array of support, for example, building the capacity of mainstream schools to enable them to better meet need, providing training for schools on identifying SLCN, targeted interventions for individual children, environmental audits, language friendly classrooms, etc. This support is geared towards supporting the delivery of quality first teaching for all children and ensuring appropriate differentiation and personalised support is available where needed. SENCO Champions highlighted a cohort of children who have SLCN along with a range of other often more significant difficulties which require a different type of provision from purely SLCN. SENCOs suggested that this cohort of children challenge schools the most and identified a lack of specific specialist provision places for this group of children. It was felt that some of these children may have underlying SLCN that have gone unidentified at an earlier age, and it was

acknowledged that the outreach support now offered can help with this in terms of supporting schools with developing robust early identification processes so that children can be supported earlier which may prevent additional problems arising later. They also felt that for some children, the overlap of a range of difficulties, one of which may be SLCN meant that a more holistic approach was needed to tackle presenting needs around social communication skills and challenging behaviour and that a refocus of a primary provision from singly 'SLCN' to 'communication and interaction' would better accommodate this more complex cohort of children whilst at the same time cater for children with complex SLCN or ASD.

6.2.3. Effectiveness of outreach provision and level of demand for places

Summary response

There is a general concern regarding the lack of evidence of the effectiveness of an external outreach provision, combined with the apparent difficulties in accessing this provision. Many respondents made points about the ability of mainstream school teaching staff to follow through on advice and guidance from outreach support, and whether they have the time and skills required to effectively support the child.

Officer commentary

In the evaluation of the Specialist Provision Primary SLCN Outreach (2015/16) (See Appendix F) schools indicate clearly the positive impact for pupils, staff and in whole school improvement.

In terms of impact on the child referred for outreach support, schools report improved outcomes, reduced anxieties, children happier to come to school, improved behaviour, increased engagement in class, adaptations to the environment and other changes having positive impact on student development.

In terms of impact of outreach support on key staff, schools report positive impact, for example, increased confidence, staff are re-assured by advice, increased knowledge, support in trying out new strategies, advice on resources, increased confidence to speak to parents about their child, helpful training and staff development, increased staff awareness about more complex needs, confidence in planning for more complex needs.

With regard to impact of outreach on the whole school, positive impact was indicated; from general and specific training for all staff, increased knowledge and confidence in meeting needs of the children, sharing good practice, using advice to cascade to other staff, improvement in the school environment, supported children to meet and exceed their expected progress, support with writing reports and My Support Plans, support and training for new staff, consistency of practice across school.

Summary response

Respondents who strongly opposed the proposals pointed out that the demand for such services was prevalent in Kirklees and that there were major problems with the existing referral process, in some cases parents have reported that they were never made aware of the provision. There are comments raised to challenge the apparent 'low level of demand' and that this is a false representation due to the low level of referral and lack of promotion of the provision.

Officer commentary

Referral for specialist provision support is largely school based however there is an option for parents to contact the service directly which is referred to in information on

the Local Offer. Over the past 2 years there have been 604 referrals to Specialist Provision from schools, of which 165 were responded to by SLCN. SENCO feedback confirms speed of response following referral as well as the ease of the referral process. In terms of access to transitional places, these are managed through the statutory statement/EHCP review processes. This ensures that only those children with the most complex needs who have undergone a period of intensive outreach support where, as part of the review process, there is a recommendation that a transitional place at a specialist provision school be considered by the local authority. The provision is referred to on the Local Offer as well as provision school websites. At the time of its implementation it was promoted to schools. There have been regular promotion events at SENCONET meetings for schools as well as it being included in the training for new SENCOs.

Summary response

A full ICAN provision at Ashbrow shows that there is demand and need and that the provision has shown excellent progress for those children over time.

Officer commentary

The aim of ICAN provision is to provide intensive specialist early intervention to children aged 3-4 (or almost 3) with specific speech and language impairment. Children attend between 2-5 sessions per week for up to 3 terms. At the point of transition to local mainstream provision, ICAN offer support and outreach if needed. ICAN is not intended as a precursor to placement at specialist provision given that it is a short term pre-school provision.

Summary response

It's a long way for children in South Kirklees to travel to Headlands if they do need a transitional place. This means an inequality of provision across the district.

Officer commentary

The closure of Moldgreen does mean that any children with ASD requiring a transitional specialist provision placement living in the south of the borough may have a longer journey dependent upon their location in Kirklees. Setting up a specialist provision school to cater for such a potential small number of children may not be deemed cost efficient particularly when the primary ASD outreach team provide significant support to this group of children. Over the past year however specialist services have been aware of an increasing cohort of young people who display a range of complex needs including those with ASD and with identified SLCN.

These young people are often displaying a complex range of behaviours which are challenging to the mainstream school and place them at risk of exclusion. For some of these children, even after extensive outreach, a number of young people are unable to successfully access a mainstream school.

Schools have identified that the expectations for these young people with identified complex needs can often result in them having overwhelming levels of anxieties and /or challenging behaviours which mainstream schools are unable to manage as effectively as is required. For these young people support is required which can quickly and efficiently respond to their needs in a timely way which equips the young person with the necessary skill set to regulate them emotionally and specifically address their identified SEN needs. This is consistent with feedback from SENCO Champions referred to above (See Appendix D).

6.2.4 Moldgreen Community Primary School – Discontinue the transitional places for children with autism

Summary response

Children with autism need plainer environments where they are not over-stimulated and are constant, mainstream schools cannot offer this.

Officer commentary

Specialist ASD outreach offers a package of individual support for pupils in mainstream schools which allows many young people with ASD to be successfully supported in their local mainstream school and schools welcome and value this support. The team work with mainstream schools to ensure an environment conducive to learning for children with ASD. This is provided through an environmental audit which enables key sensory areas to be identified and adaptations made to support the young person with ASD. Outreach supports settings to link individualised education programmes to the core characteristics of ASD and identify key areas with which pupils may require additional support. This will include modifying procedures and practices to accommodate needs of pupils with ASD, e.g. time out periods, work spaces in and out of the classroom, safe spaces, one to one teaching where appropriate, use of visuals, activities for unstructured times, etc. There are a high number of children with ASD in mainstream schools who are successfully having their needs met.

6.2.5 Provision of a centralised Primary Outreach ‘hub’

Summary response

Respondents who strongly opposed the proposals pointed out that changes should not be made to save money and that the needs of children should be the key consideration.

Officer commentary

This will not save money. The money will be directed to other parts of the specialist provision structure where there is a need, thereby showing a more cost effective use of resources targeted at areas where additional capacity is required.

Summary response

Outreach is useful at a lower level of need, but not as a replacement. Support needs to be consistent, regular and familiar.

Officer commentary

Outreach operates at a variety of different levels from light touch to intensive. Where specialist staff are allocated to a case, they remain with the case for as long as is necessary. There are a number of complex cases which specialist provision outreach teams are involved with which do require regular and intensive involvement. The outreach model provides flexibility to do this.

Summary response

The closure of these units is not about lack of uptake, but how hard it is to get a place.

Officer commentary

Placement is determined through the statutory SEN review processes for children with a statement or an education, health and care plan. Schools are in receipt of additional funding for these children and have a responsibility to ensure that this funding specifically targets the individual needs of the child. The expectation is that children will have undergone a period of intensive outreach support prior to being

considered for a transitional place. This is to ensure that resources already available to schools are used as efficiently and effectively as possible prior to a request for a more costly provision.

Summary response

SLCN and autism are different – centralising them is wrong. Outreach will not work for children with complex needs, they need experienced staff at all times.

Officer commentary

There are many children in mainstream schools with very complex needs, the most complex of whom have a statement or education, health and care plan which provides school with additional funding to meet need. Schools utilise this funding to ensure familiar staff work alongside such children to deliver targeted interventions aimed at areas of need. Part of this involves schools ensuring that staff working with children with SEND have access to training and support. Outreach support is there to provide advice and support around targeted interventions and to build the capacity in schools to put this into place. There are a large number of children whose needs are not isolated to one area and there is considerable overlap between ASD and SLCN. Children with SLCN may have difficulties with understanding and formulating spoken language, processing and producing speech sounds or using and understanding all aspects of language appropriately in different contexts. The impact of both SLCN and ASD on social interaction and social and emotional development is well documented – both groups are at risk of having problems with peer relationships and prosocial skills and of developing emotional problems. Any provision for these two groups needs to take into account this overlap and ensure a focus on individual needs rather than diagnostic groups. This provision needs to take into account their likelihood of needing support to develop peer relationships and prosocial skills as well as language and their increased risk for emotional problems. The overlap between SLCN and ASD indicates that the determination of needs requires careful assessment to identify their profiles of strengths and weaknesses with regard to different aspects of speech, language and communication as well as behavioural, emotional and social difficulties.

This overlap has been highlighted by the referrals received into both the ASD and SLCN strands where requests for outreach support for the 2 categories often mirror one another in respect of the nature of difficulties, presenting needs and this information has guided which team respond rather than a label. As a consequence of this, there have been a number of children referred to the ASD strand which have been allocated to the SLCN outreach team for support. Where this has happened, feedback from schools has continued to be positive. Where specific strand support is required this has continued to be available however it is important that this flexibility remains given that the most effective way of utilising local authority resources has to be based on presenting needs.

Summary response

Outreach staff will become de-skilled as they need to work in a specialist provision to gain knowledge, they will become isolated.

Officer commentary

Given the wide ranging needs of children referred for support, outreach teams are constantly reviewing and researching new ideas and methods in order to ensure the most effective interventions and advice is available to meet the needs of children. As such, they are constantly building upon their own skills and expertise in order to build up the skills of staff they work with in mainstream schools and ensure interventions are tailored to children's specific needs. The vast amount of their time is spent in

schools and as a team they are far from isolated as they have strong links with other services in education, health and social care, working in partnership to ensure a joined up and consistent approach and the sharing of good practice.

6.3 Summary of the consultation responses

For the complete detail of stakeholder responses please see Appendix C.

The main conclusions to be drawn from the responses to the consultation are:

- **Ashbrow School.** There was a mixed response to this proposal, however a significant majority strongly opposed the proposal. The majority of responses came from parents and carers and staff members.
- **Thornhill J&I School.** The majority of responses received across all stakeholder groups strongly opposed the proposals. The majority of respondents were parents and carers and staff members.
- **Moldgreen Community Primary School.** There was a mixed response to this proposal, however the majority strongly opposed the proposal. The majority of responses came from parents and carers and staff members.
- **Provision of centralised primary outreach 'hub'**
The majority of respondents to the proposal were identified as parents and carers and staff members, with most respondents neither supporting nor opposing, strongly opposing or opposing the proposal.

6.4 Further engagement following the consultation

To explore in more detail some of the themes that arose from the non-statutory consultation, further engagement was carried out with SENCO Champions. A session was held to discuss concerns that had emerged as part of the consultation process on Tuesday 20th September, at 11am held at Grange Moor Primary School. 5 SENCOs attended (see Appendix D for notes of the meeting). These discussions have influenced the proposed next steps.

In addition, an evaluation form (See Appendix E) was sent to all the Primary Schools that had requested SLCN outreach last year. This was titled "The Effectiveness of Primary SLCN Outreach", 66 Evaluation forms were sent to schools, 22 schools had returned a response by the closing date, see Appendix F for a breakdown of responses. This feedback has been invaluable in shaping the proposed next steps.

7. Proposed approach following the non-statutory consultation

Taking into consideration the consultation responses along with feedback from schools, in order to enhance the positively evaluated current outreach provision, officers recommend a new 'commission' of a primary specialist provision which

would offer 12 transitional places and outreach to cater for children with complex Communication and Interaction needs that are impacting significantly upon their social development and emotional wellbeing.

This means that a process to identify a host school for the proposed provision would need to take place. It is acknowledged that this would require interim arrangements and as part of this transitional phase, support arrangements for children currently accessing a place at Ashbrow School have been discussed and agreed with school senior leaders, as has the proposal for the new commission outlined above.

8. Equalities Impact Assessment

The Equality Act 2010 places the Council under a duty - the Public Sector Equality Duty to have due regard to the need to achieve equality objectives when carrying out its functions. An initial Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out on the proposals. The following is a short initial analysis of the likely changes arising from the revised proposals.

The initial assessment showed that implementation of the proposals is likely to have little impact. Following the updates made to the EIA after the non-statutory consultation, impact was reduced, although this would continue to be revised as appropriate in light of any further matters being raised, should the completion of the subsequent stages of the statutory process be approved by Cabinet. No adverse impacts are highlighted as part of this proposal. The EIA can be found here:-

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/youkmc/deliveringServices/impactAssessments/impactassessments.asp>

9. Implications for the council

9.1. Council priorities

Council policies affected by this proposal include the Children & Young People Plan. The proposals will support the Council priorities which are to;

- **Enhance life chances for young people:** Working in partnership to improve health and educational attainment to enable them to reach their full potential. The proposals offer the opportunity to continue to improve and enhance the overall educational opportunities and achievements of young people in Kirklees.
- **Support older people to be healthy, active and involved in their communities:** Focusing on preventative work, while empowering those with long term conditions to live independent lives to the full and be in control of making their own decisions.
- **Business growth and jobs:** Creating the right conditions for business to sustain the Kirklees economy, facilitating investment in skills, jobs and homes and providing pathways into work.
- **Provide effective and productive services:** Ensuring services are focused on the needs of the community and delivering excellent value for money.

9.2. Human Resources implications

There are human resources implications resulting from these proposals. Should the proposals be agreed, officers would work with the governing bodies and head teachers regarding any necessary revision to structures to provide professional and technical support. However, in terms of the existing provisions there are anticipated to be no outstanding issues, with all staffing expected to be resolved through deployment or alternative posts.

9.3. Financial Implications

Revenue

The education budget that the Council receives from government known as the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) can only be spent on education – so the proposals have no revenue impact for the Council. Specialist school places are funded from the “high needs block” of the DSG and the number of places now has to be formally agreed with the Education Funding Agency (EFA) each year. Schools also receive ‘top-up’ funding on a per pupil basis which relates to standard support needs and the school setting.

Capital

It is not envisaged that there would be any capital implications arising from all the proposals if agreed and implemented.

9.4. Information technology (IT) implications

There are no IT implications in relation to this report.

10. Consultees and their opinions

The consultation has engaged with a wide range of interested parties including; families of pupils, school staff, governors, healthcare professionals, members of the community and elected members. The full range of stakeholders that were provided with consultation materials is detailed in Appendix A.

11. Next steps

The table below shows what has happened to date and the next steps and indicative timescales involved in the reorganisation of specialist provision should cabinet approve the officer recommendations.

Table 9 – Steps of the statutory process and indicative timescales	
Activity	Date
Cabinet approval for statutory consultation	April 2016
Non Statutory consultation	May-June 2016
Cabinet consider report on consultation outcomes and decide next steps	15 th November 2016
Publication of notices and representation period (for Moldgreen Community School Only) AND Seeking expressions of interest for a primary school to host a combined 'Communication and Interaction' specialist provision.	November-December 2016
Bring back to Cabinet the outcome of the expression of interest period with a view to recommission a Communication and Interaction specialist provision and publish notice and proposals for Ashbrow School and the host school	February 2017*
Decision by Cabinet (within 2 Months) (Moldgreen Community School Only)	February 2017*
Implementation (Moldgreen Community School only) starts from	1 st April 2017*
Decision by Cabinet (within 2 Months) (Ashbrow and the proposed host school)	May 2017*
Implementation (Ashbrow School and new host school) starts from	1 st July 2017*

*Timescales are indicative and are subject to change

12. Officer recommendation and reasons

Members are requested to:

Note the feedback in response to the non-statutory consultation and the officer commentary that address the concerns and issues that have been raised and in light of that feedback:

a) **Moldgreen Community Primary School**

Approve that officers publish the statutory proposals and notices to discontinue the 10 transitional places for children with autism.

Following the subsequent 4 week representation period, the proposal should be brought back to Cabinet for final decision regarding implementation of the proposals from 1st April 2017.

b) Thornhill Junior and Infant School.

Note that the school converted to become an Academy on 1st September 2016. As part of the conversion process the matter of discontinuance of the specialist provision was considered. By mutual agreement, the funding agreement signed between Focus Trust (the Multi Academy Trust that Thornhill J&I School has joined) and the Secretary of State, does not include any specialist provision places and therefore no further statutory process is required for this school

- c) Following the outcome of the consultation, time has been taken to reconsider and reshape the initial proposals regarding the following proposals;

Ashbrow School. *Discontinue the 12 transitional places for children with Speech Language and Communication Needs at Ashbrow School.*

In order to commission;

- d) **Primary outreach provision for Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism across Kirklees.** *Proposal to increase resources to a centralised primary outreach provision 'hub' to serve the whole of Kirklees for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism.*

Permission is to be sought to proceed to a 4 week period of opportunity for expressions of interest for a school to host a combined 'Communication and Interaction' specialist provision with 12 transitional places.

Following the 4 week 'expressions of interest' period, the proposals should be brought back to Cabinet for further approval to proceed with recommissioning.

- e) Note the next steps and timescales for the subsequent stage of the statutory process and that a final decision would be required by Cabinet as the decision maker following the representation period.
- f) Request that officers carry out preliminary and preparatory work with parents, governing bodies and staff to enable a successful implementation, if the proposals are finally agreed, by engaging relevant parties as widely as possible in planning the changes in order to build confidence in the future specialist resource provisions in mainstream schools.

13. Cabinet portfolio holder's recommendations

We have welcomed all of the responses and representations received as part of the consultation process. This has given parents and carers, school staff, governors and a range of other interested parties the opportunity to feedback their views about the proposed changes to these particular specialist provisions for children with special educational needs in Kirklees.

In light of the feedback that has been received, it has been important for us to take the time to consider carefully the views that have been expressed and are grateful to those who have engaged and contributed their comments and suggestions. The feedback has influenced changes to be made to the original proposals.

Ongoing engagement with all stakeholders is valued and will be critical to ensure the very best use of resources and support is available for our children across Kirklees.

We are keen that the highest quality provision is available fairly to all children with special educational needs/Education, health and care plans (EHCP) across Kirklees to ensure that they have the very best educational experience. It is for these reasons that we support the officer recommendations to move to the next stage of the statutory process for Moldgreen Community School, and, to seek expressions of interest from primary schools to host a Communication and Interaction provision with outreach that can support young people, wherever possible to say in their local school.

We will be keen to receive further updates following both of these processes.

14. Contact officers

Jo-Anne Sanders
Deputy Assistant Director-Learning and Skills: LA Statutory Duties
Tel: 01484 221000
Email: jo-anne.sanders@kirklees.gov.uk

Mandy Cameron
Deputy Assistant Director - Learning and Skills: Vulnerable Children and Groups
Tel: 01484 221000
Email: mandy.cameron@kirklees.gov.uk

Assistant Director
Gill Ellis
Assistant Director for Learning and Skills
Directorate for Children and Adults
Tel: 01484 221000
Email: gill.ellis@kirklees.gov.uk

15. Background papers

- Report Prepared by Cambridge Education April 2008 : Kirklees Council - Review of the Arrangements for Special Educational Needs in the Children & Young People Service
- Cabinet Report: 28th September 2010 - Specialist Provision for Disabled Children and those with Special Educational Needs

- Cabinet Report: 21st June 2011 - Report on the outcomes of the non-statutory consultation on the proposals for the future organisation of specialist provision for disabled children and those with special educational needs across Kirklees
- Cabinet Report: 13th March 2012 - Report on the representations received from the published Statutory Notices on the proposals for the future organisation of specialist provision for disabled children and those with special educational needs across Kirklees.
- Cabinet Report: 2nd December 2014 - Report requesting approval to carry out a non-statutory consultation on proposed changes to existing specialist provisions at Moldgreen Community Primary School, Flatts Nursery School, Thornhill Junior & Infant School, Rawthorpe St. James (CE) VC I&N School and Rawthorpe Junior School.
- Cabinet Report: 5th April 2016 - Report requesting approval to carry out a non-statutory consultation on proposed changes to specialist provision at Ashbrow School, Thornhill Junior & Infant School & Moldgreen Community Primary School for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism.

Distribution list:

List of consultees		
Kirklees Council Officers	Chief Executive – Adrian Lythgo Director for economy skills and the environment – Jacqui Gedman Director for resources – David Smith Director for children and adults – Sarah Callaghan Director for communities, transformation and change – Ruth Redfern Director for public health – Richard Parry Assistant director for learning - Gill Ellis Assistant director for personalisation and commissioning – Keith Smith Assistant director for family support & child protection –Carly Speechley Assistant director for well-being and integration – Sue Richards Director of public health – Rachel Spencer-Henshall	
Kirklees Councillors	Ashbrow Dalton Dewsbury South	Councillor Jean Calvert Councillor Amanda Pinnock Councillor Ken Smith Councillor Musarrat Khan Councillor Naheed Mather Councillor Peter McBride Councillor Masood Ahmed Councillor Nosheen Dad Councillor Abdul Patel
Dioceses	Diocese Of Leeds Diocese Of Wakefield	
Further Education Collages	Greenhead College Huddersfield New Collage Kirklees College	
HR	Head of HR HR manager School Governor service	
Choice Advice	Parent Partnership	
University	University of Huddersfield	
MP's	Jason McCartney MP Paula Sherriff MP Barry Sherman MP	
DfE	School Organisation Unit	
Neighbouring La's	Barnsley Council..... Barnsley Council..... Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council..... Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council..... City Of Bradford Metropolitan District Council..... City Of Bradford Metropolitan District Council..... Leeds City Council..... Leeds City Council..... Oldham Council..... Wakefield Metropolitan District Council..... Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.....	School Organisation Assistant Head of Infrastructure for Learning and Care (Access) School Organisation Director Of children's Services Director of children's services Principle research & policy Director of children services Education Leeds Assistant Executive Director Director Of children's Services School Organisation
The Children's Trust Board Members	Calderdale & Hudds NHS Foundation Trust Kirklees Active Leisure National Children's Centre Calderdale & Kirklees Careers Primary Pupil Referral Service The Mid Yorkshire Hospitals	

	<p>NHS Kirklees University of Huddersfield West Yorkshire Police West Yorks Fire & Rescue Authority Kirklees College North Kirklees Clinical Commissioning Group Clinical Commissioning Group Children & Adults Services Locala Community Partnerships Job Centre Plus South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS West Yorkshire Probation Trust</p>	
Unions	<p>AEP ASCL ASPECT ATL GMB NAHT NASUWT NUT UNISON UNITE VOICE THE UNION</p>	
Parent / guardian's of pupils at :	<p>Ashbrow School Thornhill J&I School</p>	
Governors and staff at :	<p>Ashbrow School Thornhill J&I School Moldgreen Community Primary School</p>	
Special Schools	<p>Castle Hill School Fairfield School Longley School Lydgate School Nortonthorpe Hall School Ravenshall School Holly Bank School</p>	
Schools with Specialist Provisions	<p>Dalton School Headlands Church of England VC JI & N School Honley High School Lowerhouses CofE (VC) JI & EY School Moor End Academy Newsome High School and Sports College Rawthorpe St James I&N Rawthorpe Junior Royds Hall High School Thornhill Community Academy</p>	
Libraries	<p>Birkby and Fartown LIC Chestnut Centre Dewsbury Library Huddersfield Library and Art Gallery Rawthorpe/Dalton Library Thornhill Lees Library and Information Centre</p>	
Health Centres	<p>Dewsbury Health Centre Fartown Health Centre Mill Hill Health centre</p>	
Community Centres	<p>Greenfields Family Centre Thornhill Lees Community Centre Kirklees CLDT</p>	
Community Groups	<p>ADD/ADHD Support HSGA - Huddersfield Support Group For Autism North Kirklees Autism Support Group & Friends</p>	

	<p>Huddersfield Down Syndrome Support Group Kirklees Deaf Children's Society Service for Children with Sensory Impairment Huddersfield Actionnaires (Action for Blind people) Ellerslie Child Development Centre Pre-school Learning Alliance Patient Advice Liaison Service (PALS) NHS Crossroads Care in Mid Yorkshire Orchard View Young Peoples Activity Team (YPAT) Calderdale and Kirklees Dyslexia Association Dewsbury and District Autism Support Group North Kirklees Phab Club Parents of Children with Additional Needs (PCAN)</p>	
Others	<p>SENCO Team Educational Psychologists Team</p>	



Non-statutory consultation on:

Proposals for changes to specialist provision for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and autism

Please tell us your views on our proposals

This document tells you the reasons why Kirklees Council is making these proposals. It also explains how the decision making process works.

Please take time to read it and let us know your views. Comments can be made on the response form at the back of this booklet.

The closing date for responses is

17 June 2016

Why are we making these proposals?

We have taken a fresh look at our arrangements for children and young people with special educational needs. Our review covered the areas of:

- Autism
- Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN)
- Sensory Impairment (hearing and visual)
- Physical Impairment

Our aim is always to ensure that the right support is in place for children, young people and their families. For this reason, we have put forward proposals to strengthen our arrangements so that children are better supported, whichever school they attend. The proposals relate to SLCN and autism.

Speech, Language and Communication Needs

We currently have specialist places at Ashbrow School and Thornhill J&I School for children with SLCN, but demand is very low. The reason for the lack of demand is that children with SLCN are being very well supported in their local schools by 'outreach' staff, who work wherever they are needed most. This means most children with SLCN do not need to access the specialist places at Ashbrow and Thornhill. We therefore have more resources than we need in these locations.

Outreach support is where specialist provision staff identify what will help children progress in their own school.

Outreach is also about working with staff in schools to allow them to work effectively and confidently with children.

Outreach allows a flexible approach to be taken so that the needs of children are responded to quickly and effectively.

Autism

We currently have specialist places at Moldgreen Community Primary School for children with autism. However, due to a lack of demand, none of the places have been allocated since 2014 and the provision has effectively been closed. We are now proposing to complete the legal process and formally discontinue these places. There are enough specialist autism places at Headlands CE (VC) JI&N School to meet the current and predicted demand.

Our proposals

Overall, our review shows that the SLCN places at Ashbrow and Thornhill, and the autism places at Moldgreen are not needed. Discontinuing these places would allow us to improve our support for primary-aged children throughout the whole of Kirklees by increasing our outreach provision for children with autism and SLCN.

The objective of these proposals is not to reduce or cut the local authority's wider support for children with special educational needs. The aim is to re-allocate resources so that we are able to react to changes in demand and offer high quality support to children and families.

Places will continue to be kept under close review.

Summary of proposals

<p>Proposal 1 Ashbrow School – discontinue the 12 specialist places for children with SLCN</p>	<p>Proposal 2 Thornhill J&I School – discontinue the 12 specialist places for children with SLCN</p>	<p>Proposal 3 Moldgreen Community Primary School – discontinue the 10 specialist places for children with autism</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Proposal 4 Increase resources to a centralised ‘hub’ for primary outreach provision, working along side the specialist provision at Headlands CE (VC) JI&N School, to serve the whole of Kirklees for children with SLCN and autism</p>		

What happens next?

This consultation is open between 16 May and 17 June 2016. You have until 17 June to express your views in writing, online or in person at the consultation event.

Once the consultation has finished, all feedback will be reported to Kirklees Council’s Cabinet (the council’s main decision making body). They will then decide whether to move to the next stage. This would mean the publication of legal notices and another chance to view the proposals and comment on them before a final decision is made.

The following table shows the next steps involved in the process. Dates are subject to change and would be dependent on Cabinet approval to move to each stage.

Activity	Date
Report to Cabinet to approve non-statutory consultation	April 2016
Consultation and engagement	May - June 2016
Outcome report to Cabinet and approval to next stage*	July 2016
Publication of notices and representation period*	September 2016
Decision by Cabinet (within 2 months)*	November 2016
Implementation starts*	1 December 2016

*Subject to scheduling of Cabinet meetings which means dates might change

Consultation event

The following informal 'drop-in' event is open to everybody: families of pupils attending the schools, staff, governors and other members of the community and anyone who would like to hear more and discuss the proposals. Officers from the council will be present to answer questions and hear your views.

Anyone is welcome to attend. Anyone who would like some help in taking part in the consultation will receive it. Please come along and see us any time between the times below.

Kirklees Council wants to know what you think. Your views will be reported back to Kirklees Council Cabinet as part of the decision making process.

Date	Venue	Time
23 May 2016	Ashbrow School	4.30 – 6.00pm

Alternatively, you can complete the response form at the back of this document.

Response form

Please send this form or a letter:

By post: FREEPOST, Kirklees Council, RTBS-CYHU-LSEC, School Organisation and Planning Team (Postage is free, you do not need a stamp).

In person: At the consultation drop-in session or hand it in at one of the schools.

Online: You can also take part in the consultation on our website:
www.kirklees.gov.uk/schoolorganisation

Email: Please note that you can contact us via email should you have any queries regarding these proposals. Please send your emails to
school.organisation@kirklees.gov.uk

Please make sure you respond by **17 June 2016** to ensure that your views are heard.

Consultation response form

Proposal 1 - Do you support or oppose the proposals relating to Ashbrow School – discontinuing the 12 specialist places for children with SLCN?

Please ✓ tick one box.

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know

Why have you decided that is your view? Please tell us about it along with anything else you would like us to consider relating to this proposal.

Proposal 2 - Do you support or oppose the proposals relating to Thornhill J&I School – discontinuing the 12 specialist places for children with SLCN?

Please ✓ tick one box.

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know

Why have you decided that is your view? Please tell us about it along with anything else you would like us to consider relating to this proposal.



Proposal 3 - Do you support or oppose the proposals relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School – discontinuing the 10 specialist places for children with autism?

Please ✓ tick one box.

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know

Why have you decided that is your view? Please tell us about it along with anything else you would like us to consider?

Proposal 4 - Do you support or oppose the proposals relating to the development and creation of a central 'hub' for primary outreach services for children with SLCN and autism?

Please ✓ tick one box.

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know

Why have you decided that is your view? Please tell us about it along with anything else you would like us to consider relating to this proposal.

About you

This section asks you for some information that will help us to analyse the results of the survey and to see who has taken part. You will not be identified by any of the information you provide.

I am a: (Please tick ✓ and complete all those that apply to you)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent/carer	Your child's/children's school/s:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pupil	Your school:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Governor	Your school:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Member of staff	Your school:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local resident	Please tell us:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	Please tell us:

How would you describe your ethnic origin? (Please tick ✓ one box)

White	Asian or Asian British	Other ethnic group
English/Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish/British <input type="checkbox"/>	Indian <input type="checkbox"/>	Arab <input type="checkbox"/>
Irish <input type="checkbox"/>	Pakistani <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Gypsy or Irish Traveller <input type="checkbox"/>	Bangladeshi <input type="checkbox"/>	(Please write in)
Any other White background <input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese <input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please write in).....	Any other Asian background <input type="checkbox"/>	
	(Please write in).....	
Mixed	Black or Black British	
White and Black Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/>	Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/>	
White and Black African <input type="checkbox"/>	African <input type="checkbox"/>	
White and Asian <input type="checkbox"/>	Any other Black background <input type="checkbox"/>	
Any other Mixed background <input type="checkbox"/>	(Please write in).....	
(Please write in).....		

Please write in your postcode:

(We will not use this information to contact you)

--	--	--	--

--	--	--



Q1) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Ashbrow School?

Responses - Parents /Carers from Ashbrow School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My child is in need of SLCN. He has attended Ashbrow from the age of 3. Where he entered through ICAN. Without the support of the resource provision team, he would not have achieved the levels of curriculum he has. I really wouldn't know where my son would be regarding school or development and support. To take away special provision would be detrimental to pupils who need it, and would disturb, confuse children being taken away from routines, friends from school. Early intervention is very important for our children, the ICAN provision in early years helped my child access education and so he began to do better at school with the right support. • This school is super, it is the best in the area. I chose this school over my religious views as it was the best for my child. If this was to go forward, not only my child would suffer but the school and teachers as well. This is best in a school not an external hub and if it has to be a school Ashbrow is the best one because of how much it already gives to children. If this goes through my child will suffer, and that is not acceptable. The cost cutting measures that will in turn affect my child, is not something that we should allow. I couldn't make the consultation as I was at uni, and am saddened by the fact that it was only on one date. • My child has attended Ashbrow in the resourced provision, the setting has helped him so much and having the support throughout school has been outstanding as they know him and his needs, my child would not have achieved well if it was not for the provision. • This proposal contradicts the council's Early Intervention and Prevention agenda. This is a budget cut that hits one of our most vulnerable groups of people. <p>OUTREACH The results of this area of work are apparently not measurable. The progress of children with complex needs currently in mainstream school are not being measured against 1) their peers in their school or 2) the children in the Ashbrow specialist provision. Question: so on what evidence is this proposal being based? At best, outreach is hit and miss, with irregular visits by Outreach, that rely on the goodwill of staff in the child's school (SENCO? ETA? Class teacher?) and them being able to carry out what can be complex speech and language therapy - without the specialist training.</p> <p>CHILDREN WITH COMPLEX NEEDS Children with complex speech and language needs need expert, intense therapy, several times a week, by specialist staff. Children with complex Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) don't just experience severe speech problems but are also generally massively behind in their academic attainment and extreme problems in their social skills, often on a par with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Mainstream schools CAN NOT generally deal with these needs, even with the best will in the world. This leads to the child's problems becoming more entrenched and a real lack of progress.</p> <p>DELETING ALL SPECIALIST PROVISION IN KIRKLEES FOR KS1 AND KS2 Anyone with even the most basic knowledge of SEN knows that early intervention and prevention is the most effective and cheapest way for a child with complex needs to reach their potential. By the time a child with severe SLI reaches KS3 they will never catch up academically, the social damage is permanent and, more importantly, they will probably never make significant progress in speech therapy. Every child should be given the chance to succeed and reach their potential and to deny a child with complex SLI the correct and appropriate support seems to me to be tragic and morally wrong.</p> <p>NOT MAKING BUDGET CUTS Moving that money into another budget area IS a cut to children with severe needs. It's a cut to the most vulnerable in Kirklees.</p> <p>THE LAW Children with severe SLI in their Statements or EHCPs have a legal right to the level of support set out in those legally binding documents. Kirklees will still have a responsibility to provide that level of support. I foresee a time in the near future</p>

	<p>where a parent will sue for that care - paving the way for other parents (of all areas of SEN) to follow suit.</p> <p>THE LAST SET OF SEN REFORMS</p> <p>My son is the ONLY child to get a transitional place at Ashbrow and I had to fight tooth and nail to get that place for him. He has severe verbal dyspraxia and had gone through the ICAN provision at Ashbrow. He is the ideal child, suited for this provision. But it was made as difficult as possible for him to access that provision. Thanks to that high level of care/support, he is now in year 3, now in mainstream at Ashbrow and has caught up academically and can be understood - he will always have residual SLI but thanks to the support he has received (and continues to receive) he has had the chance to show that actually he's pretty bright and has a future ahead of him.</p> <p>Parents are not being told about the provision so they are not accessing it. That is why the provision is now empty. Not because of lack of need.</p> <p>MY VIEW</p> <p>If the provision cannot be supported in the long run I believe it should gradually be transferred over to Royds Hall so that by the time Royds has all year groups in place that they can accommodate KS1-KS3. This, to me, is common sense. Otherwise, when a child at Royds with severe SLI age 5 enrolls, will they be told "sorry we can't help you until you are 11"?</p> <p>I would respectfully ask Cabinet members to ask for evidence of the impact of this directly from the ICAN organisation.</p>
Responses - Parents /Carers from Ashbrow & Royds Hall Schools	
<p>Strongly Oppose</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My son was a pupil of Ashbrow. He is now 17 and has turned out to be a lovely, friendly outgoing boy, who owes it all to the amazing start he had at Ashbrow with all the care and dedication. I am horrified that they are considering removing these valuable units, placing all the pressure on mainstream school teachers who are already overstretched and over pressured with high class numbers. The argument that there would be an assistant to help will not help (we all know that assistants are used as an extra set of hands for overworked teachers!) <p>I know that from speaking to the other parents of children who went through the unit that our children all started out in mainstream school. With an assistant, and it seriously let them down. (unable to deal with behaviour learning difficulties etc...). So for our children it was a life line.</p> <p>My son was diagnosed with a specific language impairment when he was about 5 yrs old. It impacted everything he did. He couldn't read or write or follow lessons and socially struggled. We persevered in the local school, he had weekly visits from the speech therapist and educational psychologist but the school couldn't give him what he needed to progress. He spent lessons crying in a corner being ignored, teachers not understanding about the difficulties and how to help. He was midway through year 1 when he was seen by his educational psychologist who reported that he had never seen a more depressed child! The speech therapist also voiced concerns about the schools inability to give him the level of support he needed. It was at this point that we decided to move him to Ashbrow. This was not an easy decision but it was the best decision we ever made.</p> <p>We never looked back. The unit was the support that all the children needed, having such a bad start. They were with kids who were like them and no longer felt alone or different, and the teachers understood them and know how to get the best from them. He had some lessons with the full class, but certain lessons all the children from the specialist provision were taught together. He learnt to read and write (using symbol books) and had frequent speech therapy and had to be taught social skills (which we all take for granted). From a parents point of view I knew that he was safe and looked after and that I could always get to speak to someone from the team (I have 3 other children in our local school and it's almost impossible to get to speak to someone). After very happy and productive years he moved onto Royds Hall (some children didn't require the specialist provision because they made so much progress but he still needed the support). Again another faultless school. A major problem of Specific language impairment is their organisation skills and memory, at Ashbrow and Royds Hall the units were a crutch for them helping them function.</p>

	<p>He sat his GCSE, from a child that couldn't read and write, he got a D in English for GCSE and is resitting this year and is on track for a B!</p> <p>Am important thing to understand is that by closing these units you are bundling all these children as 1; instead of looking at each individual. Not all children with SLI or Autism etc. need extra help and can be effectively looked after at the local school, but some children do need that level of help and support. By closing the units you are implying that these children don't matter and are not worth helping.</p>
Responses - Parents /Carers from Castle Hill School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You have not provided enough information with regards why you are closing them other than they are not required.
Responses - Parents/Carers from Farnley Tyas First	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early intervention is vital. You are planning to create a gap in service that mainstream schools are not skilled to provide, outreach is a limited service, environment is key, you will end up having to pay for expensive out of area placements
Responses - Parent s/Carers from Honley High School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's essential for children in need of intensive support with speech and language. Their expertise for my son enabled him to speak and he now attends an autism provision. Without the placement at Ashbrow this would not have been possible
Responses - Parent s/Carers from Lindley infant School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My son aged 7 (as described by his speech and language therapist on his last report) has 'A complex speech, language and communication profile. He shows a disordered pattern of language development.' 'Functionally his receptive language levels show a high level of need' 'He continues to demonstrate a complex profile which will require a high level of support and differentiation of the curriculum'. Previously, when assessed in reception, in the spring term, he hadn't progressed since he was last seen in the autumn term, 7 months before. He has been known to speech and language since he was 2. My son is in a mainstream school and requires a lot of support. I only came to hear about the provision at Ashbrow because another parent mentioned it. I then presumed the unit was full, because it has never been mentioned to me despite my son's significant difficulties with speech, language and communication. I am very angry to read 'demand was very low'. If my son could have the opportunity to attend one of these units it could make a big difference. He also, did not receive any help from outreach, until I asked for it. I don't understand why demand is low when there are children like my son who are struggling.
Responses - Parent s/Carers from Royds Hall Community School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with SLCN need specialist teachers and support staff on a daily basis in school to enable them to cope. Outreach would not be sufficient - visiting and trying to educate staff into the child's needs is like giving a child in a wheelchair the loan of a wheelchair for a few hours a week. Most mainstream teachers and support staff have not got the skills, knowledge or time to give these children what they need - specialist support from staff who are experienced in looking after them. My son attended Ashbrow and was lucky to have the resources and skilled teachers to help him become a confident and successful student. He was in mainstream and failed - Ashbrow gave him a chance and changed his life.
Responses - Parent s/Carers from Shaw Cross J&I School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with slcn need to be supported on an ONGOING basis by specialist slcn staff who can spontaneously and continually tailor make learning to suit the child's individual needs. Tapping into services once a term/half term is not feasible as it is hindering the child's progress!
Responses - Parent s/ Carers from Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the facilities are there and are not being used, then it is a waste of time and money to continue them.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Not-stated	
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel that some spaces should be available who knows what the future holds.

Responses from staff at Ashbrow School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a great need for continuation of places at Ashbrow for children with SLCN. This need has been masked by the council not allowing transitional places to go. Children with SLCN need expert support on a daily basis and this can only be given by a school that fully understands the needs of the children. The Council have caused this 'low level of demand' by refusing to offer transitional places. The ICAN nursery at Ashbrow is full at present with children allocated places already for September this year. How then can there not be a need to continue this support into the child's Reception year and further? Children who were candidates in the past to go through Ashbrow had to take places at their local schools, within the first term they failed miserably and were referred back to the SP team at Ashbrow. The Council is responsible for the long term effects on these already vulnerable children. Outreach can only be good if the staff in local schools take advice on board and stick to it religiously. However staff change, other demands take precedence, strategies are forgotten and the child with SLCN is at best struggling along quietly but not achieving, at worst labelled as disruptive with behaviour problems and his needs are not met. At Ashbrow all staff have a wealth of knowledge and experience, even without a lead teacher in the SP team at the moment, and children with SLCN deserve to benefit from this. • It is wrong to take the support away from our children. They were promised a place with SLCN support until year 6. This is now being taken away from them. Children with the specialist provision will NOT cope in mainstream schooling without the constant support they receive now. Teachers of mainstream children in a mainstream school do not/will not understand how SLCN presents different challenges for different children. It is not always obvious when a child has SLCN needs and therefore not always spotted and supported. If they do understand it, supporting the children will throw more challenges as the full class needs the support too. It is wrong to let down children across the country who need this support. • As a class teacher, with a child supported by the SP unit, I oppose the idea. One member of the SP team (a SP ETA) works with this pupil twice a week during 'English'. The help provided prepares the child to participate fully in the lesson with the rest of the class. The SP ETA supports this child throughout the school day with social issues. This prevents behaviour issues and allows progress to be made. • Having worked at Ashbrow School for the past 20 years and seen the advent of the specialist provision unit here when it moved from Christ Church School, I have witnessed first-hand the tremendous benefits for children and families which has come as a result of children with speech and language impairment being part of the Specialist Provision Unit at Ashbrow. They have been nurtured, helped and supported by dedicated and highly committed staff throughout their primary school phase and have gone on to high school as confident, bright, often very able young people much better equipped to deal with the challenges of high school. A great proportion of the children who have attended the specialist provision unit at Ashbrow have experienced life-changing benefits by being educated within the caring atmosphere of a specialist unit, and it must seem totally incomprehensible, worrying and very stressful to them and their parents to be told that they must re-join a class of mainstream children and do without this vital daily support. The children have enhanced our school and made us so proud of them, and it would seem unimaginable that it will be advantageous to these children, who start off as very vulnerable, to withdraw this vital service. The alternative outreach service which is now being offered, whilst recognising the professionalism of the members of staff who do this work, cannot compare to the daily intensive help, support and encouragement that the children receive in a specialist unit. The children also need to have the benefit of dedicated professionals who are specialists and experts in their particular needs, not ones who simply have a quick fix solution to the children's conditions and difficulties. For many of these children speech and language impairment is a life-long condition, not one which can simply be cured by a couple of terms of speech therapy. As a result of being part of an incredibly close-knit, supportive specialist unit where their every need can be catered for, the children's achievements have known no bounds. Without being

	<p>part of such a unit the children can experience a difficult world which on occasion they struggle to understand, this often leads to these children being labelled as 'naughty' with quite severe behavioural difficulties, just because they cannot process language correctly or do not have the appropriate social skills to overcome this. Parents and extended families have also seen the huge benefits to their precious children by being nurtured and cared for in a specialist unit. It would seem odd that when a child is first diagnosed with speech and language disorder they are able to join the ICAN unit, but then are 'cast adrift' for the rest of their primary school years with only sporadic outreach teaching until they go to high school, when, again, they can become part of a specialist provision unit. This creates a huge gap for the children in their most formative years, when they need it the most. As the high school provision at Royds Hall is currently oversubscribed, with parents desperate for places, it proves without doubt that there must be a need for a primary provision unit if these families are so eager for them to be part of a specialist unit again.</p> <p>The children in the Ashbrow provision unit at the moment are wonderful and are doing so well with the intensive daily support, help, and encouragement of specifically trained staff who know them so well and understand their needs, and it would worry me greatly if I was one of their parents, and indeed as someone who has a lot to do with them on a daily basis in school, to think that this vital support is being withdrawn.</p> <p>I would implore the people who are in the process of making this decision to think again and consider these children and their families. It is an utter disgrace if the over-riding reason for considering this option is a money saving exercise, and it may well be prudent for members of the council to examine their consciences, and be ashamed of a decision which has the power to have a detrimental effect on young lives. There has to be another way, and anyone who has had a child or family member who attends one of the specialist units will confirm that this is the wrong decision for the children, and that the children's needs should ALWAYS come first – not money. The good that is done and the benefits to the children's education and wellbeing must surely be the primary consideration. We are always being told about children's rights, and it is surely their right to the correct sort of education which will enhance their primary school days and make it easier for them to progress into young adulthood without the stigma of being perceived as 'different' just because they have a speech and language impairment. If we have the means to make their life in school happier and more productive, and for them to learn alongside their peers and achieve great results with specialist teaching and support, then surely it is morally wrong not to do so?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The non-statutory consultation document states....'demand is very low.' A full ICAN provision at Ashbrow (& at Royds school) shows that there is demand and need (& has been historically) for the specialist provision and the provision has shown excellent progress for those children over time. Children that have progressed sufficiently to be able to cope with the demands of mainstream schooling, have transferred and continued to make progress. The proposals indicate no pathway for children with severe & specific speech and language difficulties within the primary sector other than proposed outreach service. Post primary is too late for these children and experience indicates that the children have associated issues with their self-worth and behaviour if transferred too early. No transitional places were ever offered (budget not available) following the SEN review and the model became a light touch outreach one which took highly specialised and trained teaching staff away from the school provisions. Promised training for these staff was never given. SP supporting staff are highly trained. Schools receiving outreach lack the necessary staff expertise to support children effectively. Children leaving ICAN (there is now no direct pathway within reception other than Early Years SEN support - long timescales and gaps in provision) or SP are being referred back at a later date or, in some cases NOT being re-referred by schools receiving outreach (ICAN children) as school believe children have attained SALT targets - This leads to complex difficulties further down the line. Proposals do not take into account the accompanying level of family support needed for children with severe SLCN. Family forum feedback indicates that families are happy for their
--	--

	<p>children to travel to a specialist provision as they recognise that their children's specific needs can be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP staff are primary trained and are being offered secondary posts and being asked to consider accepting now, which presumes the proposals are a foregone conclusion? • The proposals indicate no pathway for children with severe & specific speech and language difficulties within the primary sector other than proposed outreach service. Post primary is too late for these children and experience indicates that the children have associated issues with their self-worth and behaviour if transferred too early. No transitional places were ever offered (budget not available) following the SEN review and the model became a light touch outreach one which took highly specialised and trained teaching staff away from the school provisions. Promised training for these staff was never given. SP supporting staff are highly trained. Schools receiving outreach lack the necessary staff expertise to support children effectively. Children leaving ICAN (there is now no direct pathway within reception other than Early Years SEN support - long timescales and gaps in provision) or SP are being referred back at a later date or, in some cases NOT being re-referred by schools receiving outreach (ICAN children) as school believe children have attained SALT targets - This leads to complex difficulties further down the line. Proposals do not take into account the accompanying level of family support needed for children with severe SLCN. Family forum feedback indicates that families are happy for their children to travel to a specialist provision as they recognise that their children's specific needs can be met. • This proposal contradicts the council's Early Intervention and Prevention agenda. This is a budget cut that hits one of our most vulnerable groups of people. <p>OUTREACH The results of this area of work are apparently not measurable. The progress of children with complex needs currently in mainstream school is not being measured against 1) their peers in their school or 2) the children in the Ashbrow specialist provision. Question: so on what evidence is this proposal being based? At best, outreach is hit and miss, with irregular visits by Outreach, that rely on the goodwill of staff in the child's school (SENCO? ETA? Class teacher?) and them being able to carry out what can be complex speech and language therapy - without the specialist training.</p> <p>CHILDREN WITH COMPLEX NEEDS Children with complex speech and language needs need expert, intense therapy, several times a week, by specialist staff. Children with complex Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) don't just experience severe speech problems but are also generally massively behind in their academic attainment and extreme problems in their social skills, often on a par with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Mainstream schools CAN NOT generally deal with these needs, even with the best will in the world. This leads to the child's problems becoming more entrenched and a real lack of progress.</p> <p>DELETING ALL SPECIALIST PROVISION IN KIRKLEES FOR KS1 AND KS2 Anyone with even the most basic knowledge of SEN knows that early intervention and prevention is the most effective and cheapest way for a child with complex needs to reach their potential. By the time a child with severe SLI reaches KS3 they will never catch up academically, the social damage is permanent and, more importantly, they will probably never make significant progress in speech therapy. Every child should be given the chance to succeed and reach their potential and to deny a child with complex SLI the correct and appropriate support seems to me to be tragic and morally wrong.</p> <p>NOT MAKING BUDGET CUTS Moving that money into another budget area IS a cut to children with severe needs. It's a cut to the most vulnerable in Kirklees.</p> <p>THE LAW Children with severe SLI in their Statements or EHCPs have a legal right to the level of support set out in those legally binding documents. Kirklees will still have a responsibility to provide that level of support. I foresee a time in the near future where a parent will sue for that care - paving the way for other parents (of all areas</p>
--	---

	<p>of SEN) to follow suit.</p> <p>THE LAST SET OF SEN REFORMS</p> <p>My son is the ONLY child to get a transitional place at Ashbrow and I had to fight tooth and nail to get that place for him. He has severe verbal dyspraxia and had gone through the ICAN provision at Ashbrow. He is the ideal child, suited for this provision. But it was made as difficult as possible for him to access that provision. Thanks to that high level of care/support, he is now in year 3, now in mainstream at Ashbrow and has caught up academically and can be understood - he will always have residual SLI but thanks to the support he has received (and continues to receive) he has had the chance to show that actually he's pretty bright and has a future ahead of him.</p> <p>Parents are not being told about the provision so they are not accessing it. That is why the provision is now empty. Not because of lack of need.</p> <p>MY VIEW</p> <p>If the provision cannot be supported in the long run I believe it should gradually be transferred over to Royds Hall so that by the time Royds has all year groups in place that they can accommodate KS1-KS3. This, to me, is common sense. Otherwise, when a child at Royds with severe SLI age 5 enrolls, will they be told "sorry we can't help you until you are 11"?</p> <p>I would respectfully ask Cabinet members to ask for evidence of the impact of this directly from the ICAN organisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a class TA, I feel I will have further responsibilities put on me and the children's needs will not be met due to lack of resources and time constraints. I cannot manage specific needs whilst at the same time doing my usual jobs in class. • I feel that the premise on which this proposal has been made is not strictly correct. Page 1 states that there is a 'lack of demand' for the transitional places at Ashbrow. However it is clear that the places have not been offered or allocated to the school through the administration system. Historically Ashbrow Specialist Provision has been in demand by parents and generally full, yet more recently places (fixed or transitional) have not been allocated by SENACT to Ashbrow; even where parents with children who have been through the ICAN provision have been recommended and have wanted this place as their child had continuing need. Yet these children have a full evidence base from an experienced, qualified, multi-disciplinary team. This is surely a problem with the referral system currently in operation. It would seem unrealistic to have to have a pre-school provision which is thriving and a KS3 provision at Royds Hall High which continues to take high number of pupils into year 7, yet no primary provision. These children do not disappear at primary age. Yet for a child to take a break in the LA provision in that way would surely damage the continuity of good practice which children with SLCN (Speech, language and communication needs) need to reach their full potential. Moreover, from experience, when children have specialist needs which are not met at an age appropriate point, potential problems are stored up which could make entry to a provision at KS3 difficult as staff would need to break down these accumulated barriers. Kirklees LA used to have a policy of supporting early identification of need to prompt actions, has this now disappeared? Your document purports that SLCN children are 'well supported in their local schools by outreach staff'. How has the impact of outreach been measured since it began? No analysis has been published, and anecdotal evidence has, at times, been to the contrary. Outreach staff need a depth of knowledge of working with children with SLCN and a knowledge of how to develop a whole school approach - no easy task. Surely the outreach approach only leads to a light touch approach; yet the children need, at different times, full-time multi-disciplinary support to be available in the school environment which cannot always be timetabled for. For children with SLCN identification of need can be difficult as areas of concern can be masked or disguised as behaviour or dyslexic type difficulties. Research has shown that a 'high proportion' of children with mental health needs have SLCN with 34% being undiagnosed, (RCLST 2009). Moreover 60% of young people within the justice system have SLCN and have learnt strategies to mask their difficulties (RCSLT). Support for the families has always been valued by parents of children attending the specialist provision. If all support is given through outreach parents will not
--	---

	<p>have the opportunity to meet others also managing children with SLCN. Parents can feel as isolated as the children do when they look round and find that other children can communicate well and yet they cannot.</p>
None stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a school we were unable to recruit teachers to the vacancies within the Specialist Provision at Ashbrow. We recognised that the Specialist Provision for children with Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) cannot remain at Ashbrow. We were not made aware of the decommissioning of the provision at Thornhill until the Spring Term 2016. Our concern is that there will be no future primary provision for children with SLCN yet ICAN (the provision for children of non-statutory school age) and Royds High School are full. It appears that primary aged children with SLCN will receive light touch outreach support in their local mainstream. This is a huge concern as we know how much support the children with SLCN need. We know from experience that early intervention is the most effective. The ICAN provision provides a much needed service for the pre-school aged children and most are able to return to their mainstream schools and benefit from Outreach. However some children's needs are so complex that they need additional in-school support which allows them to access their right to an education which will bring the brightness out of them and provide them with life chances they deserve. The proposal to move to Outreach only for primary is a worrying concern because there is no Speech and Language Therapist (SALT) involvement with Outreach. Children's complex traits are often masked and it requires Speech and Language Impairment specialists to unpick the needs in order to address them appropriately. Documentation states that children are 'well supported' through Outreach. At the consultation event the LA representative was asked about how this has been measured and what criteria has been used to measure the Outreach and was unable to provide answers. Do Outreach staff have the necessary depth of experience of working with SLI/SLCN children in a school environment which equips them with the level of expertise needed to advise school staff on strategies? Schools who ask for support have usually tried everything they know / use all the resources they have before they ask for help. They need to know they can 'trust' the advice given. Do Outreach staff have the necessary depth of experience of a 'hands on' approach to working with SLCN children? Out of necessity surely the Outreach approach only leads to a light touch approach; yet the children need, at different times, support to be available in the school environment which cannot always be timetabled for. If needs are not properly met we know that they can present as behavioural issues which in turn could impact on mental health long term. The statement about 'lack of demand' is misleading as pre-school and KS3 provisions are full. It cannot be that there is a need for the other age groups but not the middle. KS3 could become heavily oversubscribed. Also children will have stored issues not addressed during their primary years. Has anyone looked at whether the issue of poor 'demand' could lie with the referral service? SENACT have not been allocating transitional places, even when children have a full evidence base. A whole school model cannot be lost. The whole school approach is tangible as all staff are on board and all children benefit. Parents also have the opportunity to benefit from meeting up with other parents who have children with SLCN. The children with SLCN currently at Ashbrow should be allowed to retain their places at the school because this is what the parents were promised. They are supported by staff who know them/their parents well. All the children at Ashbrow came through ICAN. They were parents of a group whose needs were too severe to enable them to go back into mainstream elsewhere. At the consultation event it was humbling to meet past parents and pupils who came to ensure their voices were heard. The young people talked about the positive impact being embraced by a school that recognised their needs had had on them. Parents similarly talked about how life changing their children's education at a provision with expertise in SLCN had been. Having no primary provision is a devastating thought. Strategically it would make sense to create a primary hub at Royds.
Responses from staff at Not-stated	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have had excellent outreach support from them and seen the impact and improvement children in the RP/SP have made.

Responses from Governors at Ashbrow School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are specialist staff at Ashbrow whose future is now uncertain if these changes are implemented. I have heard first-hand accounts of the huge positive different made to children's lives because of the positive impact that the specialist provision has and the children's future would not be as bright as it is. Outreach support is not the answer for children with these types of issues. • I do not believe that there has been adequate assessment of the outcomes for pupils of an outreach model. I have heard from parents and pupils who have benefited from the current school placement model and who are adamant that it is this model that has enabled the best level of development. I have seen no figures to indicate that a comparison has been made between those children supported by an outreach system and those who have been supported by the current provision at Ashbrow and therefore I have seen no evidence that supports a claim that an outreach system will deliver similar levels of progress to the current provision. I have seen no evidence of an assessment having been undertaken to identify how such a change will affect those children with complex special needs. I believe that the claim that the demand for places has reduced is fundamentally flawed. I have seen no evidence of any investigation or assessment of why demand for places appears to have reduced. There is much evidence from those who have used the system that it is difficult and complicated to apply for assessments and subsequent placement. The children currently receiving support at Ashbrow were promised that provision until the end of year six. That promise should be honoured. • This proposal contradicts the council's Early Intervention and Prevention agenda. This is a budget cut that hits one of our most vulnerable groups of people. <p>OUTREACH The results of this area of work are apparently not measurable. The progress of children with complex needs currently in mainstream school is not being measured against 1) their peers in their school or 2) the children in the Ashbrow specialist provision. Question: so on what evidence is this proposal being based? At best, outreach is hit and miss, with irregular visits by Outreach, that rely on the goodwill of staff in the child's school (SENCO? ETA? Class teacher?) and them being able to carry out what can be complex speech and language therapy - without the specialist training.</p> <p>CHILDREN WITH COMPLEX NEEDS Children with complex speech and language needs need expert, intense therapy, several times a week, by specialist staff. Children with complex Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) don't just experience severe speech problems but are also generally massively behind in their academic attainment and extreme problems in their social skills, often on a par with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Mainstream schools CAN NOT generally deal with these needs, even with the best will in the world. This leads to the child's problems becoming more entrenched and a real lack of progress.</p> <p>DELETING ALL SPECIALIST PROVISION IN KIRKLEES FOR KS1 AND KS2 Anyone with even the most basic knowledge of SEN knows that early intervention and prevention is the most effective and cheapest way for a child with complex needs to reach their potential. By the time a child with severe SLI reaches KS3 they will never catch up academically, the social damage is permanent and, more importantly, they will probably never make significant progress in speech therapy. Every child should be given the chance to succeed and reach their potential and to deny a child with complex SLI the correct and appropriate support seems to me to be tragic and morally wrong.</p> <p>NOT MAKING BUDGET CUTS Moving that money into another budget area IS a cut to children with severe needs. It's a cut to the most vulnerable in Kirklees.</p> <p>THE LAW Children with severe SLI in their Statements or EHCPs have a legal right to the level of support set out in those legally binding documents. Kirklees will still have a responsibility to provide that level of support. I foresee a time in the near future where a parent will sue for that care - paving the way for other parents (of all areas of SEN) to follow suit.</p>

	<p>THE LAST SET OF SEN REFORMS</p> <p>My son is the ONLY child to get a transitional place at Ashbrow and I had to fight tooth and nail to get that place for him. He has severe verbal dyspraxia and had gone through the ICAN provision at Ashbrow. He is the ideal child, suited for this provision. But it was made as difficult as possible for him to access that provision. Thanks to that high level of care/support, he is now in year 3, now in mainstream at Ashbrow and has caught up academically and can be understood - he will always have residual SLI but thanks to the support he has received (and continues to receive) he has had the chance to show that actually he's pretty bright and has a future ahead of him.</p> <p>Parents are not being told about the provision so they are not accessing it. That is why the provision is now empty. Not because of lack of need.</p> <p>MY VIEW</p> <p>If the provision cannot be supported in the long run I believe it should gradually be transferred over to Royds Hall so that by the time Royds has all year groups in place that they can accommodate KS1-KS3. This, to me, is common sense. Otherwise, when a child at Royds with severe SLI age 5 enrolls, will they be told "sorry we can't help you until you are 11"?</p> <p>I would respectfully ask Cabinet members to ask for evidence of the impact of this directly from the ICAN organisation.</p>
Responses from Governors at Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the sister provision to Thornhill, and I have no reason to believe that this resource is being any better used than the provision at Thornhill
Responses from Governors at Not-stated	
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the assumption that there is a lack of need for a specialist provision is incorrect. What research brought you to this conclusion? I know Outreach is an excellent support for a number of children. However some children require more intense and specialist support. This is evident through the work and needs displayed in the I-Can Provision as well as the secondary provision at Royds. What happens to the children in the Primary phase? Hasn't there always been a long belief in Education that children need to be picked up when they are young. Your plans will leave a huge gap that the children will never recover from. Ashbrow supported nearly 60 children very successfully last year through Outreach, who has carried on that level of support this year? This indicates that the provision for children with SLCN at any level will be slashed dramatically. Having been a Head Teacher in Kirklees with a Specialist provision I know how hard it is to employ experienced staff how are you proposing to address this? There are three experienced staff at Ashbrow I feel it to be essential that they are given the chance to support the remaining children from the provision at Ashbrow. I am sure they would also be able to assist in Outreach also. Having been actively involved in the review of Specialist provisions across the LA a number of years ago I am deeply saddened by the use of Outreach to replace intensive provision and hope it isn't just a money saving exercise. Children only get one chance. I was proud to work in Kirklees and felt their commitment to specialist provisions was excellent and had such a dramatic impact on children's lives. I am therefore saddened by your proposals and strongly disagree with your assumption that all children will be better supported through Outreach.
Response from Local Residents	
Strongly oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My child is in need of SLCN. He has attended Ashbrow from the age of 3. Where he entered through ICAN. Without the support of resource provision team, he would not have achieved the levels of curriculum he has. I really wouldn't know where my son would be regarding school or developmental and support. To take away special provision would be detrimental to pupils who need it, and would disturb, confuse children being taken away from routines, friends from school. Early intervention is very important for our children, the ICAN provision in early years helped my child access education and so he began to do better at school with the right support.

Responses from Other category of respondents (including respondents not stated)	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>This proposal contradicts the council's Early Intervention and Prevention agenda. This is a budget cut that hits one of our most vulnerable groups of people.</p> <p>OUTREACH</p> <p>The results of this area of work are apparently not measurable. The progress of children with complex needs currently in mainstream school is not being measured against 1) their peers in their school or 2) the children in the Ashbrow specialist provision. Question: so on what evidence is this proposal being based? At best, outreach is hit and miss, with irregular visits by Outreach, that rely on the goodwill of staff in the child's school (SENCO? ETA? Class teacher?) and them being able to carry out what can be complex speech and language therapy - without the specialist training.</p> <p>CHILDREN WITH COMPLEX NEEDS</p> <p>Children with complex speech and language needs need expert, intense therapy, several times a week, by specialist staff. Children with complex Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) don't just experience severe speech problems but are also generally massively behind in their academic attainment and extreme problems in their social skills, often on a par with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Mainstream schools CAN NOT generally deal with these needs, even with the best will in the world. This leads to the child's problems becoming more entrenched and a real lack of progress.</p> <p>DELETING ALL SPECIALIST PROVISION IN KIRKLEES FOR KS1 AND KS2</p> <p>Anyone with even the most basic knowledge of SEN knows that early intervention and prevention is the most effective and cheapest way for a child with complex needs to reach their potential. By the time a child with severe SLI reaches KS3 they will never catch up academically, the social damage is permanent and, more importantly, they will probably never make significant progress in speech therapy. Every child should be given the chance to succeed and reach their potential and to deny a child with complex SLI the correct and appropriate support seems to me to be tragic and morally wrong.</p> <p>NOT MAKING BUDGET CUTS</p> <p>Moving that money into another budget area IS a cut to children with severe needs. It's a cut to the most vulnerable in Kirklees.</p> <p>THE LAW</p> <p>Children with severe SLI in their Statements or EHCPs have a legal right to the level of support set out in those legally binding documents. Kirklees will still have a responsibility to provide that level of support. I foresee a time in the near future where a parent will sue for that care - paving the way for other parents (of all areas of SEN) to follow suit.</p> <p>THE LAST SET OF SEN REFORMS</p> <p>My son is the ONLY child to get a transitional place at Ashbrow and I had to fight tooth and nail to get that place for him. He has severe verbal dyspraxia and had gone through the ICAN provision at Ashbrow. He is the ideal child, suited for this provision. But it was made as difficult as possible for him to access that provision. Thanks to that high level of care/support, he is now in year 3, now in mainstream at Ashbrow and has caught up academically and can be understood - he will always have residual SLI but thanks to the support he has received (and continues to receive) he has had the chance to show that actually he's pretty bright and has a future ahead of him.</p> <p>Parents are not being told about the provision so they are not accessing it. That is why the provision is now empty. Not because of lack of need.</p> <p>MY VIEW</p> <p>If the provision cannot be supported in the long run I believe it should gradually be transferred over to Royds Hall so that by the time Royds has all year groups in place that they can accommodate KS1-KS3. This, to me, is common sense. Otherwise, when a child at Royds with severe SLI age 5 enrolls, will they be told "sorry we can't help you until you are 11</p> <p>"?</p> <p>I would respectfully ask Cabinet members to ask for evidence of the impact of this directly from the ICAN organisation.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My son went to Ashbrow and without the staff knowledge and years of experience he wouldn't be where he is today. The daily routine of expert staff and speech work. The environment which was adapted for them with different needs. Because of their experience of many years they had a very good idea how best to work with my son and how to draw the best out of himself. Therefore I feel that these many years of experienced staff will be lost! • The prescribed alteration to discontinue the 12 transitional places for children with speech language and communication needs at Ashbrow School would be robbing future children of a sound start in junior education and a very confusing one. Points to be made: First, continuation and maintenance of the status quo in familiar surroundings is paramount to the child's security and thus learning ability. Secondly, familiar places in school buildings and the knowledge that familiar faces and voices are continuing to support is vital to the continuing success of the process and present system. Teachers and Teaching assistants are not trained for children with additional needs. Children understand and are indeed comforted by trained support, they recognise it. All children need to be educated amongst their peers in the mainstream system in order to match their abilities. For outreach support for the Child's educational needs to be adequate, for educational success, on a rather ad hoc basis is naive to say the least. Continuity to a child is something that happens on a daily basis not occasionally on a 'if it is deemed necessary/see how it goes' basis. Schools and nursery schools, in particular, need to be fully aware of the current facility. They need to look out for children with these disabilities. The system of enabling parents to access this present facility is not good enough. The forms need to be dealt with by those making the placements. Those in authority need to be making it easier for parents to access the system. My grandson has made huge improvements not just in his educational awareness but also in understanding what he needs to do to help himself. Consistency in Ashbrow Junior School has given him this. He still has a way to go to catch up to his peers but he is being enabled to get on with it with the constant support and reassurance he has now and has always received from trained personnel at Ashbrow. We are as confident as we can be in the transition process which Ashbrow have in hand for him to progress to middle school in 2017. • I strongly oppose the proposal to change the provision for children with SLCN for the following reasons: Outreach can give a 'light touch' to many children but what about the children with complex SLI/SLCN who need intense support? 'Outreach only' cannot provide consistent support which is required for these children. Surely Outreach staff need a base school not an office to work from so they can make sure strategies suggested have a whole school approach. Nursery provision places are full and so is KS3 - why should there be a gap in the middle? If children are not given the level of support they need at Primary School their difficulties will be much greater when they get to high school. Children with SLCN can appear disruptive and it is not always possible to identify between a child who has behaviour difficulties and a child who has a lack of understanding and is therefore disruptive. In a school based provision these needs can be supported at all times whereas in mainstream there is not always the time and resources to do this. Have outreach staff had enough 'hands on' experience of children with SLI/SLCN to be able to advise and support mainstream teachers with appropriate strategies. Parents and families of children with SLCN also need support. Will mainstream teachers/support staff have the time and knowledge to give them the support they need? • I strongly oppose the proposal to discontinue the primary SLCN provision at Ashbrow School. On a personal note, I am passionate about a school based provision being available for children with SLCN as my daughter attended the specialist provision during her infant years and she benefitted greatly from the specialist teaching and support she was given. Without the specialist intense early intervention including on-site speech therapy which she so desperately needed, she would not have made the progress she did with her speech, language and social skills. Because the level of support she required was available in a provision based in a mainstream school, she was able to learn and socialise alongside her peers, and then be able to move out of the provision to go onto her local mainstream
--	--

	<p>Junior and High School. It was the hardest decision I ever had to make when professionals suggested my three year old needed specialist help in a school away from my local area, but it was right for her and the best decision I ever made. Now on a professional note, I have worked in the Specialist Provision for many years and have hands-on experience with the many differing difficulties children with SLCN face. No two profiles present as the same and it needs specialist training, resources and experience to be able to identify and support children with these specific needs effectively. It can be particularly difficult for instance to identify a child who has comprehension difficulties by confusing his lack of response and inappropriate actions as behaviour issues. However, a child with articulation difficulties is far easier to notice, but the support that child will need now and in the future with literacy for instance, can be underestimated. Over the years some children who have been through the provision had already found a mainstream primary school a very challenging and confusing experience. Some indeed, were on the verge of exclusion when they arrived and when given the level of specialist support they required, have gone on to achieve well in the later stages of their education, developing into very sociable happy young people. If they had not been able to access this specialist support who knows what might have happened? - permanent exclusion, mental health issues, in trouble with the Police? - it doesn't bear thinking about! In the provision we are able to resource specific support for individual children who present with challenging behaviour due to their SLCN. This support is needed throughout the whole school day with specific approaches necessary to support them not only with their lessons but also at playtimes, lunchtime and other social occasions and to help them cope with any changes in the routine of school life. Parents and families of children with SLCN also need a great deal of support and the specialist staff in the provision are always available to support families in this way. Mainstream class teachers don't have this time or the resources to do this. I find it quite extraordinary that there is no plan to have a primary provision anywhere across Kirklees. I agree that an Outreach Team could reach more children across the Authority but this could only be a 'light touch' for many children as the need is so great. There is however no mention of SALT involvement in the 'outreach only' approach. Are there specialists in Speech and Language Impairment/SLCN available to advise on complex cases when a child's difficulties/traits may have been hidden over time by other behaviours? The consultation report says demand is very low for specialist places currently at Ashbrow - "the reason for the lack of demand is that children with SLCN are being very well supported in their local schools by 'outreach' staff, who work wherever they are needed most". I do not believe this is the case. The need is still obviously there as places at nursery level are being taken up and so too are the places in the Provision at Secondary School so why have this gap in the middle? So children's difficulties disappear during their primary years and then re-appear when they are teenagers? - I don't think so! Some young children at the end of their time in the nursery provision have had to move onto their mainstream setting even though the professionals involved knew they would not be able to cope, only to be re-referred straight away by their mainstream school's SENCO for specialist help! Surely it is clearly unsettling for a young child with SLCN to move from one setting to another when they could have been offered a place in the primary provision they were already familiar with! Is there a problem with the referral process? SENACT have not been allocating transitional places to children even though the evidence has been there that a child needs more than their local mainstream setting. I believe changing the permanent places in the provision to transitional places was a very short-sighted decision. Even if SENACT had allocated these transitional places, parents would probably be reluctant to 'uproot' their child with very specific speech and language needs and who is already finding school life very difficult, for just a few terms! I'm sure there are many children out there who need more than an occasional visit once a term (if they're lucky) for an Outreach Team. Some children need specialist support to be available all the time in the school environment which is not always possible to be adhered to with all the pressures of mainstream timetabling of lessons. An outreach team need a 'base school' not to solely work from an office, in order to support other staff in outreach schools. This school is</p>
--	---

	<p>then a role model of the 'whole school approach' for SLCN which includes all staff in the school whether they are the Head Teacher, gardener, caretaker or the person who serves the children their lunches. An 'outreach only' model would be to work with teachers and support staff to better equip and inform them of how to cope with children with very specific Speech and Language needs rather than the Team actually working directly with a child. How can the success of this be measured? Do the outreach staff actually have the depth of knowledge and experience of working closely 'hands-on' with children with SLI/SLCN to be able to advise mainstream staff of appropriate strategies? Identification of a Speech and language impairment can often get confused with dyslexia or autism particularly if staff are working alongside the autism team. Class teachers have so much to do these days, they can't cope with more pressure of work/planning for individual children who find it very difficult or even impossible to access the mainstream curriculum without specialist support. How will the Outreach Team know if the school have been able to carry out the suggestions correctly or even at all? I also believe that some teachers will not take kindly to support staff or other teachers coming into their school telling them what to do. I strongly suggest you reconsider the proposals to change from a school based provision at Ashbrow to an outreach only provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I strongly oppose the proposals for the decommissioning of the Specialist provisions for primary SLCN pupils. There is a huge number of children, across the Authority, that are missing out on specialist support and specific input, which includes input from specialist Speech and Language Therapists (SALT), on this very important issue. This is evident with the need for provision in Early Years and High School (KS3 and KS4). At present both these provisions are full so how can there be a lack of demand for places in primary? If no provision is made for primary children they could arrive at High School with unaddressed issues which could make transition even more difficult for them. Pupils with SLCN/SLI retain these difficulties in primary, and therefore retain the need for specialist support. In my opinion there must be an issue with the referral system and several questions need to be asked. When there is firm evidence provided that a child has SLCN/SLI needs, as I know has happened, why have SENACT not been allocating transitional places to primary provisions when the need is obvious for them? Is there anyone on the panel who is Specialist SALT to give advice on the possible disguise of SLCN/SLI within the referred children? The Specialist SALT's input is both needed and significant at this time in the education of children with SLCN/SLI. In my experience of working with children with SLCN/SLI, the structure, consistent approach to school work, behaviour issues, playtime/lunchtime support, attainment, support and reassurance needed when daily routines are changed cannot be supported without permanent specialist support within the school setting. One child I have worked with was being labelled as naughty and causing disruptions in lessons, was upset at playtimes with her peers and confused when daily routines changed. Her lack of understanding of tasks set and difficulty in asking for help contributed to the assumption that she was disruptive. Her need to use filler words such as 'no' when being asked a question gave the impression that she was being rude and answering the teacher back/ when all she was trying to do was buy herself time to think of an appropriate response. Disruption occurred when the child did not understand the task set. She would start laughing, calling out and making silly noises during the input of a lesson. This would continue until she was on task and having continual, gentle reminders of appropriate behaviour. Strategies to support this child included visual cues that promoted independent learning, symbolled reminders to alleviate stress and confusion during the lesson and support secure structure, differentiated work, continual checking of understanding, a weekly social group, pre-teaching of unfamiliar vocabulary and regular intervention of reading and IEP support. On one occasion the child was unsupported in the classroom and when I entered she looked visibly distressed. Removing her from the class, I asked what was wrong and she said "I don't know what to do." I asked why she hadn't asked the teacher and she replied, "She will think I wasn't listening." Reassurance had to be continually given that this wasn't the case and with appropriate support she managed to complete the task. The problem was specific to her SLCN/SLI
--	---

	<p>needs and confirms my opinion that specialist support should be available within the school setting for more complex children. Another child I have worked with would throw equipment, hide under the table, spit, kick and climb up onto outbuildings and spiky fences, shout abuse and need regular restraint. This child had so much to give but because of difficulties often attempted to avoid work which he found difficult and hard to understand. Without consistent, specialist support in how to cope with not just understanding but also not being able to express himself without violence, how to cope with the workload and his social understanding, he would have been on the verge of being excluded from mainstream school. Again, the difficulties were specific to his diagnosis of SLCN/SLI and the need for placement in a primary provision. These types of scenarios apply to all children I have worked with, but at different levels. Not only do we work intensively with these children but also with their families. Support is given to the families by holding regular meetings to discuss IEPs, home issues related to the children's need and social events with parents of children with similar needs who can get together and discuss their concerns, these include both past and present parents. Social events are so important to the children and families. It makes them feel supported by the people who know the children best, people that work with them on a day to day basis and who can relate to the expectations and anxieties they may be feeling. As we all know all children are different, and the complexity of these needs require a variety of approaches. One size doesn't fit all. This can only happen when a specific member of a team is working alongside a child and not dipping in and out, as would happen on outreach. I agree that some outreach support, for children with less complex needs, would be of benefit to both the staff and the identified children in schools. This would still need to come from both a Specialist Teacher and a Specialist Speech and language Therapist, who both have specific knowledge and experience in dealing with the needs of these children. It would also need to be, in my opinion, a school base. Doing this would create a whole school approach which in turn would help the outreach staff model how strategies can be applied from the cook serving lunch to the head teacher leading assembly. Questions need to be asked in relation to the outreach work, such as: How is Outreach measured and what criteria has been used to implement it? Is there a depth of experience required for the staff carrying out the outreach for children with SLCN/SLI and the advice they are giving to the school? Do the outreach staff have or have they had the necessary depth of 'hands on' experience of working with children with SLCN/SLI on a daily basis? Surely an outreach approach is only a light touch and not the daily support, which is often a necessity, and is available within the provision and cannot be timetabled for? What do the outreach team do to gain full knowledge of the child? Are they reliant on the knowledge of the class teacher who will have had to do a full observation that includes background information? What would be used to identify comprehension difficulties opposed to behaviour concerns which can be masked for children with SLCN/SLI? Would working alongside the Autism team, on a day to day basis, muddle the identification of SLCN/SLI with Autism, as traits can be similar? The skills of SLCN/SLI trained staff have improved the progression of the children I have worked with over the years. This includes strategies such as the use of Communicate in Print (CIP) resources both in class and across school, the understanding of how to rephrase, provide a consistent approach, gentle reminders of appropriate behaviour, social groups, intense IEP support, effective input into the planning of a lesson and offers of how to model teaching to other staff members. With specific support these children can, will and do overcome some of the difficulties they experience in day to day life and learn how to cope within social situations that they feel anxious about and are unable to do at present. For some of these children, the primary years at school are the cement needed for High School and later life when, in some cases, the misunderstanding of language could lead to them becoming in trouble with the police and mental illness. Would you want to be responsible for the input into any of these things happening to innocent children who have had an important layer taken away from their education?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1.SEND REFORMS – disproportionately impacting on SLCN: The stated driver for closure of the SLCN provision is: 'very low demand for places,
--	---

	<p>due to the level of support offered to mainstream schools by the outreach staff.' I feel that the perceived lack of demand is more complicated than has been presented in the consultation document. From my perspective as a Speech and Language Therapist, the SEND reforms seem to have disproportionately impacted children with complex SLCN, in particular those children who have the capacity to achieve significant positive outcomes with intensive specialist support in a Specialist provision.</p> <p>I feel that fewer of these children are being issued with EHC Plans with a consequent reduction in the demand for specialist provision places. There is a potential unmet need here.</p> <p>2.Specialist Provision is proven to have significant impact on children's outcomes: We have evidence that children with complex SLCN do benefit from access to Specialist units in the Kirklees area. Provisions have the specialist training and capacity to implement specialist interventions and adaptations to the curriculum to support these children to progress. My statistical evidence using Therapy Outcome Measures (TOMs) as shown in the graph over the period of September 2013 to April 2016 indicates that of all the children entering the ICAN unit 80% of them have severe or severe & complex levels of need. On leaving the ICAN unit after two or three terms of highly specialised input only 28% of pupils continue to present with severe or severe and complex needs. In addition 42% of these children leave the unit having made significant amounts of progress in that they present with mild or no SLCN needs. I am concerned that children whose SLCN have not been identified in the Early Years will not have access to specialist provision during their primary education. In addition that the 28% of pupils who continue to present severe levels of need do not have the option to take up a transitional place at Ashbrow for another 3-6terms to extend and increase their potential for progress. If the above results could be extrapolated to Primary aged children, they would suggest primary aged children with complex SLCN will miss out.</p> <p>3.Concerns about capacity to deliver the required amount of specialised intervention in mainstream:</p> <p>I am concerned that the children who have complex SLCN (specifically those who have the capacity to make significant progress with intensive specialist intervention) may not be receiving the required level of intensive support in mainstream school settings. This is a particular concern when children do not have an EHC in place as schools often do not have the resources, or capacity to support these children at the required level of intensity.</p> <p>4.Concerns about the skill set within mainstream schools to deliver specialist intervention:</p> <p>I often find that the ability of mainstream education staff to meet these children's needs and understand them varies dramatically across schools, despite support from Specialist education and health staff. School staff often attempt to implement recommendations but do not have the necessary specialist knowledge to achieve the best possible outcomes or to identify when they need further specialist advice or support to meet these children's needs.</p> <p>Without transitional specialist places, children will not have access to the skills of specialist professionals on a regular/intensive basis which may impact on their ability to access their mainstream curriculum and ultimately their outcomes. Furthermore, transitional places would afford the opportunity for specialist professionals to complete a period of detailed, intensive assessment for the more complex cases in order to ascertain a fully child-centred intervention plan.</p> <p>5.Inequality of Service Provision for Primary School Aged Children with Complex SLCN I am concerned that there is demand for specialist places for children with complex SLCN at nursery age (ICAN), and at Secondary Level (Royds Hall Specialist Provision) but there is perceived low demand at Primary level (Ashbrow Primary & Thornhill School). The perceived lack of demand at Primary level is inconsistent with the pattern of need at Nursery and Secondary level</p>
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to Non-Statutory Consultation Proposals for changes to specialist Provision our views are expressed from experience and expertise in Specific Language Impairment and also our experience of the wider perspective of Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) and as past members of the

	<p>Ashbrow Team.</p> <p>We would like to pose some questions and make some comments for consideration; Low demand for places in Ashbrow Provision – As SLCN needs considerable skill and expertise to both assess and plan for, does the authority have that expertise to recognise children with SLCN and therefore fill the places? Could the lack of this expertise be the reason for low demand?</p> <p>Does the authority have sufficient Speech and Language Therapy input to help with the assessment and intervention of children with SLCN? SLI for example is complex and often a hidden impairment and requires a thorough understanding and knowledge of speech and language development and understanding of its distinction from other similar communication problems such as Autistic Spectrum Condition.</p> <p>Will outreach provide a multidisciplinary team which must include parents whose joint planning and exchange of views and ideas will enhance the meeting of needs? And will the outreach model support the family of a child with SLCN or SLI? (The Ashbrow Model).</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to the consequences of inadequately meeting the needs of children with SLCN? SLCN if left unrecognised and unaddressed results in poor life outcomes for children and young people – many studies show links between poor speech, language and communication skills and youth offending, low literacy levels, social difficulties, rejection and isolation (listed in The Cost to the Nation of Children's Poor Communication, I Can Talk Series – Issue 2, I Can, 2006).</p> <p>Do schools have the expertise and time to address issues in which SLCN can impact on other areas of development such as self-worth, behaviour, socialisation etc.? The Ashbrow model provides the supportive environment and this experience of dealing with these issues.</p> <p>Outreach provision – Is there any evidence, feedback that this improves children's opportunities?</p> <p>And is this what schools need and want?</p>
--	--

Q2) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Thornhill Junior and Infant School?

Responses- Parents / Carers from Ashbrow School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not needed then thats fine.
Neither Support nor Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the school have decided they wish to close the provision then nothing can change that.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This provision has already closed. Every area should have access to provision. Outreach wouldn't work, needing access to SP staff at all times gives security, without feeling secure affects behaviour.
Responses- Parents / Carers from Farnley Tyas First School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early intervention is vital. You are planning to create a gap in service that mainstream schools are not skilled to provide , outreach is a limited service , environment is key, you will end up having to pay for expensive out of area placements
Response- Parents / Carers from Royds Hall Community School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with SLCN need specialist teachers and support staff on a daily basis in school to enable them to cope. Outreach would not be sufficient - visiting and trying to educate staff in the child's needs is like giving a child in a wheelchair the loan of a wheelchair for a few hours a week. Most mainstream teachers and support staff have not got the skills, knowledge or time to give these children what they need - specialist support from staff who are experienced in looking after them. My son attended Ashbrow and was lucky to have the resources and skilled teachers to help him become a confident and successful student. He was in mainstream and failed -

	Ashbrow gave him a chance and changed his life. All the above points, plus: In your statement you say 'most children with SLCN do not need to access the specialist provision...'. It's true some children's needs could be met in mainstream school but as you say, not all. What happens to the children with more severe communication needs who need specialist provision? The answer is they will fail in school; their behaviour will become a problem - eventually they will be excluded. Not the best start in life! I would also question why referrals are low - are they not getting SALT assessments in the first place! Or is there insufficient speech therapy in the resource provision that parents decide not to send them.
Response- Parents / Carers from Shaw Cross J&I School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with SLCN need to be supported on an ONGOING basis by specialist SLCN staff who can spontaneously and continually tailor-make learning to suit the child's individual needs. Tapping into services once a term/half a term is not feasible as it is hindering the child's progress!
Response- Parents / Carers from Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, again if there are no reasons to continue this facility then close it and use the funding for another use
Response- Parents / Carers from Not-stated School	
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel that some spaces should be available who knows what the future holds.

Responses from staff at Ashbrow School	
Neither support nor oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the school have decided they wish to close the provision then nothing can change that.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a great need for continuation of places at Ashbrow for children with SLCN. This need has been masked by the council not allowing transitional places to go to children with SLCN, children with SLCN need expert support on a daily basis and this can only be given by a school that fully understands the needs of the children. The Council have caused this 'low level of demand' by refusing to offer transitional places. The ICAN nursery at Ashbrow is full at present with children allocated places already for September this year. How then can there not be a need to continue this support into the child's Reception year and further? Children who were candidates in the past to go through Ashbrow had to take places at their local schools, within the first term they failed miserably and were referred back to the SP team at Ashbrow. The Council is responsible for the long term effects on these already vulnerable children. Outreach can only be good if the staff in local schools take advice on board and stick to it religiously. However staff change, other demands take precedence, strategies are forgotten and the child with SLCN is at best struggling along quietly but not achieving, at worst labelled as disruptive with behaviour problems and his needs are not met. At Ashbrow all staff have a wealth of knowledge and experience, even without a lead teacher in the SP team at the moment, and children with SLCN deserve to benefit from this. The comments above also refer to Thornhill children. The same things have happened with the same results. Surely the Council does not expect children with SLCN to live on only one side of Kirklees? In relation to my experience, I am sure that others use this service to its full potential. This supports children in their own setting and prepares them for the next steps - regardless of their school. The non-statutory consultation document states....'demand is very low.' A full ICAN provision at Ashbrow (& at Royds school) shows that there is demand and need (& has been historically) for the specialist provision and the provision has shown excellent progress for those children over time. Children that have progressed sufficiently to be able to cope with the demands of mainstream schooling, have transferred and continued to make progress. The proposals indicate no pathway for children with severe & specific speech and language difficulties within the primary sector other than proposed outreach service. Post primary is too late for these children and experience indicates that the children

	<p>have associated issues with their self-worth and behaviour if transferred too early. No transitional places were ever offered (budget not available) following the SEN review and the model became a light touch outreach one which took highly specialised and trained teaching staff away from the school provisions. Promised training for these staff was never given. SP supporting staff are highly trained. Schools receiving outreach lack the necessary staff expertise to support children effectively. Children leaving ICAN (there is now no direct pathway within reception other than Early Years SEN support - long timescales and gaps in provision) or SP are being referred back at a later date or, in some cases NOT being re-referred by schools receiving outreach (ICAN children) as school believe children have attained SALT targets - This leads to complex difficulties further down the line. Proposals do not take into account the accompanying level of family support needed for children with severe SLCN. Family forum feedback indicates that families are happy for their children to travel to a specialist provision as they recognise that their children's specific needs can be met. SP staff are primary trained are being offered secondary posts and being asked to consider accepting now, which presumes the proposals are a foregone conclusion?</p>
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need SLCN provision across the country. I don't work at the school neither do I know the children who go to the school but if they currently have a place it is because they need it and should not be taken away from them.
Responses from staff at Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been a complete disaster from the start and has been very badly managed by senior managers in Kirklees. A complete waste of tax payers money. SEN support/provision within Kirklees is a complete joke and the money could've been far better used.
Responses from staff at Not-stated school	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from them as outreach has not been great. The Grade 8s are nowhere near as skilled from Thornhill and have at times been rude to staff in school and little impact has been seen in the children worked with.
Response from Governors at Ashbrow School	
Neither support nor oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the school have decided they wish to close the provision then nothing can change that.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not believe that there has been adequate assessment of the outcomes for pupils of an outreach model. I have heard from parents and pupils who have benefited from the current school placement model and who are adamant that it is this model that has enabled the best level of development. I have seen no figures to indicate that a comparison has been made between those children supported by an outreach system and those who have been supported by the current provision at Thornhill and therefore I have seen no evidence that supports a claim that an outreach system will deliver similar levels of progress to the current provision. I have seen no evidence of an assessment having been undertaken to identify how such a change will affect those children with complex special needs. I believe that the claim that the demand for places has reduced is fundamentally flawed. I have seen no evidence of any investigation or assessment of why demand for places appears to have reduced. There is much evidence from those who have used the system that it is difficult and complicated to apply for assessments and subsequent placement.
Response from Governors at Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision facility within the school is not being used effectively, and the current arrangements are a waste of money which could be used to better effect by providing an Outreach only service
Responses from Local Residents	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This provision has already closed. Every area should have access to provision. Outreach wouldn't work, needing access to SP staff at all times gives security, without feeling secure affects behaviour.

Responses from Other category of respondents (including respondents not stated)	
Neither Support nor Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the school have decided they wish to close the provision then nothing can change that. I cannot comment in detail as this is out of my working area – other than it being a reduced option for families within the Kirklees area and my conviction that a Specialist Provision is the best option for some children.

Q3) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to Moldgreen Community Primary School?

Responses - Parents / Carers from Ashbrow School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is special school for autism and these children would benefit more from that than support in setting.
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When an academy or future academy chooses to rid themselves of vulnerable children with SEN then the reasons are very clear? Results Results Results.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist provision is important I know this as my child goes to Ashbrow and it works!!
Responses - Parents / Carers from Farnley Tyas First School	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The head doesn't want those children, she told me that herself ...open a provision in a school that believes in the future of these kids. Outreach cannot offer enough support. I have been told by outreach that they can only advise mainstream , it's up to the school to offer support advised or not ..you will cause harm to more children causing a knock on effect of increased costs in key stage 3 provisions and health
Responses - Parents / Carers from Royds Hall Community School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with SLCN need specialist teachers and support staff on a daily basis in school to enable them to cope. Outreach would not be sufficient - visiting and trying to educate staff into the child's needs is like giving a child in a wheelchair the loan of a wheelchair for a few hours a week. Most mainstream teachers and support staff have not got the skills, knowledge or time to give these children what they need - specialist support from staff who are experienced in looking after them. My son attended Ashbrow and was lucky to have the resources and skilled teachers to help him become a confident and successful student. He was in mainstream and failed - Ashbrow gave him a chance and changed his life. All the above points, plus: In your statement you say 'most children with SLCN do not need to access the specialist provision...'. It's true some children's needs could be met in mainstream school but as you say, not all. What happens to the children with more severe communication needs who need specialist provision? The answer is they will fail in school; their behaviour will become a problem - eventually they will be excluded. Not the best start in life! I would also question why referrals are low - are they not getting SALT assessments in the first place! Or is there insufficient speech therapy in the resource provision that parents decide not to send them.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Shaw Cross J&I School	
Strongly oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These children need hands on specialist support on a daily basis. My child's eta (etas do a brilliant job given the limited resources/knowledge/understanding) is not Makaton trained. I've observed some OCD type behaviour which my child's PEAD observed within 20 minute of an appointment which the school did not observe in the 8 months they have spent within close proximity of him, nor are they trained to spot these behaviours let alone deal with these behaviours!!! I will be getting my MP involved!
Responses - Parents / Carers from Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes not needed, no good wasting money in this climate.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Not-stated School	
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel that some spaces should be available who knows what the future holds.

Responses from staff at Ashbrow School	
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When an academy or future academy chooses to rid themselves of vulnerable children with SEN then the reasons are very clear? Results Results Results.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This 'consultation proposal' is ridiculous, the closure of Moldgreen is already a done deal and it is to the detriment of the children. Staff expertise has been lost and again vulnerable children put at risk. It's already been closed! In relation to my experience, I am sure that others use this service to its full potential. This supports children in their own setting and prepares them for the next steps - regardless of their school. The provision has already been closed!
Responses from staff at Non-stated school	
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's a long way for children in South Kirklees to travel to Headlands if they do need a specialist placement. Some children with autism are very complex and special schools are only accepting children on P levels or just above. Mainstream school cannot cope with the more and more complex SEN coming into school. Children with autism need plainer environments where they are not over stimulated and things don't change and mainstream schools cannot offer this all the time.

Response from Governors at Ashbrow School	
Neither support nor oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have insufficient information to make comment in this area
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When an academy or future academy chooses to rid themselves of vulnerable children with SEN then the reasons are very clear? Results Results Results.
Response from Governors at Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the use of resources in my own school I have no reason to believe the situation will be any different at this school

Responses from Local Residents	
Strongly oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist provision is important I know this as my child goes to Ashbrow and it works!!

Responses from Other category of respondents (including respondents not stated)	
Strongly oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As far as I am aware these specialist places have not been available since the closure of the unit in 2014. I was under the impression that there would be a new location for the primary provision in South Kirklees. As far as I am aware this has not happened. 2. The permanent closure of this provision removes parental choice for those children who would benefit from a Specialist Provision within a mainstream school. 3. Children who have been identified and who have a diagnosis of Autistic Spectrum Disorder and an EHC plan have not been offered a place, for example: a parent has reported to me that her child, who has a diagnosis of ASD, cannot have a place at Headlands Primary School Autism Specialist Provision as there is no space, as well as being informed that there is no Specialist provision available in South Kirklees. There seems to be an inequality in provision across North and South Kirklees.
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When an academy or future academy chooses to rid themselves of vulnerable children with SEN then the reasons are very clear? Results Results Results.

Q4) Do you support or oppose the proposal relating to the provision of a centralised primary outreach hub?

Responses - Parents / Carers from Ashbrow School

Neither Support nor Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A hub is a good idea but should be school based, being out of school is not productive.
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't think the outreach would be able to do it - our children 'need the 24/7 provision' so more specialist provision supporting their needs is better. Also the child's 'social and emotional' needs are met/understood & supported in a holistic way. Security of my child is very important - outreach would not be able to do this. Yes, in ADDITION to specialist provision.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Farnley Tyas First School	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outreach is still useful at a lower level of need, but not as a replacement for specialist provisions. The closure of these units is not about lack of uptake, because you don't tell parents about the provisions and you make it extremely hard to get a place, thus creating a lack of uptake...stop lying to us, we know you have another agenda
Responses - Parents / Carers from Honley High School	
Neither support nor oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be more support, not less, more input not less. Currently support from outreach is non-existent.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Lindley Infants School	
Neither Support nor Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it means closing the specialist units then I oppose it.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Meltham Moor Primary School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children should be able to attend their local school and that school receive the appropriate support, training and advice.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Royds Hall community School	
Strongly oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLCN and autism are different - centralising them is wrong. Outreach will not work with children with complex needs. The staff need to be with that child all day every day. Mainstream teachers do not have the same skills, knowledge or time to enable them to give the child what they need. Over time the Outreach staff will also become de-skilled as they need to work in a specialist provision to get their knowledge and learn from their colleagues. They will become isolated working in several schools a week. This is a recipe for disaster!
Responses - Parents / Carers from Shaw Cross J&I School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tapping into services is not the 'intensive support' that a child with disability needs.
Responses - Parents / Carers from Not-stated School	
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsure of what this is. It doesn't affect me but it may affect others. Maybe get a proper report from people to which this will/does affect.

Responses from staff at Ashbrow School	
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need regular specialists in school, not staff popping in and out whenever they feel necessary. Support needs to be consistent, regular and familiar. These children need key workers who are within their environment all the time.
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff working from a central hub is not in the best interests of the children. Children with SEN need experienced staff at all times. If a child with SLCN or ASD has a problem in school which school staff are unfamiliar with should the child then wait for the next possible appointment with a member of staff from the 'Hub'? This again would be failing the child and our SEN/vulnerable children deserve the best we can give them. SLCN and autism are two very separate things. They should not be banded together. The children in specialist provision have a speech and language impairment that is not linked to autism. They need constant/consistent support. Outreach will not provide them with this. In my opinion, the children build relationships with staff with experience and

	<p>knowledge within the SP area. To create a 'hub' would detach from this and the children would not be able to form those trusting relationships. The signs of SLCN and autism need to be recognised and this will only happen from a strong relationship, internally - not an outreach system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals aim: 'to ensure that the right support is in place...' '....to strengthen our arrangements so the children are better supported.' Children with an ASD diagnosis have different SLCN needs to those with severe and specific communication needs (i.e. specific speech and language impairment, in absence of other conditions) and those with SLCN related to e.g. medical needs. Costs of proposed outreach, specifically travel and specific training. Light touch aspect of outreach compared to specialist and intensive, specifically differentiated support within SP. Family support issues. The proposal to base the outreach at Headlands School is a real concern. Surely outreach staff for SLCN need to have a primary base in a school with SLCN children. The approach to autism, as is the Headlands specialism, and children with SLCN is different. Staff in schools receiving outreach need to have a school base to visit to see how the environment is configured, how the whole school approach is planned for, and specialist programmes at work. This necessitates a primary school base for children with SLCN, here you should see staff rephrasing effortlessly, repeating frequently, signing and symbol support, but most of all happy relaxed children who are learning alongside their peers gaining vocabulary and social skills as well as English and mathematics.
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, in ADDITION to specialist provision.
Responses from staff at Not-stated School	
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are extremely different needs and whilst a few strategies work across both (quality first teaching), it's important there's very skilled staff working effectively to give specific advice. Visits to SPs to see advice working in practise with real children has been really important for support staff to understand how to work with complex children
Response from Governors at Ashbrow School	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outreach services for this type of provision is not practical or in the best interests of the children. This proposed change seems short sighted and goes against the grain of new council. Early Intervention and Prevention? I do not believe that there has been adequate assessment of the outcomes for pupils of an outreach model. I have heard from parents and pupils who have benefited from the current school placement model and who are adamant that it is this model that has enabled the best level of development. I have seen no figures to indicate that a comparison has been made between those children supported by an outreach system and those who have been supported by the current provision at Ashbrow and therefore I have seen no evidence that supports a claim that an outreach system will deliver similar levels of progress to the current provision. I have seen no evidence of an assessment having been undertaken to identify how such a change will affect those children with complex special needs.
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, in ADDITION to specialist provision.
Response from Governors at Thornhill J&I School	
Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because the children needing to access these services will find an outreach service less disruptive than having to move school for a transitional place than moving back when the transitional period ends. In my opinion this option also provides better value for money to the council.
Responses from Local Residents	
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't think the outreach would be able to do it - our children 'need the 24/7 provision' so more specialist provision supporting their needs is better. Also the child's 'social and emotional' needs are met/understood & supported in a holistic way. Security of my child is very important - outreach would not be able to do this.

Responses from Other category of respondents (including respondents not stated)	
Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The well experienced staff will not make bonds with the children and therefore will not be able to assess their needs and skills correctly, which will lead to bigger problems as they get older. I cannot stress strongly enough that the experience of the staff is key. I find it hard to believe that no referrals are coming through for SLCN.
Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the consultation process proceeds with the decision to close the specialist provision places at Ashbrow, Thornhill and Moldgreen then the following are aspects that I would indicate as being appropriate during consideration of creating the new proposal of a specialist unit at Headlands with a plan to create a central outreach team: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Joint working: In the report commissioned by the government entitled 'What is Good Practice in Autism Education' (2011) by Autism Education Trust it was identified that one of the core principals of good practice in Autism education is the need for joint planning and working with health and educational professionals to support Language and Communication. I genuinely believe that cross discipline combined working ensures the best possible outcomes for children across specialist teaching experience combined with specialist language and communication recommendations via therapy services. 2.Specialist Provision Placement at Headlands: It is unclear if the Specialist Provision places at Headlands will be offered to children with complex SLCN and ASD across North and South Kirklees. As these are two very different clinical areas I would express concerns about the pressure to develop skills in specialist staff in these two widely different clinical presentations which often require completely different specialist interventions and educational support.
Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, in ADDITION to specialist provision.

Note- Some stakeholder responses may have been included in more than one category of responses, if they have identified themselves in more than one category of respondents.

SENCO Champions session re Specialist Provision proposals
Tuesday 20th September, 11am
Grange Moor Primary School

Notes from the session

Jayne explained that the purpose of the discussion was to get a better understanding of SENCOs knowledge and use of specialist provision along with some feedback of support provided. Jayne explained that this would be useful in relation to the consultation regarding proposed changes to primary SLCN provision.

Jayne posed the following topics to the group as part of an open discussion:-

1) What do you know about support available from specialist provision?

- 4 strands of support; ASD, SLCN, Physical, Sensory
- Royds Hall – Secondary SLCN
- Understanding is that Ashbrow provision has closed
- Outreach provision has moved from Thornhill, central hub with ASD team
- Autism places @ Headlands, nothing @ Moldgreen and no places replaced in South Kirklees.
- ASD and SLCN comments included “very good”, “excellent”, brilliant support” in relation to support received (specific support cited: practical approaches, school development audits, practical strategies, very efficient, time limited and longer interventions offered as needed, good advice and resources provided, quick assessment and offer of effective strategies.
- positive experiences noted primary and secondary level
- good HI support

2) Have you made referrals to SLCN SP, i.e., teams based at Thornhill and Ashbrow?

4 of the 5 SENCOs had made referrals and all 4 commented positively on involvement with reference to:

- good resources provided, supported by implementing strategies to support transition, simplified things, visual timetables etc.
- provide reassurance to SENCO that school are on the right track, pointing out what is working effectively but also adding other ideas onto this.
- may suggest MSP or EHCP request if all support possible is being put into place and there is little or no progress
- ratifies what you are doing is right but also identifies gaps
- used Outreach to explore next steps for child at transition and how best to support parents with decision making ring and check how things are going.
- timely response
- SLCN referrals have positive feedback

1 SENCO felt parents like medical link via SALT involvement so tended to refer to SALT rather than specialist provision outreach as thought it would be quicker but said that would refer to primary outreach team now aware of quick take up after listening to colleagues' experience

3) Speech & Language therapy service/SLCN SP team – what is your understanding of the two?

- Specific speech & language impairment should be referred to SALT (added comment that this was less of an assessment outcome than it had been in the past, i.e., not as many children being diagnosed with SLI).
- SLCN SP outreach; more practical advice and strategies, whole school programmes for SLCN whereas more theoretical from SALT with specific programmes suggested if language skills not regarded as commensurate with cognitive abilities by SALT (which SENCOs felt affected the quality of the SALT service on offer)
- may get information about a child's difficulties from SALT but don't always tell us what to do about it
- some inconsistencies in SALT offer noted by SENCOs, e.g., written reports
- SLCN outreach is used on occasion due to capacity to support teaching staff rather than the SENCO. Supports the SENCO with advice, puts weight behind what they are advising teachers to do.
- SLCN outreach enhances what SENCOs already have in place, confirming existing support plans and making suggestions of additional help.

4) What is your experience of language needs in schools as there seems to be a suggestion that there is a lot of need? If so, why do you think this isn't reflected in very high referral numbers??

- massive increase in SLCN acknowledged so SENCOs have skilled themselves up in this area and SENCOs who are experienced often deal with these in house (e.g., make good use of IDP).
- whilst some SENCOs have skills and expertise it is still useful to have the outreach team come in and model and provide support- this enhances capacity and reinforces good practice
- don't refer all SLCN cases because use learning from previous outreach involvement for children with similar difficulties
- possibility that new SENCOs may not be aware of the support on offer or the referral process even though SP teams have outlined at SENCONET and covered in training for new SENCOs
- SLCN outreach only been around for 2 years, still quite new, may be taking time to filter through and for people to hear about positive experiences?
- some SENCOs maybe avoid completing the forms? Could they be made aware it's just 2 pages one being the child's details? Easy referral system.
- 1 SENCO added she first came into contact with SLCN SP when a referral for ASD outreach was passed on to SLCN team to respond because of ASD team had too many referrals, which in the SENCOs view the support received was appropriate

to the need. SENCOs liked idea that ASD SP and SLCN SP were working together to ensure cover and getting it right, don't have to worry too much about what box ticked when referring

- lack of training for teachers to recognise needs and therefore opportunities missed for early intervention and referral
- perhaps the term 'speech, language and communication needs' is not clear enough, spell out the impact of communication? Not just about 'speech' but also communication. Children being mis-diagnosed with ADHD by other professionals where behaviours from SLCN have become an issue when not addressed – this undermines work done by schools when ADHD
- suggestion that Head teachers sometimes refer without having tried any strategies. Could this be an opportunity to highlight what can be done prior to referral? (reference to C&I graduated approach document)
-

JW asked if SENCOs saying that if we identify SLCN needs early on we can prevent problems down the line and that SLCN SP outreach can support with this?

- Yes, this would prevent problems escalating and also provide staff training.
- SENCOs agreed the Communication and Interaction graduated approach document would support with that as well

5) What about your views on the lack of take-up of primary SLCN transitional places?

- some children have very complex needs, can't be pigeon-holed into SLCN or ASD only
- one child doesn't always fit in 'one place' and therefore ends up staying in mainstream which is also unsuitable.
- some reluctance from parents to uproot children and move them to a school out of their area and away from established friendship groups, it's not what every parents wants
- are some SENCOs unaware of places actually being available?
- very little 'out there' in the media about SLCN whereas ASD is always at the forefront
- are SENACT officers leading conversations towards transitional places?
- SALTs never mention transitional places so are they aware?

On a more general note SENCOs commented on the level of complexity of need some children in their schools have which goes wider than 'slcn':

- SENCOs felt that they have children on roll currently whose needs were not being met in mainstream school and that they deal with more complex cases than some specialist provision schools.
- no provision other than special school for complex needs where children can't specifically be diagnosed as either ASD or SLCN.

- different use of language - graduated approach document uses 'Communication and Interaction' then we use 'SLCN' when it comes to provision. 'Communication and interaction' is much clearer

Are you saying that a provision for wider needs under 'Communication and Interaction' would be more appropriate in being able to meet the needs of the more complex children you have described?

- SENCOs positive about a joint communication and interaction support provision - this would cover some of the more complex children who have wider needs.
- View that SENCOs are dealing with complex children where no alternative place available. In order for SENCOs to take on children who would have been previously placed in special schools, they need the training and resources. Often labelled with behavioural problems. Lack of time to deal with the most complex cases in an effective way.

-

General comments re SENCO role

- *General shared acknowledgement of challenges of SENCO role; whole school audits were a popular idea to flag up where schools don't have the resources/capacity to meet children's needs / potential to 'join up' smaller schools to share support and provide nurture groups etc. / Can't just be on SENCOs shoulders, has to involve the management structure and head teachers*



Kirklees Specialist Provisions

Westtown Family Centre, Boothroyd Green,
Dewsbury, WF13 2RQ
Tel: 01924 483744

Email: specialist.provisions@kirklees.gov.uk

Did you receive support from ASD SLCN Both

School Name:
How did you find the service as a whole?
What impact has the service had for the referred student?
What impact has the service had for key staff?
What impact has the service had for the whole school development?
What else would have been helpful/useful?

In the last year your school made a referral for support from Specialist Provision Outreach Team. We are currently evaluating our outreach service and value your feedback.

Your prompt response is appreciated and the evaluation of this form will help us to improve our future service.

Please return to the above email address by Friday 16th September 2016.

Thank you

Esther Marper
Strand Lead ASD

Jo Sayles
Strand Lead SLCN

The Effectiveness of Primary SLCN Outreach

An evaluation sheet was sent to all the Primary Schools that have requested SLCN outreach last year. 22 were returned by the closing date.

The feedback about the effectiveness of the outreach from the evaluations returned was positive.

Staff were asked to reflect and give feedback in the following four areas:

1. What impact has the service had for the referred student?

- Improved outcomes
- Reduced anxieties
- Child happier to come to school
- Improved behaviour
- Increased engagement in class
- Adaptation to the environment
- Positive impact on student development.

2. What impact has the service had on key staff?

- Increased confidence
- Staff are re-assured by advice
- Increased knowledge
- Support in trying out new strategies
- Confidence to speak to parents about their child
- Training and staff development
- Staff awareness about more complex needs
- Confidence in planning for more complex needs
- Positive impact on staff
- Supported with new resources

3. What impact has the service had on the whole school?

- General and specific training for all staff
- Knowledge and confidence in meeting needs of the children
- Sharing good practise
- Using advice to cascade to other staff
- Improvement in the school environment
- Supported children to meet and exceed their expected progress
- Support with writing reports and My Support Plans
- Support and training for new staff
- Consistency of practise across school.

4. How we improve the service?

- More training opportunities
- More frequent outreach
- Better communication with other Specialist Services.

In response to the cabinet summary report:

“There is a general concern regarding the lack of evidence of the effectiveness of an external outreach provision.....”

- The evaluation of the Specialist Provision Primary Outreach indicates clearly that there has been impact for pupils, staff and in whole school improvement.

“There are concerns that the move to outreach provision would heavily impact on teaching standards”

- The positive relationships formed with mainstream colleagues allow outreach staff to develop their own professional development within the teaching standards. This is evidenced by the coaching and mentoring of mainstream staff to build the capacity of their own school and to have the confidence to use new skills within the classroom; thus supporting Quality First Teaching.
- Empowering mainstream staff to support children within their own settings and facilitate staff to meet the needs of their children with their existing resources effectively.

“Children with the most complex SLCN require intense therapy and support on a one-to-one basis several times per week; many respondents are concerned that outreach does not address the needs of these children.”

- The response indicated that the outreach staff are skilled and knowledgeable in their field and raise the confidence of their mainstream colleagues. They can use their skills to show how children with more complex needs can be supported within a mainstream setting using the advice and recommendations from other professionals including the Speech and Language Therapists.
- The SLCN outreach staff would consult with staff and parents to assess the level of support needed depending on the individual child and their needs.

“Many respondents made points about the ability of mainstream school teaching staff to follow through on advice and guidance from outreach support, and whether they have the time and skills required to effectively support the child.”

- The new SEN guidelines require teaching staff to differentiate within the classroom through Quality First Teaching to meet the needs of all children. Schools value the support and advice from outreach staff bringing new ideas, strategies and resources to their schools.

“A lack of early intervention and prevention could potentially mean that it is too late to deal with SLCN at high school age if this has not been addressed at primary level.”

- There is an accessible referral process and response to need is made quickly. There are good communication links between the Early Years outreach team and the Primary SLCN outreach team to make early identification of children’s needs clear. The teams can then work closely to continue the support that is given to these children.

How did you find this service as a whole?

- "Staff have been non-critical and offered valuable advice?"
- "The whole provision service is a great support for school and being able to talk to staff who have a wealth of information is great!"
- "Excellent, efficient, support and professional".
- "I found the service very efficient and helpful. I was provided with lots of practical ideas and the reviews were useful to focus on everyone on outcomes".

What impact has the service had for the referred student?

- " Positive impact for the student as the visits confirmed the validity of our strategies and suggested how these might be developed."
- " The impact for the pupil has been the small adaptation of the curriculum, environment and raising staff awareness. Obviously this has had a positive effect on their achievement helping them to make small steps forward."
- "Support provided has seen improvement in self-esteem, social skills, confidence in talking to adults and ability to access learning in the classroom.
- "Parents have reported the child is happier coming in to school!".

What impact has the service had for key staff?

- "Staff are more skilled and well informed to support all students within the school."
"re-assurance and confidence for staff that they are doing the correct thing and making improvements to the provision we offer".
- "Staff have the confidence in what they are doing day to day".
- "The specialist advice and guidance has enabled the provision of specific activities and strategies to promote progression and learning".
- "Staff are developing greater confidence to plan for and meet very specific needs".

What impact has the service had for whole school development?

- "The advice and strategies provided will enable school to benefit other children with similar needs in the future".
- "The support provided is being used to develop the whole school staff , in particular with the writing of My Support Plans."
- "Looking at our learning environments to make adjustments to support our pupil".
- It has extended the range of interventions we can provide to our pupils and upskilled staff."

