

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN LEICESTER: CONSULTATION

INTRODUCTION

In its publication *Excellence for All Schools - Meeting Special Educational Needs*, (1997) the Government clearly set out its direction by stating that:

'..whilst recognising the paramount importance of meeting the needs of individual children, and the necessity of specialist provision for some, we shall promote the inclusion of children with SEN within mainstream schooling wherever possible.' (p5)

The Government has also stated that it intends to reduce social exclusion. The DfES distributed the 'Index for Inclusion' (Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education) to all schools. Other key initiatives - for example, 'Preventing Social Exclusion' (Social Exclusion Unit) and 'Valuing People' (Department of Health) were further evidence of a strong Government drive to promote Social Inclusion, nationally.

The Green Paper *Every Child Matters* makes reference to building the capacity of schools and Early Years settings to make provision for pupils with SEN and disabilities.

Leicester City has a tradition of supporting pupils with special educational needs in a variety of settings and through diverse provision. This ranges from mainstream schools along a continuum of support to full-time placement in a special school. Recent Ofsted Inspections have confirmed that the quality of education in Leicester City Special Schools is high. However, there are increasing numbers of parents requesting support for their children in local mainstream schools.

This has resulted in a reduction in the allocation of places in City special schools. This reduction in numbers has already presented funding difficulties for some schools in the current financial year and suggests that the viability of schools with primary-aged pupils will reach a critical level from the next financial year and worsen the year after.

For all of us working with pupils with SEN in Leicester, the challenge now is to achieve greater inclusion whilst protecting the entitlement that all children have, to a quality education. To do this, we must build upon the excellence of our special schools and the good practice in our mainstream schools.

Background

In 1998, the City began a review of the provision it was making for pupils with SEN. In August 2000, from this work, the Education Committee approved a policy for Special Educational Needs based on the following aims:

- To ensure high levels of achievement, effective learning, progress and development for all pupils regardless of any special educational need;

- To support Leicester schools in meeting the diversity of needs of all pupils with SEN increasingly within their own communities (“developing inclusive schools”);
- To secure a range of provision appropriate to pupils’ individual needs;
- To facilitate a high level of satisfaction and participation of pupils, parents and carers in determining how pupils’ needs are best met;
- To ensure effective mechanisms which sustain consistent practice across all City schools through a clear and common understanding of the respective responsibilities of schools and the LEA and the agreed procedures which ensure timely identification, assessment, monitoring, review and evaluation of needs, intervention and provision;
- To establish transparent mechanisms which resource schools and ensure all pupils’ needs are appropriately met, wherever possible, without recourse to Statements of Special Educational Needs, and that for all pupils (including those with Statements, resources are used in a transparent and accountable manner;
- To ensure that schools identify and describe how they provide access to a broad, balanced and relevant curriculum, for all pupils;
- To facilitate collaboration in inclusive practices between all city schools; and
- To ensure access to appropriate training and expertise to support the aims and objectives of the LEA’s policy.

These aims set out a vision for the future education of boys and girls with special educational needs in Leicester City. The shape of future provision must be a dynamic and evolving structure.

From these aims, an SEN strategy was developed. Many elements of this have either been achieved or are currently underway. For example:

- 1) The mainstream funding formula, which resourced schools directly to make provision for pupils with SEN and laid the basis for revising the Local Management of Special Schools formula.
- 2) Promoting inclusive practice in schools - Leicester City has produced a comprehensive Meeting Individual Needs Document with extensive training and support for its implementation. The DfES and Audit Commission have commended this document.
- 3) Behaviour Support Strategy - The original Behaviour Support Plan was produced in 1998 and a revised plan in 2000. In line with Government requirements this is due for review in 2004.
- 4) Training Programme to support Inclusion: Last year over 200 central courses were run by support services, together with customised support and training in individual schools.
- 5) The development and restructuring of provision for pupils with SEN in the City of Leicester.

The fifth element of the strategy is the development of many workstreams over a period of years and will include the examination and development of provision for

pupils with a range of special educational needs such as autism; social, emotional and behavioural difficulties and physical and sensory needs. This consultation paper puts forward proposals for the first of these workstreams: **the future development of special provision in the City for pupils with Moderate, Severe, and Profound and Multiple Learning Disabilities (MLD, SLD, PMLD).**

Future Developments

The formative consultation document - *'Meeting Individual Needs: Development and Restructuring of Provision for Pupils/Students with Special Educational Needs in the City of Leicester'*, proposed that,

"All primary and secondary schools will provide for a wide range of general learning difficulties, including moderate learning difficulties and specific learning difficulties."

Whilst the ideal long-term goal would be for all schools to be fully inclusive, not **all** mainstream schools will be able to cater for **all** pupils who should have full access to the National Curriculum and appropriate resources and facilities. For example, few schools are fully accessible to pupils with physical disabilities and even with a rolling programme of building improvement, this would take many years to achieve

Schools' resources are often stretched by the need to achieve challenging targets. They may not be best placed to take up the new initiative. To do so successfully, they will require additional resources.

Establishing a network of provision - Schools with Additional Resources (SARs) working in partnership with Special Schools.

Schools with Additional Resources (SARs) are those funded over and above their delegated budgets in order to meet the Special Educational Needs of a wider range of pupils than those normally on roll.

The concept is not new: Schools with Additional Resources (or Enhanced Resource Schools [ERSs]) are established in many Authorities. Locally, Nottingham and Derby, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire all have examples of SARs/ERSs. Indeed, forms of SAR are already in place in Leicester City. The LEA has audited the Current unit provision in the City and intends to develop the nature and pattern of SARs in the City to ensure strong links with special schools and encourage the development of inclusive pathways.

Wherever possible, SARs would be established in neighbourhood 'pyramids' - linked infant, junior (primary) and secondary schools - so that parents can identify a 'pathway' for their child's educational career, without the uncertainty of transfer at the end of each phase.

The general aim of the SARs will be to meet fully, the Special Educational Needs of stated pupils whilst working towards the greatest degree of inclusion and social and academic achievement in the primary or secondary curriculum, within mainstream schools.

It will be important for special schools to be included in the development of SARs. Their expertise will be used to contribute to direct pupil support and the training already available to staff in SARs and other mainstream settings.

Funding for each SAR will relate to the number of places bought by the LEA and the 'place factor' designated for each level of Special Educational Need as determined by the Local Management of Special Schools (LMSS) formula. This means simply, that fewer places will be bought in special schools for the following year, - with subsequent effects to individual school budgets.

Falling rolls and decreasing budgets will impact significantly upon at least *four* special schools in the next financial year. This will pose staffing and curriculum problems, which would become serious, unless a solution can be agreed.

However, this also presents an opportunity to develop new and innovative special schools in a way that ensures a continuing and viable patterns of provision.

The new schools would offer state-of-the-art buildings and equipment together with the best practices in the education of MLD/SLD/PMLD pupils. The Authority would consult with students, staff and parents about the features they would want to see in these new schools.

A joint Health and Education Working group involving both Primary Care Trusts and representatives from the City, County and Rutland Education departments is addressing the current concerns regarding school nurse support. This group will establish appropriate nursing cover for all of the schools in the area – including the new schools.

The location of the schools will be dependent partly upon the success of the City's bid for over £150 million to develop secondary education in the City. Schools could either be redeveloped on existing sites or on new sites in the City. In either case, every opportunity will be taken to ensure that the skilled and experienced staff working in the present schools would be retained to establish the new schools.

The new schools would develop close working relationships with SAR 'pyramids' to provide advice, support and inclusion opportunities on a collaborative basis.

Currently, there are 6 schools making provision for pupils with MLD, SLD and PMLD:

Ellesmere College (11-19)
Emily Fortey (5-19)
Nether Hall (5-19)
Oaklands (5-11)
Piper Way (5-11)
Western Park (5-19)

Proposal: Primary Provision (7-11)

Given the current numbers of primary age pupils in special schools, the likelihood of a continuing decrease in County numbers, *plus* a reduction arising from the establishment of SARs, it was considered realistic to propose the development of

one generic primary special school - offering provision to 125 children with moderate, severe and profound and multiple learning difficulties, for Key Stage 2 only.

It was agreed by the professional groups consulted, that younger Foundation/Key Stage 1 (F/KS1) pupils could be provided for within mainstream settings, including SARs, with appropriate support. This was also the view of the special school representatives. It was noted that there were limited numbers of pupils with high dependency needs; that many F/KS1 children are already supported in mainstream; and therefore, the overall number of Key Stage 2 pupils would not require more than could be provided by a single special school.

Proposal: Secondary Provision (11-19)

In the case of the secondary MLD/SLD pupils, there is the same reduction in overall numbers. However at the secondary stage, it is often considered advisable to create teaching groups with similar cognitive abilities.

Therefore, **two** proposals were considered:

Secondary Proposal One:

Create two new KS3/4 (11-19) secondary schools, each of an approximate capacity of 175, with one school making greater specialist provision for pupils with higher dependency needs.

Secondary Proposal Two:

Create one large KS $\frac{3}{4}$ (11-19) generic special school with a capacity of 350 (possibly across two sites).

In the case of both proposals, it is expected that there will be similar purpose-built facilities and that the school/s will develop close partnerships with mainstream secondary schools and with the FE sector.

Alternative proposals were considered including amalgamating the existing establishments into four schools: one primary and one secondary MLD, one primary and one secondary SLD. However, this was not considered a viable option as the current and projected pupil numbers would not sustain 4 viable schools in the longer term.

In addition, a proposal to realign the current pattern into four schools 2x 7-14, 2x 14-19 was eventually discounted at Project Board as the City has no similar pattern of mainstream provision into which the new schools could locate.

Timescale

In order to avoid a situation where one or more schools falls into financial difficulties, it is important that the formal processes are completed within the next year to permit the establishment of shadow governing bodies and the reassignment of staff to the new schools:

- This consultation will end on March 22 2004. There will be opportunities for staff, parents and governors to send in their views and/or to discuss these proposals with officers. (The form at the end of this document can be used if you wish).
- Following this consultation, Councillors will decide whether to take the proposals further. Should they decide to do so, then there will be a further, *formal* consultation process.
- A *formal* consultation must take place within a set timescale. This would be completed during the Summer Term 2004.
- The results of this further consultation would be taken to the School Organisation Committee in the Autumn Term 2004. It would be for this Committee (SOC) to decide if schools should be closed and new ones opened.
- If SOC agrees, arrangements would then be made to appoint 'shadow' governing bodies for the new schools. Head teachers and staff would be appointed as 'designates', working in their current schools. Building work would begin around this time.
- The new schools would open in the Autumn 2005 but if buildings were not completed, children and staff would remain in the existing school buildings until their new schools were ready.

Number of written responses

- 172 Total number of written responses received (includes written and consultation response sheets).
- 136 Consultation response sheets received (included in the statistical analysis in section 2 of this report).
- 139 Written submissions analysed - from response sheets, attached to response sheets, letters, reports (included in analysis in sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this report).

1. Statistical analysis

Consultation Response Sheets - All

%ages apply to those who answered the question.

Q

- 1 **General arrangements.** A continuum of provision - comprising mainstream schools (including those with additional resources SARS) and new special schools - will provide for pupils with generalised learning difficulties.
- 2 **Foundation and Key Stage 1.** A range of mainstream settings including dedicated SARS will provide for pupils at Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1.
- 3 **Key Stage 2.** The creation of One generic primary special school to offer provision to 125 children at Key Stage 2 (7-11 years).
- 4 **Secondary - Option A*.** The creation of Two new Key Stage 3/4 (11-19 years) special schools - each to provide capacity of approximately 175 places.
- 5 **Secondary - Option B*.** The creation of One generic Key Stage 3/4 (11-19 years) special school to provide 350 places - possibly across Two sites.
- 6 **Supplementary question (if you agree to Option A in Q4).** One of the Two secondary special schools will make special provision for pupils/students with higher dependency needs.

Agree		Disagree	
N ^o	%	N ^o	%
56	44%	72	56%
27	21%	99	79%
44	35%	81	65%
54	45%	66	55%
10	10%	93	90%
49	48%	54	52%

* Both proposals envisage the new schools developing close partnerships with the Further Education Sector.

2. Meetings

The following meetings were held for Parents, Staff and Governors.

School	Date
Ellesmere College –parents (x2)	3/2/04
Ellesmere College - staff	3/2/04
Ellesmere College – governors	3/2/04
Emily Fortey School – staff	3/2/04
Emily Fortey School – governors	10/2/04
Emily Fortey parents	10/2/04
Oaklands School – staff	2/3/04
Oaklands School - governors	4/3/04
Piper Way School - parents	9/3/04
Piper Way School - governors	9/3/04
Western Park - governors	11/2/04
Western Park - parents	11/2/04
SENCo meeting	18/3/04

Notes from these meetings are summarised in Appendix 1.

Two meetings were held at Ellesmere for parents due to numbers on roll.

No notes were taken at the meetings at Nether Hall School as the offer of individual/group discussions was declined.

Staffs of all six schools were invited to attend one of three meetings at Ellesmere, Emily Fortey and Oaklands.

3. General Responses from parents/carers, pupils, staff and unknown individuals

135 responses were received in this category.

As people were invited to respond anonymously, the analysis does not distinguish between parents, pupils, teachers or other staff members. Staff included in this section identifying themselves as such, either did not specify which school they represented, or stated that they wished to give their opinion in a personal capacity.

This section Includes comments from Ellesmere Student Council.

This section includes the comments which were attached to a petition 'Save our School' from Emily Fortey. There were 398 names on the petition, however, the response is only counted once within the 'number of similar responses' column.

Of the forms and letters received in this category, 102 made written comments. These are summarised in Appendix 2.

4. Letters and Responses from School Staff/Head teachers/Governing Body

32 written responses were received from schools. This section includes all responses received from identified individuals representing schools (on school letterhead, on behalf of school/group of schools, from Head teacher, SENCO or governing body):

School	From
Mainstream Schools	
Abbey Primary School	Mr Trivedi, Governor
Beaumont Leys School	Liz Logie, Headteacher
Crown Hills Community College	-
Hamilton Community College	E de Middelaer, Principal
Judgemeadow Community College	R Gilchrist, SENCO
The Lancaster School	Gill Jameson, SENCO
Merrydale Infant School	Elaine Henderson, SENCO
Overdale Junior School	Pam Weston, Headteacher
Queensmead Infant School	S Boyce, Headteacher
Southfields Infant School	B Odedra-Pinder, Headteacher
Spinney Hill Primary School	Jane Jarvis, SENCO
Sir Jonathan North Community College	Jane Collins, Principal
Whitehall Primary School	Scott Fewster, Headteacher
Leicester Secondary Heads	Dr Mike Griffiths, Headteacher of City of Leicester School and Vice Chair Leicester Secondary Heads
Special School	
Emily Fortey School Staff	Ann Standley, Acting Headteacher
Emily Fortey School	Ellen Wood
Ellesmere College Staff Group	Andrea Soulby and Jill Poole
Ellesmere College Governing Body	Various signatures
Ellesmere College	Neil Foster, Assistant Principal, Links Coordinator
Ellesmere College	Jill Poole
Ellesmere College	Fiona Moir, Principal
Ellesmere College	George Knights, Chair of Governors
Nether Hall School Governors	-
Nether Hall School	-
Nether Hall School Parent Action Group	Judy Warner, Parent Governor
Oaklands Special School	Malcolm Robbins, Governor
Oaklands Special School	Andy Moran, Headteacher
Piper Way School Staff	-
Piper Way School	Ann Standley, Headteacher
Piper Way Governors	Ian Keeling, Chair of Governors
Western Park School Governors	-
Western Park School	-

All 32 submitted written comments, which are summarised in Appendix 3.

A number of schools have also submitted new proposals, or expanded upon suggested proposals.

Responses from Unions and Other Stakeholders

5 written responses were received from Unions and other stakeholders:

Organisation
TCC Teachers Panel
NASUWT
UNISON
Voluntary Action Leicester
NUT

All 5 submitted written comments, which are summarised in Appendix 4.

Appendix 1 - Summary of comments/issues raised at meetings with staff, governors and parents

Comment	Number of similar responses
Concern about mainstream - resources, level of support, identification of needs, staff attitude, teachers, respect and equality issues, coping questions, experiences not good, bullying, less parental involvement, diverse needs in the classroom, discrimination, local, dietary requirements, practical arrangements.	15
Buildings/location questions - timescales, where? Involve staff in layouts/designs/facilities, 6th form/FE? Concern about size, depend upon BSF? need to be ready before any closures, inclusion opportunities/links, wasted money on recent new build?	13
SARs questions - resources and funding, equipment, transport, safety, security, class sizes, staffing, halfway house, range of need, where?	13
Meet the needs of children - complex needs, medical, relationships, friendly and supportive environment, small school, small classes, some need special school.	11
Need KS1 special school - benefit for child, impact, if good grounding in special infants more would go to mainstream secondary, what are benefits of all KS1 in mainstream?	11
Need more information/consultation - clarification, statements? 2 options seem to be the same, need non-biased source of information for parents, confusion, other models/possibilities, councillors/officers should visit, talk to parents, figures, data, parents on working groups.	8
Trust in the LEA is low - parents don't trust, new college, LEA should manage, don't believe figures on falling rolls, change things without listening, only concerned with money, parents coaxed into keeping children in mainstream?	8
Change can be difficult - for child, detrimental, unsettling, uncertainty, needs to be gradual, planned, interim arrangements, continuity, transition.	7
Places at special schools - pressure on places, have to fight/struggle to get place, current problems, will there be space to accommodate all who require?	6
Staff in special schools - what happens to them? salaries, ring fencing, teachers, teaching assistant's allowances? Reapply for jobs?	5
EBD/ASD issues - need specialist facilities in special schools, consider all provision	4

Comment	Number of similar responses
In favour of 2 new secondary schools - 2 schools are better than 1, 1 high dependency and 1 less complex needs	4
Parental choice - needed, generic special schools reduce parental choice, parents need a say in the process, what about children waiting for a place?	4
Transport questions - resolve issues, reassurance needed, will it still be available?	4
How will children's views be heard?	3
Parents wanted/received reassurance that children wont be moved from special to mainstream without their approval	3
Positive view of mainstream - welcome idea, improved independence and confidence, good experiences of mainstream	3
Children don't fit into categories.	2
Current special school is good.	2
Money that has gone into mainstream for SEN should be spent on SEN children - should be monitored.	2
Concerns about statements and resources in the past.	1

Continued on next page

Appendix 1 continued - Summary of comments/issues raised at meetings with staff, governors and parents

Comment	Number of similar responses
Document was difficult to understand - need simple English and no jargon.	1
For 5-7 yrs option to attend SARs is necessary	1
Process is divisive.	1
Realise change has to happen.	1
SLT knowledge in schools before pupils move in.	1
Why change a system that works?	1
Why not have primary and secondary on the same campus or all age schools?	1
Will County Pupils continue to attend City Schools?	1
Worry about the disruption of children's education - will children with SEBD attend the new schools?	1

Appendix 2 - General responses (includes those from parents/carers and pupils and unknown individuals)

Comment	Number of similar responses
Mainstream school concerns - the effect on schools, resources, size of schools, bullying, effect on child, have bad experience, class sizes, league tables.	48
Don't close/change school * - don't want another school, why start again? need special schools, build on current, set up new before further decisions.	46
Current special school provision is excellent - physio, speech therapy, outdoor, curriculum, excellent/dedicated staff, links to mainstream, good Ofsted, atmosphere.	39
Children have different needs - complex or medical needs, may not be met under proposals, one system doesn't cater for all children.	36
A large primary or secondary special school is too big - will result in less care, less individual support.	35
Proposed provision for primary is inadequate - need KS1, not enough places at KS2, need nursery, may need more space in future, early identification is key.	35
Child is happy at the current school - comfortable, enjoys school, well settled, has good friends, progress has been made, safe.	20
Inclusion needs funding and support - need clear guidance for funding and monitoring of resources, training, specialists, time.	20
Parental choice - need a choice/range of schools/settings, appropriate, need continuum, parents may go out of City, match SENs.	19
More disruption is bad for the child and parent, anxiety, transition, learning dips when changing schools, distress caused, continuity is important.	17
Staff - mainstream will be stretched further, stressed, overburdened with paperwork and reports, untrained, inexperienced. Special staff will lose jobs?	13
Need local/central schools - concern regarding travelling, transport.	12
Consultation - be more open, more discussion/detail, more parents consultation, more mainstream consultation, listen to opinions of all (inc pupils).	11
Is this to save money? - not the most important thing, what are our children worth?	11
Autism - has not been covered in documents, where will this be covered?	10
Need data and evidence - numbers haven't dropped, children have been wrongly placed, waiting lists, case not established, don't understand the figures.	9

Comment	Number of similar responses
Document is badly written, grammatically incorrect, difficult to understand, wrong focus.	8
Don't trust the LEA - to manage change, don't understand issues, no confidence, is it an experiment? pipe dreams.	8
Support proposals for inclusion - but with correct resources and support, where appropriate.	8
SARs - have questions regarding SARs that need to be answered, more detail required.	6
Current options don't deal with inclusion, inclusion is a process of restructuring culture and policies and practices.	5
Change is needed - positive, sensible options, economic sense, should have happened before.	2
Suggestion - ensure schools don't lose their identity, a house in the new school, children taking a role in the planning of the new school.	1
Suggestion - have 3 phases on the same campus (5-11, 11-16, 16-19).	1

- Excludes petition 'Save our School' from Emily Fortey with 398 names on it. See main report.

Appendix 3 - Responses from School Staff/Headteachers/Governing Body

Comment	Number of similar responses	
	Special School	MS School
Need data/evidence/research - of falling rolls, compare, briefing, how fits in with other plans (BSP), cost-benefit analysis, don't understand figures.	11	10
Should be based on need and appropriateness.	13	7
Excellence in our Special Schools - strength that could be built on, developed over many years, not closed, good practice.	10	7
Resources and funding - additional, training, timely, schools need to be guaranteed the money and support, need experts in speech and language, psychologists, occupational therapy, physiotherapy.	13	4
SARs questions/suggestions - more info needed, not mentioned at secondary phase, role unclear, timescales, where/who, in place before any closures, pyramids, examples.	8	9
Consultation - need more, detailed, clear rationale, exchange of views, stakeholders, related groups, parents, pupils, listen, community languages.	9	7
Foundation and KS1 special school provision - why is it not mentioned in the proposals? Early identification, buy places out of City? need FS and KS1.	9	7
Need to serve whole City - stay small, communities, need 2 secondary schools, needs sites offering full range, village/community campus.	12	4
Impact on other students and staff in mainstream - time, stress, standards, SENCo, recruitment and retention, training, modify lessons and homework, all schools can't cater for all SEN.	9	6
Parental choice - important, not restricted, need real choice.	11	4
Links - between mainstream and special and SARs, share expertise.	10	4
Options - expand, alternatives, are more solutions available, flexibility, how were options formulated? Who by? flawed.	7	5
Some pupils cannot cope with mainstream - large classes, large institutions, inadequate staffing and resources.	6	5
New build - how will it be funded? BSF, expensive, where will it be? Purpose built.	7	2
Shared understanding of inclusion - vision, what does it really mean? Choice and equity, policy review.	3	4
Change should be controlled and planned - confidence in the leadership and management capability of the LEA? Failed to manage.	5	1

Appendix 3 continued - Responses from School Staff/Headteachers/Governing Body

Comment	Number of similar responses	
	Special School	MS School
EBD - questions, concerns, need for greater and more effective provision.	2	4
Understand, agree with the principle of inclusion and need for change, however.....	4	2
Special school staff - redundancy/redeployment? Job protection, teaching staff, LSAs, admin staff, ring fence.	4	1
Autism - need provision.	3	0
Cost cutting - is short-sighted, quality provision costs.	0	2
Analysis of consultation - ensure that there isn't just a collation of numbers for and against.	0	1
Needs of younger children being met admirably in mainstream settings in most schools.	0	1
Post 16 - vital	1	0
Promote support for parents through the Parent Partnership Scheme.	0	1

Appendix 4 - Responses from Unions and Other stakeholders

Comment	Number of similar responses
Loss of current staff expertise may result - reduce morale, anxiety, are hard working, dedicated and professional	4
Provision for pupils on the autism spectrum - questions and concerns, logistics, staffing, funding	4
Concern about generic special schools - will they meet the needs, demands on staff	3
Concern about restricted KS2 provision in the proposals - neighbourhood provision	3
Current provision is excellent - high confidence, praised for teaching and learning and for caring atmosphere	3
Facilities and quality in an future provision needs to be at least as good as current	3
More consultation - need further debate, a range of options, more proposals	3
Not adequate grounds to end provision for 3-7 year olds, need contingency	3
Proposals not formed by a representative group - not transparent or representative of all schools	3
Why divide phases between primary and secondary? Evidence? Look at other configurations	3
Child's need - arrangements to determine how these are met is required	2
Parental choice - parents have the right to choose mainstream or special dependent on need	2
Support the establishment of SARs - in neighbourhood pyramids	2
Commitment to a continuum of provision- mainstream, SARs, special, dual placement	1
Concern that money for initiatives may be used for other purposes	1
Document uses jargon, complex language, not accessible to parents	1
Need data/evidence regarding mainstream school appropriateness	1
Need more information - parents need reassurance, class sizes, group sizes, repeat years, travelling, league tables	1
Need more specialist teachers	1
Oppose school closures for budgetary reasons	1
Proposals will overstretch the available resources, no room for influx	1
remind LEA about the Disability Discrimination Act	1
Support the move for inclusion in mainstream if sufficiently resourced	1
What are implications on terms and conditions? Redundancy, ring fencing, redeployment	1

