

Summary of responses to consultation document 'Improving SEN provision in Brent'

1. The consultation document was sent to
 - all Brent schools and governing bodies
 - teacher unions
 - all parents of Brent pupils attending out-Borough special provision
 - all parents of pupils attending a Brent special school
 - Parents forum
 - Parent Partnership Service
 - Brent Association for Voluntary Action
 - Neighbouring local education authorities and other LEAs who place pupils in Brent special schools
 - other agencies represented on the Childrens Partnership Board and Children's Partnership Group

2. There were 176 responses to the consultation, broken down as follows

- governors	11
- head teachers (and deputies)	9
- teachers	13
- SENCO's	4
- teaching assistants/welfare officers	30
- schools forum	1
- unions	3
- other agencies/partners	8
- parents	94
- including 77 responses from Hay Lane parents	
- pupils	1
- group response from Grove Park School Council	
- unknown	2

3. The majority of respondents were in agreement with the broad conclusions drawn from the first stage of consultation and in particular, that there should be no special school closures.

4. Within this broad agreement, the following more specific issues arose from the consultation about the proposals for Brent special schools.
 - i) There was some concern about lack of special school provision for moderate learning difficulties arising from the proposals and a number of respondents felt that Manor School should continue to provide for some children with MLD.

- ii) The proposals for Woodfield School, in particular the development of 16-19 provision, were welcomed. Potential difficulties of placing students with MLD alongside students with autism was mentioned by some respondents.
 - iii) There was a mixed response about the proposal to consider part-time and/or temporary placements at Vernon House. Respondents in favour felt that this would give greater flexibility about placements and would support joint working between Vernon House and mainstream schools. However, other respondents felt that part-time/temporary placements would not provide the necessary stability for children with emotional, behavioural and social needs and the mix of full-time, part-time and temporary placements would be difficult to manage at Vernon House.
 - iv) There were a number of concerns expressed about the proposals for Hay Lane School, as follows
 - most respondents felt that provision for profound and multiple learning difficulties should be retained at Hay Lane.
 - premises and playground space at Hay Lane are in urgent need of improvement
 - there were some concerns that students would be transferred from Hay Lane to Grove Park without full consideration of individual needs and parental views.
 - not all respondents were in favour of retaining Hay Lane and Grove Park as all age schools
 - v) The majority of respondents were in favour of Grove Park meeting a wider range of needs. However, a significant number of respondents expressed some concerns about the placement of students with profound and multiple learning difficulties at Grove Park and, in particular, potential health and safety concerns of placing pupils with different needs together.
5. The proposal for new secondary Pupil Referral Unit provision was widely supported. One respondent raised issues about the mix of statemented and non-statemented students at the PRU.
6. The proposal for improved mainstream provision for physical disability was generally supported. The following points were made by some respondents.
- all schools need to become accessible and resources should not be focussed only on 'designated schools'

- there are resource implications for the PCT in supporting students with complex needs in mainstream schools
 - additional revenue funding is required for specialist staff and equipment
7. There was wide support for increasing collaboration between special and mainstream schools. A number of respondents raised practical issues of how an outreach service will be structured and funded and whether there would be increased budgetary provision for training.
8. It was generally agreed that there are substantial improvements required to special school accommodation particularly at Hay Lane. A number of respondents were concerned that funding, both capital and revenue, would not be sufficient to make the necessary improvements.
9. It was noted that the following areas were not covered within this review, which will need to be addressed.
- early years provision and role of Childrens Centres in meeting SEN
 - additionally resourced mainstream provision for hearing impairment, visual impairment and speech and language needs.
 - Provision for vulnerable students including those with Aspergers
10. A number of respondents also made the point that improvements in SEN provision should go hand in hand with improved respite and leisure provision and increased availability of therapy provision.