

Question 1	Organisation	Yes	No	Comments
Do you agree with the purpose of the review?	Anon	Yes		Standardised system based on audit of pupil need is welcome I do not understand the matrix & I have not received any LEA input which was raised at HTCF. Therefore I cannot respond but I want my return to be noted as such.
	Greenfield			Providing it is not a means of cutting down all statedemented hours.
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		However, the process must be simple, transparent and appropriately monitored and moderated across all schools. Criteria must be unambiguous and based on moderated or standardised data.
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes		
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		
	Anon		No	No problem with current system/more change. Statements protect the most vulnerable groups from the whims of the LEAs and schools although they are over bureaucratic Hopefully this will result in SEN pupils receiving funding they need and remove duplicate funding on grounds of FSM etc
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		The content of the most recent statements & the level of funding attached has been effective. The process involved in achieving this level of support has also improved. Funding for pupils at SA & SAT has not been clearly defined or been adequate .
	Anon	Yes		It appears that the LEA is using this as a tool to reduce the number of statements, as their last attempt under the SEN reshuffle failed. There is currently a greater need for "statements" as the children coming into mainstream school have greater needs!
	Anon		No	Our borough schools need to implement a more equitable, open, transparent, and less bureaucratic funding system for SEN. The review provides a dialogue in which these changes can become a reality.
	Lynda Waltho	Yes		But not as a cost cutting exercise. If a child needs the support and protection a statement provides we would want this to continue.
	Anon	Yes		Although many of the principles of the review are acceptable and understandable; we have concerns over the move & remove statements (13f). Parents currently have a useful legal safety net with statements. What protection would be provided for them without?
	Anon		No	
	Leasowes	Yes		
Question 2 Do you agree with the principles of the proposed review?	Anon	Yes		See Question 1
	Greenfield			Average SAT's scores & expected level of SAT's needs defining carefully.
	Anon			Banding system must be seen to be clear, fairly moderated and based on 'hard data' i.e. standardised scores/ percentile ranks or against age-related NC attainment targets.
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		The banding system does not seem to include children with good SAT's or insignificant SAT's results but with behavioural SEN affecting other children
	Cllr. Attwood		No	Overly complicated
	Anon	Yes		
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		
	Withymoor School & Language Unit		No	Para 15- Moving away from specific hours has implications for contracts for support workers. Graduated banding is welcome While SATS results are a measure I am concerned that some pupils achieve required results but are still underacheiving- dyslexic tendencies can be masked by average results.
	Anon			The graduated banding system needs to consider more than just the SATS scores. A pupil making progress may only be doing so because of a high level of support & intervention. There needs to be a level of funding identified to maintain this otherwise funding will be attached to failure rather than success
	Anon			You have already increased the bureaucracy and red tape by changing the RS4 form. Also there is a greater need to standardise what counts as each stage of code of practise. What is "SA" in our school would constitute a statement request in other parts of the borough.
	Anon		No	
	Lynda Waltho	Yes		Concern regarding the amount of children who may qualify to be placed on the matrix who do not currently receive funding e.g. some ADHD/autistic spectrum: may not trigger FSM or low SATS/NFER, but do have issues. However the 'ring-fenced' pot of money means that there would be personnel/finance issues for schools which will be above what they are paying at present.
	Anon	Yes		With the promise that funds are ring-fenced for SEN provision and associated bureaucracy is minimal and useful rather than system generated
	Anon	Yes		
	Leasowes	Yes		
Question 3 Do you have any comments on the SEN matrix framework proposed?	Anon	Yes		Monitor & moderate school action via visits to schools by SEN staff.
	Greenfield			See Question 1
	Anon	Yes		Not all children may neatly fall into one category Pupil descriptors need to be more objective or specific for schools to make good 'best-fit 'judgments for their pupils with SEN.
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		Standardised scores and/or percentile ranks with NC attainment levels set against age-related expectations would be more useful (i.e. P scales 5-8 in a pupil of Reception age are very different level of SEN compared to those achieved by a pupil in Year 5).
				Currently the matrix is more appropriate to primary schools than secondary schools. Some case studies or exemplars would be useful Unless more data specific, the process as described could be very imprecise and time consuming for schools to administer.
				Why no SpLD descriptors although detailed as a category in matrix?
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes		What about Aspergers and no visual/hearing/physical disability? Too complicated and in particular areas unreasonable support allocations suggested.
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		

	Anon	Yes	Very complicated. Difficult to understand. Descriptions for cognition and learning- too much reliance on "P" scales. Older pupils may have achieved L1-2 but not progress further. More differentiation in The framework is a good start, where pupils fit into several categories, I hope their needs will not be identified as just "the worst category" or that funding will not be unnecessarily duplicated.
	Withymoore School & Language Unit	Yes	It would have been useful to have some of the comments from the pilot schools i.e difficulties, adaptations etc. that were made. How do you plan to moderate this? How do SENCOs decide where on the matrix a child will fall-what about if they are C1 for 2 aspects & C6 for something else. According to the matrix descriptions in the appendix I've got children in mainstream who should be educated in a specilaist setting! Will the funding match the TA levels as identified in appendix 1? You need to delegate a lot more to schools than you currently do!!
	Anon	Yes	The framework is a good and productive start, but the entire dialogue needs to be an evolving process over time, allowing for the input from many people involved. The framework will take a lot of getting used to. It looks complex and it will take a significant amount of time to carryout initial placement of children.
	Anon	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	
	Anon	No	There are a number of issues relating to the matrix that I have concerns about. SEN pupils have highly individualised needs that do not fit into neat categories, this is cmpounded by lack of clear differentials between funding bands. I believe the CRISP model in Birmingham works on this systemand is very contraversial.
	Leasowes	Yes	
Question 4 Have you any comments on the proposed funding methodology?	Anon	Yes	There is a big training need for all staff
	Greenfield		
	Cllr. Rogers		All pupils should receive the current level of support
	Head of Learning Support	Yes	Appears to be unchanged from the current funding method?? Do not agree with Level 2 TA for pupils with SpLD, the skills and support strategies needed to support these pupils equate with those of pupils with SLCN and those with ASD (i.e. level 3TA). Usually a specialist teacher will teach a key lesson each week and liaise with a skilled TA who will undertake follow-up lessons independently for rest of the week-this requires a high level (3) of skill and autonomy.
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes	Non statemented pupils who have SEN needs & move after Jan do not receive fundinfg for the new school. Will this deter schools from taking " particular" pupils.
	Anon	Yes	Complex. More work for SENCO Banding must be sufficient to maintain current levels of support (i.e. cost of hours support)
	Withymoore School & Language Unit	Yes	I am greatly concerned that the notion of the finite pot will lead to underfunding. The matrix, if it exists can not be manipulated to fit the funding. SEN pupils have an entitlement, schools have to provide, therefore funding has to be provided. Currently I am aware that many schools fund SEN pupils over and above the money they receive.
	Anon	Yes	Funding from Y6-Y7 was not clear. Funding based purely on SATS would not be sufficiently fair or accurate. Funding for SAT- would this be affected by the waiting lists of referral & diagnosis?
	Anon		Will it work? I could have at least 1/3 of my school (probably more) on the matrix somewhere (not C11)-will all of those children get the allocated funding? What will happen if someone decides a school is getting too much! What about unscrupulous SENCOs who put them down as being worse than they really are?! If my statemented children are deemed to be placed too low on the matrix will their statement be ammended? The list of descriptors relies heavily on parents agreeing to take child to see outside agencies, will funding hampered if this doesn't happen?! The accountability element on the proposed funding methodology needs to be thorough.
	Anon	Yes	Concerned that this model will prove to be more expensive so therefore the unit of resource will not be enough to provide the support it is supposed to.
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	Whist the principle is sound there are flaws with this method. If say a C6 is awarded but there are only L3 Ta's available, school would not receive sufficient funding. Likewise, if C5 was awarded-this may lay rise to claims for increased pay/level from a L2 TA
	Anon	Yes	I think making a differential of level 2 or level 3 support could cause pragmatic timetable issues for schools
Question 5 Have you any comments on the proposed timescale for identification of SEN pupils for funding via the matrix?	Leasowes	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	Schools will need to update their assessment processes to ensure audit criteria are updated in time for budget review.
	Greenfield		See Question 1
	Cllr. Rogers		Rather tight. Need to train as many people as possible as soon as possible.
	Anon		Forecasting finance in Jan for A or Action+ in new Sept intake is difficult.
	Cllr. Attwood	No	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes	As with other initiatives this year, unreasonable expectations. There are no dates for training suggetsed however, Jan 31st has been mentioned to place statemented children on the matrix. Will training take place before then?
	Anon	Yes	Early identification is impossible under present timescales.
	Withymoore School & Language Unit	Yes	Current timetable is impossible. Personnel issues have not been I do not believe the LA & LSS have the capacity to be able to complete the task in time, if moderated and carefully considered decisions (which affect funding) are to be taken.
	Anon		Unrealistic. There needs to be several training & discussion sessions first.
	Anon	Yes	What happens if a child transfers in/out during the school year? Does their SEN funding go with them? Surely that would make things much more difficult to track! What about if a child comes from out of borough & has severe needs, but no statement, because you aren't giving them out.
	Anon	Yes	
	Lynda Waltho	No	
	Anon	Yes	Needs to be delayed until after this financial year! No time to do it for April 2006!

	Anon	Yes	Lessons should be learned over this from the SEN and primary schools reviews. Problems arise when these things are rushed through. The timescale for changes to SEN funding should be e.g for Jan 2007 with financial in April 2007
	Leasowes	Yes	I think they are sensible, however intake from out of borough will be quite difficult to cover initially.
Question 6			
Do you agree with the need to delegate the centrally retained funding of £1.4m to schools?	Anon	Yes	Schools will need support to access appropriate support for pupils with complex needs. The advice will need to take on board financial reality.
	Greenfield		See Question 1
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes	Devolve to local level. Schools in the main will be able to do it. The protection of pupils with SEN Statements would be best achieved if funds were held centrally until rigorous, robust and moderated monitoring systems were in place across the LA. Concerns that funds may not reach the school to provide timely support if pupils move schools in mid-year.
	Head of Learning Support	No	I feel delegation is not always the most effective use of funding. Keeping a job centrally as long as this is transparent is useful and fair.
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	No	The burden of this extra work falls on an already overloaded staff.
	Anon		Pupils with most severe needs must be protected by the LEAs.
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	No	With a provision that schools are accountable for the spending- in accordance with the allocation for specific pupils.
	Anon	Yes	In part but will this lead to a loss of centrally based specialist teams?
	Anon	Yes	It also raises the issue of training for staff in schools.
	Anon		Do you give statements for children for more than 25 hours, as I have been told by my case officer that you don't! Will you be giving statements of more than 25 hours once the fundings been delegated?
	Lynda Waltho	Unsure	
		Yes	
	Anon	No	Same concerns as before-will there be enough? We will all want a slice as inclusion has affected all schools and some schools currently receive low funding levels due to the present triggers! But if more pupils are being dealt with in mainstream due to inclusion-the £1.4m needs to be reviewed and probably increased if possible
	Anon	Yes	
	Leasowes	Yes	
Question 7			
Do you agree that schools need to keep their SEN matrix data up to date throughout the year?	Anon	Yes	A timeline for action by SENCO's/Schools would be helpful at the earliest opportunity to support school review/action.
	Greenfield		See Question 1
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes	Essential for scheme to work properly.
	Anon	Yes	Good practice
	Head of Learning Support	Yes	Yes, this should be standard practice according to SENCO P guidance.
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes	Particularly if funding depends on it.
	Anon		Additional resources required.
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	Once a year
	Anon	Yes	Isn't this done anyway through plasc?!
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	But this will be difficult and time consuming!!
			But this is only possible 6 monthly.
	Anon	Yes	Termly is asking too much with regards to workload if reviews are to be carried out correctly
			However at present the E.P service is understaffed and not delivering full quota service; will they meet this additional obligation? What will happen if there is a dispute regarding placement?
	Leasowes	Yes	
Question 8			
Do you agree with the monitoring mechanism proposed?	Anon	No	Agree with light touch monitorind.
	Greenfield		Disagree with a formal return.
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes	See Question 1
	Head of Learning Support	No	I do not like finite budgets. What happens to pupils in 26-28? Monitoring must be based on the systematic use of rigorous , transparent and objective data to ensure:
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes	Accurate monitoring (at LA level) and moderating (at school cluster or LA level)
	Anon	No	Accurate self-audits can be completed
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	No	Provision mapping is made against this data and against NC levels
	Anon	No	Concerns that the Educational Psychologist Service will find it very difficult to provide the suggested number of visits from within current caseloads, to monitor this accurately and appropriately.
	Anon	No	There is a need for checking to avoid "misuse"
	Anon	No	schools with large % SEN will not be able to cope with this extra workload.
	Anon	Yes and No	See Question 9
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	The change in SDA and the nature of their involvement in school (for band 1) means they do not have the time or knowledge to carry out this role. Surely LSS already have huge input in to this area.
	Anon	Yes	Unrealistic. Current staffing levels suggest that this would not be possible if involvement of EPS & SEN officers would be expected at every review.
	Anon	Yes	I think that there is a very good chance that it will be abused . It's the only realistic way it can be done.
	Anon	Yes	all costs should be monitored effectively; accountability and moderation are essential!
	Anon	Yes	However, if a particular school needs more allocations, a fair effort should be made to increase a particular allocation. It is important to provide all of the necessary funds needed to a particular school.
	Anon	Yes	
	Anon	Yes	Termly review of IEP is not in line with code of practice requirements. It will increase my workload by 33%-167 reviews. I raised this at a consultation meeting and was assured this proposal would be removed.
	Leasowes	No	
Question 9			
Do you have any further comments on the monitoring mechanism?	Anon	Yes	Would be an enormous burder every term. Twice yearly is more realistic.
	Head of Learning Support	Yes	IEP reviews should follow SENCOP guidance (i.e at least 2x year) However, 1x each term is preferable for pupils at SA+ and for those with Statements.
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes	What evidence will be presented to Childrens Services to prove parents are happy & children receiving adequate provision since there is no obligation to submit a return to LEA. LEA has responsibility in part for all children, it must have feedback via governorsof parents concerns
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes	What training will SDA's or SIP's have re: SEN and Statemented pupils?

				IEPS do not need to be reviewed termly. (36) A minimum of 6 months is required but may be reviewed sooner. This would reduce workload for SENCOs. To identify in terms of money how much is spent on each SEN pupil is hugely complex. TA support, SENCO support, extra teacher planning time, resources (often shared) monitoring needs to be based around pupil progress to IEP targets. This could be a huge job. Or will it just be lip service SENCO & head to SDA? Could schools identify needs and funding band while waiting for involvement from outside agencies? Has the impact on the stability of staffing levels been considered?
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		
	Anon	Yes		
	Anon	Yes	No	
	Lynda Waltho			Need to have sustainable Ed. Psychs! Must have continuity so that ED Psych & SENCO have a good mutual understanding.
	Anon	Yes		
	Anon		No	
	Leasowes	Yes		See previous box
Question 10				
Do you agree that the council should request data from schools to confirm how funds for SEN pupils have been allocated in schools?	Anon		No	Better for people to discuss and monitor/moderate during discussions with colleagues
	Greenfield			See Question 1
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		Important to monitor to ensure funds are allocated properly. Costing is difficult/impossible to do in group situations.
	Anon			Definitely, and also where this is spent and whether parents consider adequate provision. If inadequate LEA can lobby government.
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes		
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		It would be impossible to administer or monitor the system transparently and equitably without this information. This should be simple and not too bureaucratic! (See overall aims!) See box above. This could become another time consuming paper exercise which does not evaluate the impact of the spending. e.g. Does that TA spend 24 hours with "A" or does he spend most of it helping generally in the classroom. What proportion of SENCO wages do we allocate to each child? Where a child is supported in a group, how do we cost this out. What price 10min precision teaching per day for 6wks???
	Anon			Additional data to SATS should be considered
	Anon	Yes		SENCOs need to see this data too- we don't all know what the budget is spent on!
	Anon	Yes		Accountability will ensure that all schools are using their allocations properly and so that the students will achieve their maximum potential with the funds provided. Could this pilot be a paper exercise?
	Lynda Waltho	Yes		
	Anon			
	Anon	Yes		
	Leasowes	Yes		I think similar arrangements to now should be in place. This could become a huge bureaucratic issue
Question 11				
Which method of implementation do you prefer for commencement in the 2006/07 financial year?	Anon	Yes		Timescale to tight for this year. Schools need training. Better to continue this year and address implementation issues through 2006
	Greenfield			See Question 1
	Anon			Para 44 is more realistic. Immediate full implementation with protection
	Head of Learning Support			A
	Cllr. Attwood			There will be a need for training in Jan 06 to enable this to take the current situation is impossible. Implementation with
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Option B		
	Withymoor School & Language Unit			
	Anon			B
	Anon			Second option
				Implementation with protection is the only realistic choice (although I don't support implementation at all) There is no way I could get all of my children assessed on the new matrix by the end of Jan, as I haven't had the appropriate training offered as yet!!
	Anon	Yes		Plan A
	Lynda Waltho			Option B
	Anon			Method B is preferred but 2006/07 is too early in light of many aspects not being finalised. 2007/08 is a far more realistic date.
	Anon	Method B		Matrix completed by end of January is very optimistic
	Leasowes	Option B		
Question 12				
Have you any comments on the proposed wording on statements for the future?	Anon	Yes		The matrix is not easily comprehensible to the non specialist. Suggest further work to consult on appropriate formats which are clear to all involved. See Question 1
	Greenfield			
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		Aligning statement descriptors with those the SEN matrix will ensure clarity for both schools and LA.
	Cllr. Attwood		No	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank		No	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit		No	
	Anon	Yes		While statements need to fit with the matrix, surely each child is an individual with their own specific needs. My concern is that the statements may become bland and "prescribe" inappropriate "treatment" for the pupil.
	Anon	Yes		Where will the protection of the child be secured ?
				The child's needs need to be met & SENCOs need to be consulted, to make sure the statement actually meets the day to day needs of the child. Let's face it SENCO consultation is after the statement has been agreed by parents!!
	Anon	Yes		The wording should allow for flexibility of provision, but parents need to feel secure in the support which is provided. If parents do not feel secure with their support, the statement is worthless having involved the use of many resources, such as the EP's office and others.
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	No	
	Anon		No	
	Leasowes		No	
Question 13				
Have you any comments on the application of the SEN matrix for special schools or SEN units?	Anon		No	
	Greenfield			See Question 1
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		Rather complex. May need to do a pilot run first.
	Cllr. Attwood		No	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		Where do the SATS fall. This issue has gone very quiet - if not not enough detailed information.
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		Important to maintain funding for I have no experience in this area and feel unqualified to comment. Just made sure there are enough places in special schools, for those children identified on the matrix as needing this level of provision.
	Anon	Yes		It is an established fact that the allocations to SEN are extremely important; therefore the school forum needs to look very carefully at the funding for SEN so that the allocated money is shared equitably across the board. This is particularly important because it seems as though there will not be more money going into the overall budget for SEN.
	Anon			
	Lynda Waltho	Yes	No	
	Anon		No	
	Leasowes		No	

Other comments

The Mere

Page 5 of 5

Concerned that there will no longer be access to high level support for SEBD children. Where is the "specialist setting" referred to Pg 25. What is the nature of "specialist support" for pupils referred to in 5C4. Proposals generally do not seem to support Inclusion.