

RESPONSES TO SEN MATRIX CONSULTATION DOCUMENT				APPENDIX 2	
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	
	Greenfield			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.	
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		Providing it is not a means of cutting down all statemented hours.	
	Head of Learning Support	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.	
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes			
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes			
	Anon		No	No problem with current system/more change.	
	Withymoore School & Language Unit	Yes		Statements protect the most vulnerable groups from the whims of the LEAs and schools although they are over bureaucratic	
	Anon	Yes		Hopefully this will result in SEN pupils receiving funding they need and remove duplicate funding on grounds of FSM etc	
	Anon			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		No	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!	
	Lynda Waltho	Yes		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.	
	Anon	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		No	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?	
	Leasowes	Yes			
Question 2					
Do you agree with the principles of the proposed review?	Anon	Yes			
	Greenfield			See Question 1	
	Anon			Average SAT's scores & expected level of SAT's needs defining carefully.	
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		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.	
	Cllr. Attwood			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	
	Anon		No	Overly complicated	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes			
	Withymoore School & Language Unit		No	Para 15- Moving away from specific hours has implications for contracts for support workers. Graduated banding is welcome	
	Anon			While SATS results are a measure I am concerned that some pupils achieve required results but are still underachieving- dyslexic tendencies can be masked by average results.	

				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			
	Lynda Waltho	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.	
	Anon	Yes		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		No		
	Leasowes	Yes		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.	
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	
	Withymoore School & Language Unit	Yes		Banding must be sufficient to maintain current levels of support (I.e. cost of hours support)	
	Anon	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			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	Yes		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?!	

	Lynda Waltho	Yes		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.	
	Anon	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	
	Leasowes	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?	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 suggested 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.	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		Current timetable is impossible. Personnel issues have not been	
	Anon			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	Yes		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.	
	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.	
	Head of Learning Support		No	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.	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank		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.	
	Anon			The burden of this extra work falls on an already overloaded staff.	

	Withymoor School & Language Unit		No	Pupils with most severe needs must be protected by the LEAs.	
	Anon	Yes		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? It also raises the issue of training for staff in schools.	
	Anon	Unsure		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	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!	
	Anon	Yes		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	
	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. See Question 1	
	Greenfield			Essential for scheme to work properly.	
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		Good practice	
	Anon	Yes		Yes, this should be standard practice according to SENCO P guidance.	
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		Particularly if funding depends on it.	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		Additional resources required.	
	Anon				
	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!!	
	Anon	Yes		But this is only possible 6 monthly. Termly is asking too much with regards to workload if reviews are to be carried out correctly	
	Leasowes	Yes		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?	
Question 8					
Do you agree with the monitoring mechanism proposed?	Anon		No	Agree with light touch monitorind. Disagree with a formal return. See Question 1	
	Greenfield				
	Cllr. Rogers	Yes		I do not like finite budgets. What happens to pupils in 26-28?	
	Head of Learning Support		No	Monitoring must be based on the systematic use of rigorous , transparent and objective data to ensure:	
				Accurate monitoring (at LA level) and moderating (at school cluster or LA level)	
				Accurate self-audits can be completed	
				Provision mapping is made against this data and against NC levels	
				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.	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes		There is a need for checking to avoid "misuse"	
	Anon			schools with large % SEN will not be able to cope with this extra workload.	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit		No	See Question 9	
	Anon		No	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		No	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 and No		I think that there is a very good chance that it will be abused . It's the only realistic way it can be done.	
	Lynda Waltho	Yes		all costs should be monitored effectively; accountability and moderation are essential! 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			
	Leasowes		No	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.	
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?	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		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.	
	Anon	Yes		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?	
	Anon	Yes		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?	
	Lynda Waltho		No		
	Anon	Yes		Need to have sustainable Ed. Psychs! Must have continuity so that ED Psych & SENCO have a good mutual understanding.	
	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.	
	Anon			Costing is difficult/impossible to do in group situations.	
	Cllr. Attwood	Yes		Definitely, and also where this is spent and whether parents consider adequate provision. If inadequate LEA can lobby government.	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank	Yes			
	Head of Learning Support	Yes		It would be impossible to administer or monitor the system transparently and equitably without this information.	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		This should be simple and not too bureaucratic! (See overall aims!)	
	Anon			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	Yes		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!	
	Lynda Waltho	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.	
	Anon			Could this pilot be a paper exercise?	
	Anon	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.	
	Head of Learning Support			Immediate full implementation with protection	
	Cllr. Attwood			A	
	Headteacher Quarry Bank			B there will be a need for training in Jan 06 to enable this to take the current timescale is impossible. Implementation with	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Option B			
	Anon			B	
	Anon			Second option	
	Anon	Yes		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!!	
	Lynda Waltho			Plan A	
	Anon			Option B	
	Anon	Method B		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.	
	Leasowes	Option B		Matrix completed by end of January is very optimistic	
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.	
	Greenfield			See Question 1	
	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 ?	
	Anon	Yes		The childs 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. Lets face it SENCO consultation is after the statement has been agreed by parents!!	
	Lynda Waltho	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.	
	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 S/ARCS sit in. This issue has gone very quiet - if not not enough detailed information.	
	Withymoor School & Language Unit	Yes		Important to maintain funding for have no experience in this area and feel unqualified to comment.	
	Anon				
	Anon	Yes		Just made sure there are enough places in special schools, for those children identified on the matrix as needing this level of provision.	

				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.	
	Lynda Waltho	Yes			
	Anon		No		
	Leasowes		No		
Other comments	The Mere			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.	