

## HEREFORDSHIRE DRAFT CAPITAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY (SEND) 2020-2030

### **APPENDIX 2 TO THE SEND CAPITAL STRATEGY REPORT FOR SCRUTINY CONSIDERATION 23<sup>RD</sup> MARCH 2021**

#### **Draft strategy consultation history**

1. During the development of the strategy there has been a range of consultation activity. Initially some strategy suggestions were put forward to head teachers of special schools, when it became evident to the SEND commissioning team that demand for places in specialist settings was increasing (2016/2017). This led to the application for a new government funded 16-19 college, which was successful. Subsequent investigation into the trend of increased pressure on places across all age ranges in the county also prompted further examination of the national picture and the situation within similar authorities. Concerns as to this trend and the need to respond were raised at a Directorate level, and shared with the Director, Assistant Director and member for education. A draft strategy was formulated that considered current capacity deficiencies, and also suitability and condition of accommodation in current settings. This draft was shared with the council members for assets, education and finance.
2. A sequence of further consultation, leading to refining and shaping of the final strategy was conducted, including several meetings with school leaders of the special school in Leominster to specifically discuss proposals for that school, as it was emerging as the highest priority for improvement.
3. The draft was then shared with the capital consultancy group, which is a group of school leaders representative of all schools and settings in Herefordshire. Members include head teachers, governors, and bursars/business managers representing all age ranges of mainstream schools, and also representatives of special schools.
4. The strategy was refined and revised at several stages in the process, and following receipt of the countywide recent condition reports for maintained schools in 2020, completed and presented to the Director of Children and Families.
5. The final draft was then circulated for consultation on the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021, by the Children and Families (C and F) business support team. The published consultation included a link for consultees to respond with their views via a survey monkey questionnaire. The strategy was circulated to all Herefordshire school leaders by the weekly Spotlight publication, with encouragement to share this with as many recipients as they thought would have interest in reading and responding. In addition the

strategy was sent personally to all parents and carers of children and young people with an education, health and care plan for SEND, and the SEND strategy consultation group of all SEND education and social care professionals, convened and chaired by Herefordshire Council Head of Additional Needs. The consultation details were also published on the council website.

6. In addition to the above, the draft strategy was circulated to the Chair of the Children and Families Scrutiny Committee, member for education, member for assets, and Leominster ward councillors, (the latter in regard to their anticipated interest in the particular recommendations regarding the special school in Leominster).
7. The above consultation on the final draft strategy closed on 9<sup>th</sup> February. **\*\*For a summary of responses please see below.**
8. Final consultation on the draft strategy was by full scrutiny committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2021.
9. Following receipt of scrutiny committee views, the full range of consultation responses were considered, and amendments recommended or thought necessary were completed. Changes and actions as a result of consultation are listed on page 12 below.
10. Political groups are consulted as part of the process of submitting the final report to cabinet for decision.
11. Summary feedback will be provided to all respondents to the recent consultation, explaining whether responses have resulted in any change to the strategy.

## **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RECENT CONSULTATION**

### **Questionnaire comments made regarding each proposal within the SEND draft capital strategy consultation and percentage agreement or disagreement in each case**

**Total number of respondents 52. (Five respondents represent 9.6%, figures below rounded to 1dp)**

**Number who completed a response to every question – 52**

**Number of respondents that commented on at least one question - 26**

### **General point made in the comments**

- Six of 52 respondents commented on the need for simpler language. Action – simplify where possible and add glossary of terms.

<b><u>Q1 The description of the Council rationale for a SEND capital strategy and the proposed way forward is helpful</u></b>	<b><u>Directorate response to comments</u></b>
<p><b>Strongly agree/agree – 69.5%, Neither agree or disagree – 19.2%, strongly disagree or disagree – 17.3%.</b></p> <p><b>R7</b> In principle, it is a sound rationale. In terms of implementing it with parity across all schools, there needs to be a lot more clarification of how this will be achieved in reality without disadvantaging any one school. How will the rationale for the adaptations for students with</p>	<p>As stated in the strategy, capital investment proposals are based upon a full range of accommodation information, including parental preference but prioritising</p>

physical needs be achieved given the substantial costs that are often associated? What will be the balance of parent preference verses the capital investment required?

**R8** strongly feel that working on improving the existing building and keeping a 6th form at Westfield would be the preferred option for my child

**R13** The document appears to significantly reduce the provision for specialist accommodation in the city when what we are experiencing is a huge increase in the need for specialist intervention places but an inability for schools to afford to fund these places. It appears that the council is reducing its support and expertise for the children that are requiring it most. This document indicates a further reduction of 87 places for these young people when what is greatly needed is reinvestment.

**R19** Not enough specialist settings within Herefordshire

**R22** An encompassing approach to support a diverse range of children with special needs is vital across Herefordshire. Currently there are inadequacies and gaps in provision for children who do not fit into specific categories. There is a woeful lack of initial assessment and subsequent support for children at an early stage when preventing the escalation of any difficulties is possible.

**R28** It is a typical council document written for professionals. It is not written for lay people to read. Could it be explained plainly for parents of SEND children who are not always degree educated!

**R32** It's a bit befuddled in parts but it's a good try!

**R35** Broadly agree with the strategy outlined. BCS requires capital investment to ensure it meets capacity. Additional consultation would be welcomed throughout the process.

**R38** There were issues with the document; I found it may be inaccessible/difficult to completely understand, and, in the key is refers to colours representing different investment scenarios, yet the document is in black and white

**R40** Agree but a bit difficult to navigate.

**R42** Couldn't find it the document on the council website?

**R50** Elements of confusion between a capital strategy and service delivery

those settings with the most pressing need for improvement first.

This question, is not about Westfield School  
The strategy actually adds places to learning disability specialist schools, both at 2-16 and also post 16 age phases. There is a proposed decrease in capacity for the pupil referral unit, which accommodates mostly children who have been permanently excluded from mainstream schools, as these numbers have recently fallen. In addition, intervention placements for children which would currently have been provided at Brookfield, is proposed to be provided in new nurture groups attached to mainstream primary schools, thus the reduction of intervention places proposed at Brookfield.

More of a comment about service provision than capital investment, but noted.

Comment on needs assessment processes, not capital projects

Yes, simplification will be worked on

As above  
In support

Yes simplification will be worked on, and removal of colour coding

As above  
The document was on the website.  
Good point, do we take out the references to service delivery?

**R51** Some of the descriptions of the proposed plans contradict each other: if it is not feasible to "close all LD schools and build one county through 2-19 school" (LD school option B) then why is it acceptable to close the 16-19 provision at our special schools and combine them into one?

The option to close all LD schools and build one was considered, as with all options, but discarded. The closure of the sixth form was proposed as a solution to the very small numbers of pupils in the Westfield sixth form setting.

**Q1 Comments overview – simplify language; clarify places; and service delivery. Action – simplify text where possible, clarify proposals for increase or decrease of places and where, refer service responses to Head of Additional Needs for forthcoming SEND strategy consultation.**

**Q2 The document explains the way in which the council is seeking to use accurate information to decide when and where it will invest in order to improve buildings and facilities where children with SEND are taught **Strongly agree/agree – 69.2% neither agree or disagree – 19.2%, strongly disagree or disagree – 13.5%.****

**R7** I'm not sure how in the current situation in Herefordshire with regard to secondary schools that the statement 'Sufficiency – how much physical capacity is there, allowing how many pupils?' for considering the setting of each school. Given that the majority of secondary schools are already full or that some may not be open to expansion, gives a consistent approach across the county.

**R8** I agree improvement is needed in existing buildings at Westfield, but not that funding should be sent elsewhere

**R13** There is little information provided for the changes proposed

**R28** I've read the document and I'm really not sure

**R32** There's perhaps a bit too many 'to be decided' or 'needs further consultation' aspects, but generally going in the right direction to support SEND children.

**R35** We agree accurate information should be used to make decisions. This can only be achieved with wider consultation with stakeholders to obtain up to date and accurate information.

**R42** Very often the parent or carers are the best people to accurately determine where a child is best educated.

**R52** The document is confusing and does not describe an approach to the distribution of capital.

The strategy, refers only to SEND schools, not mainstream secondary schools

This question does not refer to Westfield School  
Difficult to strike a balance, some want more, some want less information.

Simplify where possible

Some solutions (e.g. ref autism provision), are not yet fully investigated, but needed to be referred to.

Wider consultation is proposed for the Westfield sixth form proposal. We try to gather accurate information as frequently as possible.

We agree, that is why consultations with parents and carers are held frequently, through the Education, health and care plan annual review.

The document indicates priorities, the budget for each is unknown until a feasibility study for each individual project is conducted.

**Q2 Comments overview – clarification if possible. Action – simplify text where possible, respond to above queries/requests for clarification in general feedback published**

**Q3.The proposed course of action for schools for pupils with a learning disability is appropriate a) Undertake a feasibility study into the best way to achieve improved accommodation for a 60 place 2-16 Westfield School. b) Consult in 2021 on the proposal to close by phasing out the Westfield Sixth Form starting from one year after the opening date for the Beacon Post-16 College. Strongly agree/agree – 48.1% neither agree nor disagree – 32.7% strongly disagree or disagree – 23.1%.**

**R8** I agree point a) is needed, but not with point b). I feel it is important for my child to have continuity up to and including post 16 at Westfield. I feel that would best meet my child's needs.

**R11** My daughter attends Westfield Sixth Form from out of county as it is the nearest school. The small class size is necessary for her with a programme structured for her needs. A large 60 pupil college would not be appropriate She has great support from staff and has high anxiety levels which has required support from CAMHS and having the support from an individual learning mentor for weekly sessions makes a big difference. A large college where this support may not be included as the focus will be on independence .The community of Leominster have always supported the school and the learning is also done in the community including visiting the shops, library, running a cafe in town, horticulture at a national trust property close to Leominster. The school is attended by local police and other agencies to make sure pupils have good safety knowledge. Westfield sixth form staff are always very approachable they have visited my daughters home environment when she had a prolonged absence from school to help her back to school which was a god send when anxiety levels are high

**R12** Westfield is a school that serves the Leominster community. For students with severe learning difficulties to travel to Hereford for Sixth Form, this could prove an additional challenge. I am concerned that this is a further example of funding being taken from Leominster and again being diverted into Hereford.

**R14** I strongly agree to the feasibility study to improve Westfield School however, I strongly disagree to the proposed closure of Westfield Sixth Form. I strongly feel it is unfair and divisive to not allow separate responses to these two questions. This is not a fair consultation questionnaire.

Support for investment. Parent would like child to continue to Westfield sixth form

Out of county pupil, would like to continue at Westfield. Shropshire LA has indicated interest in commissioning places at the new college in Hereford when it opens

Support for retaining sixth form, concern about travel. Also concern ref investment taken from Leominster to Hereford generally. Transport modelling has been conducted, described within scrutiny report.

Agreeing with investment, disagrees with sixth form closure.

<p><b>R15</b> Yes Rebuild Westfields On It's Current Site. We as Parents Of A Future 6th Former Feel Very Strongly That 6th Form Provision Should Be Kept At Westfield.</p> <p><b>R17</b> Travel time affects both younger and older children with ASD. Westfield school provides excellent education settings for all year groups. Smaller six form provides better personal relations.</p> <p><b>R22</b> A robust provision must be available to ensure adequate transition for the students to the new placement and emotional support in addition to their current needs for those students completing their time with a reduced student number in Westfield.</p> <p><b>R23</b> I strongly agree that improving accommodation for Westfield is important but strongly disagree with phasing out Westfield Sixth Form as I believe all students especially those with SEND should have a choice of sixth form provision rather than a single provider. I also believe that all the students currently at Westfield should be able to continue there until they are 19 years old, should they and their parents choose to do so</p> <p><b>R28</b> The proposal to improve Westfield school with a feasibility study is a very good idea. What I worry about is that this is the “sweetie” for the fact that you wish to remove their sixth form. As a parent who can’t get transport to Westfield for our child even though it is the best place for him I feel that the needs of the INDIVIDUAL child are not high in the Councils thoughts or strategy. If you close Westfields sixth form the children from this area will miss out and so will our child.</p> <p><b>R38</b> Agree, good provision must be based locally for those 2-16 in the north of the county is important.</p> <p><b>R42</b> Westfield is a 2-19yrs school. Is the council unaware of this?</p> <p><b>R48</b> Surely it would be better to do a feasibility study before sending the option out as it may not be feasible!</p> <p><b>R50</b> both strongly agree and strongly disagree. I strongly agree that improved accommodation is needed at Westfield. I strongly disagree that the feasibility study mandates the age range, which is to be consulted on at a later date. I also strongly disagree with phasing out the sixth form, as this limits choice.</p> <p><b>R51</b> Strongly agree - Westfield School is spread across 2 buildings which were originally built for different purposes, and need to be completely renovated to ensure they are safe</p>	<p>Agrees with investment, wishes child to continue on to Westfield sixth form</p> <p>Worried ref travel time, wants a small sixth form (Beacon college class sizes will be the same as Westfield, Westfield has mixed age classes). Personal relationships at Barrs Court are outstanding (Ofsted). No reason to think this won’t be the case when BCT leads Beacon.</p> <p>We agree. As with other pupils, for example those moving from Blackmarston to Barrs Court or Westfield at 11, or Barrs Court main school to the Hub, this is a very important support framework to provide.</p> <p>Agrees with investment, would like choice. Currently parents do not have choice of more than one SEMH school, or hospital support service, or pupil referral service. Mainstream sixth form colleges all have very large cohorts to accommodate thousands of post-16 children, and are financially viable.</p> <p>Agrees with investment. Wants child to continue at Westfield. Parents and carers of children in the south, east and west of county would also no doubt like a school in their immediate locality, but these options aren’t feasible or affordable for the very small numbers of post 16 pupils needing this service (60 across the whole county).</p> <p>In agreement</p> <p>This respondent couldn’t find the strategy on the website,</p> <p>We are conducting a feasibility study for 2-16 and 2-19, results due in May.</p> <p>Agrees with investment, wants choice.</p> <p>Agrees with investment, is satisfied with provision at Westfield, concerns ref travel, change, unfamiliar</p>
---	---

and fit for purpose. This is clearly a necessity. b) strongly disagree on the proposal of Westfield's Sixth Form being phased out, for the following reasons: - The provision of 2-19 education enables learners to build on their existing experience and skills and grow into capable, confident adults, while being supported by staff who they have already built up strong, secure relationships with. - Accessing a central Post-16 provision in Hereford City is not feasible for some students, for a number of reasons including: lack of access to travel or inability to tolerate long journeys; difficulty coping with change and unfamiliar environments; vulnerability due to a lack of social understanding, etc. Additionally, students would not have as much opportunity to build relationships with their local community and their peers as they would at Westfield School. - There are plenty of examples of counties which have just one special school or post-16 provision where those provisions have proven to be too large, too overwhelming and not able to respond to the needs of their learners to the same standard as a smaller provision. All students and their families deserve a choice of educational provisions. Mainstream students in Herefordshire moving into Post-16 provision have the choice of: Hereford Sixth Form College, Hereford and Ludlow College (Hereford City and Holme Lacy campuses), Hereford College of Arts, Earl Mortimer Sixth Form, John Kerle Sixth Form, John Masefield Sixth Form. Under this new proposal, SEND students would have only one option: The Beacon. This feels like discrimination

**R52** Accommodation at Westfield requires significant investment. This is factually correct. It should not refer to specific age ranges, since a building that is in need of improvement is just that. It makes no difference for what age range that improvement is intended. There is no need to phase out post-16 provision at Westfield school, since this is outstanding regardless of the poor quality buildings. To remove one of two post-16 provisions would remove all aspects of choice for learners. The Beacon College was built under the remit of the Free School programme, which is intended to increase choice and variety of provision based on evidence of need. Free Schools are not intended to replace existing poor quality buildings, or lead to the closure of existing provision.

environment, lack of understanding, loss of immediate local community, feels that larger sixth forms are unsuccessful in other parts of the country. Wants choice. We agree that Westfield provides good service – for a very small number of pupils at post-16. The good quality of this service referred to, is outstanding at Barrs Court. BC trust are to lead the new college. There is every likelihood that the same excellent education in all aspects will be available at the Beacon. Regarding choice of post 16 provision, there are thousands of post 16 students moving into mainstream post 16, but between 50-60 total in Herefordshire needing LD post 16 (this includes those small number of students coming in from neighbouring counties).

Agrees with investment. Each proposal, particularly for SEND, needs to describe age range, as post 16 facilities are different. The question is, should we be proposing to invest a significant amount of public funds to build a sixth form element for less than 12 students (may be less than ten when new college opens), if we do, are we prepared to also do this in other market towns?

The comment about free school purpose is correct. The free school programme is intended to add capacity. However, it does not forbid closure of other settings if there are good reasons. One of the reasons in this case is viability. This is why we are proposing to consult on closure, as to not do so and invest in like for like may be seen to be poor use of capital funding, and setting a precedent which would make arguments for similar investment elsewhere difficult to refute.

**Q3 Comments overview – comments are all in agreement with the investment in new Westfield buildings, the objections aired are to the proposal to consult on closure of the Westfield sixth form. Actions – examine views of Director of C and F, scrutiny committee and relevant members as to whether the proposal to consult on possible closure of the Westfield Sixth Form remains in the strategy.**

**Q4 The proposed course of action for alternative provision (Hereford Pupil Referral Service) is appropriate - 'Commission a feasibility survey to look at the options available, high level cost and best solution for further examination' Strongly agree/agree – 69.2% neither agree or disagree – 25.0%, strongly disagree or disagree – 5.8%.**

**R8** I'm sorry but I do not understand this statement. I do not feel the question is formed in an accessible way for parents to understand.

**R13** I believe 'High Level cost' is the driving force behind this survey, not the provision or needs of young people. The consultation should be made primarily on what schools and young people require to enable that every child can access an educational curriculum best suited to their needs. If driven by cost, we will continue to face more and more cuts to this essential educational setting. We have witnessed cuts to our provision, to our staffing, to our general upkeep. Changes made, have meant that we receive children when they are often broken by the system, rather than when an intervention package can be put in place that will provide the greatest opportunity for change and success. Without the additional funding and improved setting, we become a holding ground for children that the system has given up on.

**R22** The schools require substantial investment in order to support the diverse and vulnerable students it caters for.

**R25** How would this affect the service (St Owens – Aspire Living) for adults with complex needs that shares the building with B/C sixth form? That must be taken in to consideration of what impact this may have on them.

**R32** Just get something done and cut out the talk, commit to it....costs will ALWAYS be going up!

**R48** Surely it would be better to do a feasibility study before sending the option out as it may not be feasible!

We agree that simplification before general publication should be worked on.  
High level cost will always be an aspect of any proposal, but there has been a great deal of fact finding and discussion about current need, and the needs that we can try to anticipate for the future. It is good to see that in fact numbers of children and young people being permanently excluded from mainstream and needing places at the pupil referral unit have in fact decreased. This may in part be due to Covid closures, and will need to be carefully analysed. Numbers of places available for school leaders to access for intervention have remained, for individual schools to access.

Agreeing with investment

This response refers to question 5 not this question

We can only commit to a project when it has been agreed through the council project management process  
We have to prepare a brief when we send out procurement documentation. The brief needs to give a



steer as to what we need – numbers of places and type of accommodation – based on government buildings guidelines for settings of this type.

**Q4 Comments overview - one response to wrong question, one from staff member resisting reduction in PRU numbers, one keen to get on with it, one to wait for feasibility before proposing any option. Action – some simplification of text where possible, give general feedback as above to other points.**

**Q5 The proposed course of action for the home and hospital teaching (H3) is appropriate 'Produce a business plan for Council approval proposing to remodel the building currently used by Barrs Court post 16 students at Symonds Street for use by H3 when it is vacated, investigating design, time and cost implications. Interim measures to be put in place to mitigate present capacity issues at H3 as a potential project is developed' Strongly agree/agree – 63.5% neither agree nor disagree – 32.7% strongly disagree or disagree – 3.9%.**

**R8** Again, I do not follow this statement.

**R13** If this is seen as a beneficial proposal for H3 rather than a temporary sticking plaster, then yes.

**R22** Opportunity to engage vulnerable students requires a range of spaces and teaching environments

**R26** H3 requires a purpose built setting with potential to expand in future years. It also requires significant calm quiet outside space

Simplification will be considered where possible  
In agreement, the remodel would follow government building recommendations for this special need.  
As above

As above – we agree, ideally an outside learning environment is needed, either on site or easily accessible nearby.

## Q5 Comments overview – agreement, simplification if poss. Action – simplify text in strategy if possible

**Q6 This proposed course of action for primary age resourced provision for autism is appropriate 'Conduct further work on the capacity at KS1 and 2, and the trend at national and statistical neighbour level. This will enable a proposed project to be brought forward' Strongly agree/agree – 75% neither agree nor disagree – 17.3% strongly disagree or disagree – 7.7%.**

**R3** Also need to look at the trend in Herefordshire and the cohorts that exist in nurseries to inform our need. National and statistical neighbour isn't always best indicators of our local situation

**R8** I feel Westfield as it stands offers every opportunity and all the continuity of care my 13 year old needs. To make a big transition at post 16 would be very disruptive to her security, learning and stability

**R22** Earlier interventions and support strategies are vital to help children with such difficulties to fully engage in education and society.

**R28** I know of many ASD children who have never been given provision for them. I feel we need to increase funding for all ASD CYPs irrelevant of ability and therefor make diagnosis easier and more helpful.

**R32** Wording for this proposal is rather non-understandable to ordinary people...please re-phrase in simple English.

**R45** I strongly believe that better provision for autistic pupils needs to be provided in mainstream and specialist schools. This can only be done if significant funding is used to increase integrated and specialised Hubs, teaching staff and appropriate neuro-diverse learning environments in mainstream schools particularly. I appreciate that this would be a huge financial outgoing but strongly believe that it would be a valuable investment for children - giving them the best possible chances to learn in ways that best suit them (SEN & neurotypical pupils) be themselves, be happy, confident moving forward through to secondary provision which nurtures their needs and allows them to grow into happy, healthy adults.

**R48** Herefordshire currently has no placement for higher functioning autism and many pupils are send to schools that are not appropriate and do not meet need. This proposal will not meet current need in a timescale that is acceptable. My Child is has a diagnosis of Autism and is currently being sent to a SEMH school, it is affecting his mental health and his academic levels are falling consistently

We agree, this is why we are proposing further investigation.

The question refers to provision for children at the home and hospital resource bases not Westfield School

We agree, a proposal to set up nurture groups attached to some primary schools has been agreed and is under development.

This is a service provision comment, but noted

Simplification where possible

A service provision comment but noted for inclusion in further information gathering

This seems to agree with our proposal, but is disappointed in the timescale as it won't benefit their child. **Noted for individual follow up by SEND team if possible.**

**Q6 Comment overview – agreement, some simplification required, some observations about service provision. Action – simplify where possible, use general feedback, and pass service provision comments for use in SEND strategy consultation which is forthcoming**

**Q7 This proposed course of action for secondary age resourced provision for autism is appropriate 'Conduct further work on the capacity and type of provision needed at KS3 and 4, and the trend at national and statistical neighbour level. This will enable a proposed project to be brought forward' . Strongly agree/agree – 73.1% neither agree or disagree – 17.3%, strongly disagree or disagree – 9.6%.**

**R3** Many ASC children have to travel long distances to attend appropriate provision. However provision attached to mainstream isn't appropriate for children that currently require an out of county provision

**R8** Again I do not feel I understand the statement. My daughter has autistic traits and I feel she is very well catered for at Westfield

**R22** Other areas of support need to be established at the same time so that children with other difficulties are not lost through lack of appropriate provision

**R24** It's also a worrying time for parents trying to organise colleges and what's in store for those leaving high school with aspects of what aftercare is to follow

**R26** The Bridge provision needs completely rethinking and investment. Provision is significantly underfunded and inadequate. A larger provision will allow students to remain within the Bridge at all times instead of having to spend most of their time struggling in mainstream classes. If support and investment in this provision was made fewer children would have to attend H3 or be educated out of county

**R32** 'Statistical neighbour?

**R33** Don't really understand why there is specialist provision for 60 pupils at KS1 and 2 but only 8 for KS3 and 4. I don't believe this condition disappears so my concern would be that once the pupils move to KS3 and 4 the level of support is reduced.

**R40** There was excellent provision at BHBS Keilder until 5 years ago.

**R45** I strongly believe that better provision for autistic pupils needs to be provided in mainstream and specialist schools. This can only be done if significant funding is used to increase integrated and specialised Hubs, teaching staff and appropriate neuro-diverse

This is a comment on need for some children to access out of county settings which we agree with. We do commission those places, but aim to ensure as much provision in-county as possible  
We will simplify where possible but this respondent has misunderstood the question, which is about resource bases attached to mainstream schools, not special schools.

Service provision response, not necessarily capital. But noted.

We agree, transition needs to be well managed.

There is no space at the school to expand this provision.

Create a glossary of terms

This comment agrees with the strategy, that the KS4 provision needs to be examined.

Refers to Bishops School removing in-house Keilder provision, a decision made by BHBS school leaders.  
Agreeing with proposal to investigate gaps in provision

learning environments in mainstream schools particularly. I appreciate that this would be a huge financial outgoing but strongly believe that it would be a valuable investment for children - giving them the best possible chances to learn in ways that best suit them (SEN & neurotypical pupils) , be themselves, be happy, confident moving forward through to secondary provision which nurtures their needs and allows them to grow into happy, healthy adults.

**R48** See comments for Q6 - same applies

Agrees with proposal but disappointed in timescale for their particular child.

**Q7 Comment overview – one request for simplified text, one request for a glossary, two comments about current provision at Bishops School, some points ref service provision. Action simplify where possible, provide a glossary, and pass service comments to the Head of Additional Needs**

**List of all changes or actions completed as a result of consultation**

- **Simplify text in strategy where possible - completed**
- **Provide a glossary - completed**
- **Pass observations and concerns ref service delivery to Head of Additional Needs for inclusion in the SEND strategy consultation - completed**
- **Clarify proposed increase or decrease in places in each proposed improvement - completed**
- **Discuss responses given to proposed consultation on closure of Westfield Sixth Form with Director and AD of the Children and Families (C and F) Directorate - completed.**
- **On completion of all of the above, amend the strategy as necessary and submit to the C and F Scrutiny Committee for their recommendations - completed.**
- **The recommendation put forward by Scrutiny Committee on 23.03.21 was that it should be made clear in the strategy, that the scope and scale of the feasibility study relating to the proposal to invest in improving Westfield School, should be informed by the result of the consultation on proposed closure of the Westfield Special School Sixth Form phase, to be conducted later in 2021 – recommendation completed.**
- **Produce final amended strategy and submit for Cabinet deliberation on 22.04.21 for decision.**