

High Needs Review Consultation: Summary report


This report was created on Monday 18 February 2019 at 07:06.

The consultation ran from 18/01/2019 to 15/02/2019.

Question 1.1: Do you support the proposal to strengthen district working in 3 localities (Mansfield/Ashfield; Bassetlaw/ Newark; Broxtowe/Rushcliffe/Gedling) to meet the needs of children and young people with SEND within their district?

Do you support the proposal to strengthen district working in 3 localities to meet the needs of children and young people with SEND within their district?






| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 425 | 81.26% |
| No | 84 | 16.06% |
| Not Answered | 14 | 2.68% |

Question 1.2: Do you support the proposal to notionally allocate elements of the high needs budget to districts (overseen by the locality) to manage, and monitor the provisions and outcomes of CYP with SEND within each district?

Do you support the proposal to allocate elements of the high needs budget to districts (overseen by the locality) to manage, and monitor the provisions and outcomes of CYP with SEND within each district?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 393 | 75.14% |
| No | 120 | 22.94% |
| Not Answered | 10 | 1.91% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 1:

Any further comments:

There were **142** responses to this part of the question.

Question 2.1: Do you agree that engagement with parents of CYP with SEND, needs to be a priority for schools and district teams at the earliest stage? (This would be through the development of a county wide strategy to ensure that CYP with complex SEND have their needs met in local settings, so that they can enjoy the same opportunities as other children and available funding is used effectively, fairly and transparently)

Do you agree that engagement with parents of CYP with SEND, needs to be a priority for schools and district teams at the earliest stage




| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 490 | 93.69% |
| No | 26 | 4.97% |
| Not Answered | 7 | 1.34% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 2:


Any further comments:

There were **139** responses to this part of the question.



Question 3.1: Do you agree with the proposal to develop and pilot 3 enhanced provisions in mainstream schools, which will support localities to ensure that there is sufficient high quality and cost effective provision to meet the needs of some CYP with SEND?

Do you agree with the proposal to develop and pilot 3 enhanced provisions in mainstream schools which will support localities to ensure that there is sufficient high quality and cost effective provision to meet the needs of some CYP with SEND?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 413 | 78.97% |
| No | 98 | 18.74% |
| Not Answered | 12 | 2.29% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 3:

Any further comments:

There were **185** responses to this part of the question.

Question 4.1: Do you agree that the LA should explore and pilot with publicly funded schools the development of 'special school hubs' as outlined above?

Do you agree that the LA should explore and pilot with publicly funded schools the development of 'special school hubs' to provide transitional support to move a child from special school to mainstream; mainstream to special school; or from commissioned alternative education provision to special school where existing placements are at risk or whilst waiting for a special school place or subject to significant parental dissatisfaction or as part of an EHCP review?




| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 400 | 76.48% |
| No | 111 | 21.22% |
| Not Answered | 12 | 2.29% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 4:


Q Any further comments:

There were **173** responses to this part of the question.



Question 5.1: Do you agree that the LA should seek to work collaboratively with publicly funded schools, early years settings, FE colleges, commissioned alternative education provision, parents, and other partners including health and social care to proactively seek new ways of working to increase independence and integration into employment, and independent/semi-independent living where at all possible?

Do you agree that the LA should seek to work collaboratively with publicly funded schools, early years settings, FE colleges, commissioned alternative education provision, parents, and other partners including health and social care to proactively seek new ways of working to increase independence and integration into employment, and independent/semi-independent living where at all possible?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 499 | 95.41% |
| No | 16 | 3.06% |
| Not Answered | 8 | 1.53% |


Question : Any further comments for proposal 5:

Any further comments:

There were 110 responses to this part of the question.

Question 6.1: Do you agree that we should strengthen the current Family SENCo model by developing a new role of district SENCo (7 in total) in 3 localities to support the interface for schools, parents and health and social care professionals in relation to CYP with SEND in each district?

Do you agree that we should strengthen the current Family SENCo model to be developing a new role of district SENCo (7 in total) in 3 localities to provide the interface for schools, parents and health and social care professionals in relation to CYP with SEND in each district?




| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 361 | 69.02% |
| No | 149 | 28.49% |
| Not Answered | 13 | 2.49% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 6:


Any further comments:

There were 175 responses to this part of the question.



Question 7.1: Do you agree that we should review the current SFSS structure to develop a new role of SEND Locality Leads (3 FTE) as described above?

Do you agree that we should review the current SFSS structure to develop a new role of SEND Locality Coordinators Managers (3 FTE) to lead and coordinate a range of SEND functions within Localities working closely with district SENCOS, LA SEND teams including ICDS, other partners?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 359 | 68.64% |
| No | 144 | 27.53% |
| Not Answered | 20 | 3.82% |


Question : Any further comments for proposal 7:

Any further comments:

There were 129 responses to this part of the question.

Question 8.1: Do you agree that we should maintain a county wide sensory team to continue to provide support, advice and guidance to all publicly funded schools and placements?

Do you agree that we should maintain a county wide sensory team to continue to provide support, advice and guidance to all publicly funded schools and placements?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 492 | 94.07% |
| No | 23 | 4.40% |
| Not Answered | 8 | 1.53% |


Question : Any further comments for proposal 8:


Any further comments:

There were 76 responses to this part of the question.

Question 9.1: Do you agree that we should retain TA teams within localities drawn from the existing Early Years, Communication & Interaction and Cognition & Learning TA teams?

Do you agree that we should retain an early years TA team within localities to continue to provide support, advice and guidance to parents in the home and to support transition to early years and statutory education (0-5 yrs)?






| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 453 | 86.62% |
| No | 53 | 10.13% |
| Not Answered | 17 | 3.25% |

Question 9.2: Do you agree that the TA senior practitioner role should retain responsibility for safeguarding across SFSS and oversee county wide early years referrals and additionally carry out initial assessments?

Do you agree that senior practitioner role should take responsibility for safeguarding across the service and oversee county wider early years referrals and initial assessments?



| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 407 | 77.82% |
| No | 93 | 17.78% |
| Not Answered | 23 | 4.40% |


Question : Any further comments for proposal 9:

Any further comments:

There were **105** responses to this part of the question.

Question 10.1: Do you agree that SFSS staff should develop new ways of working within locality teams working alongside all publicly funded schools and settings, parents and other partners to provide detailed advice, training and guidance particularly for SENCOs to meet the needs of CYP with severe and complex SEND?

Do you agree that SFSS staff should develop new ways of working within locality teams working alongside all publicly funded schools and settings, parents and other partners to provide detailed advice, training and guidance particularly for SENCOs to meet the needs of CYP with severe and complex SEND?




| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 437 | 83.56% |
| No | 69 | 13.19% |
| Not Answered | 17 | 3.25% |

Question 10.2: Do you agree that the 2 of the 3 Senior Teachers roles are unchanged (Dyslexia and ICT) with the 3rd post changing to lead a county wide Autism Strategy?

Do you agree that the 2 of the 3 Senior Teachers are unchanged (Dyslexia and ICT) with the 3rd post changing to lead a county wide Autism Strategy?





| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 400 | 76.48% |
| No | 101 | 19.31% |
| Not Answered | 22 | 4.21% |


Question : Any further comments to proposal 10:

Any further comments:

There were 135 responses to this part of the question.

Question 11.1: Do you agree that SFSS should develop a traded service offer available to all publicly funded schools and settings and other partners in order to maximise capacity in schools without increasing the budget required to sustain SFSS?

Do you agree that SFSS should develop a traded service offer available to all publicly funded schools and settings and other partners in order to maximise capacity in schools without increasing the budget required to sustain SFSS?




| Option | Total | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 332 | 63.48% |
| No | 165 | 31.55% |
| Not Answered | 26 | 4.97% |

Question : Any further comments for proposal 11:


Any further comments:


There were 122 responses to this part of the question.



Question 1: It is important that we get as wide a representation of views as possible. Please let us know which stakeholder group you are part of. Please tick all that apply

It is important that we get as wide a representation of views as possible. Please let us know which stakeholder group you are part of. Please tick all that apply





| Option | Total | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Parent | 295 | 56.41% |
| Primary School | 184 | 35.18% |
| Secondary School | 77 | 14.72% |
| Special School | 35 | 6.69% |
| Head Teacher | 49 | 9.37% |
| School Governor | 39 | 7.46% |
| School Based Teacher | 37 | 7.07% |
| School Based TA | 32 | 6.12% |
| Support Service Teacher | 18 | 3.44% |
| Support Service TA | 18 | 3.44% |
| SENCo | 72 | 13.77% |
| Family SENCo | 23 | 4.40% |
| Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) | 36 | 6.88% |
| Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) CEO | 6 | 1.15% |
| Diocese | 4 | 0.76% |
| FE Colleges | 4 | 0.76% |
| Education Learning Skills Staff | 11 | 2.10% |
| ICDS Staff | 8 | 1.53% |
| Voluntary Organisation | 11 | 2.10% |
| Independent Provider | 10 | 1.91% |
| Commissioned Alternative Education Provider (AP, INM) | 7 | 1.34% |
| Not Answered | 20 | 3.82% |

Other:

There were **28** responses to this part of the question.