

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESPONDANT	ORGANISATION	PAGE
21. Katharine Asson	Acorn Recruitment	2
22. John Welch	St Joseph's RC Primary School	6
23. ANONYMOUS		11
24. ANONYMOUS		17
25. D McCollough	Bassaleg School	24
26. ANONYMOUS		30
27. ANONYMOUS		35
28. (School Governor)	Milford Haven School	40
29. ANONYMOUS		46
30. Claire Dorer	NASS	52
31. Victoria Owens	Carms Ethnic Minority Achievement	61
32. Brendan McMorrow		67
33. ANONYMOUS		71
34. Haydn Jones		77
35. ANONYMOUS		78
36. Dawn Price	RCT People First	84
37. Cerys Jones	N Wales Council for Deaf People	85
38. Norman B Moore	Wales Council for Deaf People	90
39. Sally Davies	Association for the Deaf	96
40.	- Published on 'Young Persons Responses' -	

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

**ALN021: Katharine Asson
Acorn Recruitment**

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Flexible services to work around family life
Early identification and interventions
Mandatory checks
Provision of further/higher education to cover all stakeholders

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Network events
Database of approved provision

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It would be useful if this could include multi-agency/independent bodies as part of the decision making.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Can you clarify where WBL fits into this as it is mentioned once in the consultation document but not in any of these questions.
If WBL is to be included as alternative provision how will it be funded and regulated.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

ALN022: **John Welch**
 St Joseph's RC School, Newport

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

New terminology will help ensure that consistency vocabulary is used across provisions. This could also have a possible positive impact on pupils not being classed as 'special'

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Supporting comments

Longer term support is a positive move to ensure that pupils have clear and supported transition. Some pupils who may have attended mainstream school and sixth form or collage may actually need specialist or specific support to progress post 18.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Supporting comments

Statutory assessment is a long and time consuming process that can be stressful for all parties involved. IDP's can be easier to update and include all parties involved. Concerns however around parents ideas of what impact this will have on support.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

A new code of practice will ensure that there will be a clear approach for Alenco's . Mandatory requirements will also protect pupils and staff.

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

A consistent approach is needed across all provisions.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Longer term support is a positive move to ensure that pupils have clear and supported transition. Some pupils who may have attended mainstream school and sixth form or collage may actually need specialist or specific support to progress post 18 this will ensure that no pupil/young adult does not meet their full potential.

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This is key to a fully supported approach to learners. Other agencies must be involved in all aspects of the pupils development.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Supporting comments

Again a consistent approach across all services will aid the support of all pupils.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Supporting comments

This is key, tribunals have a very negative impact on all parties. Early resolution is highly important to ensure support for the pupils and a positive relationship for school and parents.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	*	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Yes, this will ensure a consistent approach for all cases.

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

ALN023: ANONYMOUS Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This would enable better planning for transition to adulthood. Closer links with FE and HE sectors would need to be created as well as a strengthening of links with Social Services and Health. The Educational Psychologists are well placed to support these young people but this would mean that a greater capacity would be required within local EP services. There was some concern that there would be a stigma attached to being labelled as ALN as they transition to adulthood.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The principle of having one document, the IDP, is a good one. We do see a risk factor in that for those pupils with complex or severe needs the document may not be detailed enough or contain evidence that is objective and based on good practice. It is important that these documents do not become generic but genuinely reflect the needs of the child. We would like to see a list of mandatory attendees at a PCP meeting which should include an Educational Psychologist. The EPs could also play a role in facilitating the meeting or in training of professionals to run these meetings.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

While we would agree that LAs should be responsible in order to ensure a good quality of IDPs, this would raise issues in terms of capacity to manage this. We feel that the fact that EPs are not named here is an omission as they have the skills to ensure that needs of the pupils are addressed and also to lead on the training for school staff to support them in identifying and meeting needs.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The wording of the code would need to be specific and we feel incorporate the role of the EPS

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	X <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Further education should fall under the same legal/statutory framework as schools/PRU

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The appropriate funding and resources must be available for this to happen

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Children and young people should only be placed in provision that meets the identified need. The Local authority needs to be clear that the provision can meet need before placing. We query whether this is also applicable to home schooling.

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It is important that there is more joined up working including shared training, casework and joint working with clusters of schools. The Code of Practice would need to describe assessment so that there is a shared understanding that this is not

just a paper exercise but is a process that informs teaching.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

See above comment re: shared training etc.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	X	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

If this would avoid the duplication of effort, however this needs to be treated with caution to ensure that the IDP can adequately fulfil the role of a PEP and also have clarity about who takes the lead in these cases.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	X	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

We strongly agree that this is a positive move forwards.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	X	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

We note that there is no reference to the role of the Educational psychologist in this paper. We feel it is essential that the Ep's role should be included in the white paper as we are ideally placed to support the IDP system through training staff, and support in identifying needs of children and young people.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN024: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs',(ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that **all** children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Do the present school Action pupils need an IDP? If these pupils are in mainstream and just need good differentiation in class and are identified for a catch up group for Literacy or Numeracy, why can't they just be put on a list for a catch up group as part of good assessment and intervention of slightly below average needs. If these pupils have a 10 week intervention program (responsibility of class teacher /maths/Literacy co-ordinator) improve and have no further problems this is good practice. However if there are still identified problems then they have an IDP and be the responsibility of the ALNCO. As there can be confusion between the need for a Catch up group or the need for ALN provision and responsibility between class teacher, Maths and Literacy co-ordinator and ALNCO for the present SA pupil. Those that have more significant difficulties identified e.g Dyslexia or Dyscalculia would have an IDP as would other pupils who have physical, emotional behaviour, moderate/significant ALN who are at present our SA+ pupils. Schools need to differentiate between a little help in mainstream to move pupils on and ALN which need intensive ongoing moderate/significant support to enable the pupil with ALN to access the curriculum. I think that all pupils should have an IPP individual pupil profile. I believe that the present SA+ and statemented pupils need an IDP. However how and who they are delivered by may be different. Present SA+ each class teacher should deliver them

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

with the parent/carer. Present statemented pupils should be delivered by the ALNCO only where all outside agencies attend. All ALN pupils having IDP's 2x a year would be impossible for the class teacher ALNCO to deliver. Especially for some schools who are in Community First areas where the ALN register could be between 30%-50% of pupils at the school.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree Present Statemented pupils only)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes for the present statemented pupils only. I have trialled the IDP's for a year and I can see how we could do IDP's 2x a year for Statemented pupils with all agencies attending. However I think that it is impossible for IDP's to be done 2x year for SA and SA+ pupils. I would never be in my class teaching, all SENCO's would have to be non-teaching. Also outside agencies will never have time for anything except attending IDP's. They would also clash with other IDP meetings organised at different schools on the same day. SA+ pupils should be reviewed by the class teacher and the parent only. They could invite the outside agency but I am sure they would be unable to attend as they will be attending the present Statemented pupils IDP's as these will take priority over present SA +IDP's. This is the only solution I can see working!!!

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Training for outside agencies (SLT, Educational Psychologists, GP's etc) to recognise the range of ALN e.g Dyslexia, Dyscalculia, Autism, Specific Language Impairment, EBD etc. This is important for pupils to have their needs identified correctly by all agencies and then have the correct provision being put in place for the individual ALN pupils. As there can often be different conflicting ideas about the primary needs of pupils with ALN.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes if there was only one plan this would definitely make both parties attend meetings as both education, health and social services are responsible for the IDP there would be less separate meetings to attend, closer liaison and protection of pupils wellbeing.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes parent partnership officers who befriend parents and help them see that we want the best for their children just as they do. Sort out problems before they escalate and stress both parents and pupils who then take on the fight or flight model.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes as many simple misconceptions can be resolved quickly and easily without the need for a tribunal. Many parents can get swept away with what they have heard or think they should do, having spoken to a family member or a friend. Without getting supportive advice from someone who actually understands the process and knows how to help them, someone who can sort out their concerns work between them and the organisation SLT, LA etc. They begin the tribunal process and get involved often in something that they do not understand, but they will fight for their child's rights which is understandable. However all they simply needed was to be listened to and understood and have their child's and their own needs met, someone working as an advocate interceding between parent and LA so that they can once again work together with the agency concerned, so much can be resolved. Many parents of children with ALN are in denial and want their child to be 'normal' so pretend they can do things that their child's peers can do when they can't. Others want to blame someone else or just feel guilty. These parents need support and counselling from experienced Parent befrienders who understand and are able to resolve many fairly simple issues preventing escalation, anger and resentment towards the LA.

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

I do understand that new ALNCO's coming into the role need training and the proposal of training at Masters level prior to taking on the ALNCO role during teacher training is an excellent idea as at this point there is no other major responsibilities upon the NQT. However I do not believe that SENCO's or ALNCO's who are actually doing the job at present will be able to do the job properly and train for a Masters at the same time. Especially when they are a full time class teacher, responsible not just for the mainstream ALN in a primary school but also Head of specialised base classes with 16 + statemented pupils. It is very important that the same demands are not being made on **all** SENCO's as we all have different roles and responsibilities as we are also Senior Managers, in charge of TA's, subject areas, behaviour, EAL pupils LAC etc etc. Whilst some SENCO's are non – teaching and only have mainstream pupils needs to address in one area e.g. Foundation Phase (Maybe they could do a Masters and their job at the same time), there is no comparison from one school to the next. I might like to do a Masters in ALN but I simply have no time, my job is constant all day and all night!!!!!! I am totally exhausted. I have trialled the IDP's for a year and I can see how we could do IDP's 2x a year for Statemented pupils. However I think that it is impossible for IDP's to be done 2x year for sa+ pupils as I would never be in my class teaching. Also outside agencies will never have time for any think except attending IDP's. They would also clash with other IDP meetings. It would be impossible!!! Please see NUT SENCO Charter sent as an attachment.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

**ALN025: D McCollough
Bassaleg School**

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Who makes decisions - what is process to identify?

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Include communication within Code of Practice - Processes for Information Review.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Who ultimately and under what guidance will someone decide to put an IDP in place?

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN026: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Massive cost for 21-25 at a time of 'austerity'. Focus should be 0-21

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Increases quality. BUT time is massive import. Must be reduced to be workable.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

LAs should be state-funded and state-monitored.

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

ALN027: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

More training needed for child ed psychs due to extended age. And health professionals

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Wouldn't be achievable for all children on ALN register to have IDPs - with reviews etc. Depends on the child and their needs. IDPs & SA+ - def not SA

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

'Best endeavours' - term too loose.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It's open to too many parents.

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

--

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN028: (School Governor)
Milford Haven School

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

ALN - Positive broadening approach

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

ALNCo need greater training, especially Post 16 yrs.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

We like the cohesiveness, tracking & flexibility. Time consuming - need to allocate time.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Schools are best places to write IDP. Local Authority to support delivery, i.e. working with Health authority to ensure delivery i.e. SLT

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Like the breadth of these comments/plans

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

--

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Greater agreement & strength needed re agreed delivery.

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Pooled budgets - money, staff, plans. Only focus is the children with ALN.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Should be in place anyway.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Still needed bacuse new plans fail to reduce the need for tribunal.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

We applaud greater status for ALNCo's in school. Clear training is needed; vital re training and experience.

All teachers need to understand ALN and use quality teaching to differentiate for specific needs.

MAT children have ALN too.

The advocacy role and mediation role for the ALNCo needs training.

The ALNCo needs to have a strategic role i.e. SMT in school, influencing quality of of teaching, quality of provision, training etc. Data & planning for ALN.

Training for ALN national training within 3 years of post.

Time implications for ALN et al is huge. More time needed.

We think the enhanced pupil/parent say/involvement is good but needs expanding to include friendships/social, emotional behavioural issues and preparation for life after school, healthy living, leisure.

We are data rich, spend money on more direct time staffing for children.

Greater experience/skills and rigour from Estyn following on ALN.

Greater flexibility of curriculum needed for children with ALN; i.e. healthy living (not PE), not Welsh classes for children struggling with communication skills in general.

You haven't improved resources i.e. ALNCo, SLT, Educ Psychologists, child care CAMS - so you will still have tribunals etc. Improve resources.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN029: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	x
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Supporting comments

Definition needed. No graduated response

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Significant implications.
 Why 25years? (Complete FE at 23)
 No differentiation between needs

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

De-skilling schools
 No graduated response – not realistic
 Raises expectations of some as no criteria and disadvantages those in social deprivation areas

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Only change of name not process!

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting Comments

LEA does not know every child
 School budget reduced
 Massive implication
 No equity - %social deprivation and high learning needs

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- I agree that COP needs updating
- Local Health Boards are 'run' under different rules
- SS missing ??

More joined up thinking needed

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Only "guidance" – mandatory or not?

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

- What does "best endeavours" mean?

Funding mechanisms at FE lot different

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

If resourced appropriately

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes – sharing of information but should be mandatory for all, including Health!
(Statutory assessment is multi-agency)

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Should be mandatory or if "provide guidance" -will not happen

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	x
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Supporting comments

- Lots of LAC do not require learning plans
- For those with ALN this would resolve duplication

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	x	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	x
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Supporting Comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	x
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Supporting comments

No definition – no structure/scaffold of graduated response will mean appeals will grow, therefore massive financial implications

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

- What is the role of the Senco?
- This will de-skill schools
- No graduated response may result in support being taken away from most needy and vulnerable
- Those who shout loudest will get needs met , NOT those most needy.
- No definition of ALN

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:



Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN030: Claire Dorer
National Association of Non-maintained & Independent
Schools (NASS)

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

b)

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

NASS welcomes the introduction of the term 'additional learning needs' (ALN) to replace the term 'special educational needs' (SEN). The AEP believes the change in terminology will help minimise any stigmatisation felt by young people currently labelled as having SEN. We would welcome a broad definition of 'learning needs' within the reform to recognise the role factors such as emotional wellbeing and mental health play in learning.

- c) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

NASS supports plans within to replace SEN statements with Individual Learning Plans from birth to 25 years and hope that alongside the Social Services (Wales) Act this will result in a stronger focus on preparing young people for adulthood. In recent years an increasing number of NASS members have developed services to young people with complex needs. This support is sometimes delivered through Independent Specialist College Provision but many of our members deliver adult

social care plus a variety of health, social enterprise and employment services. Often, this provision has no formally recognised education component and is funded through adult social services or continuing care support.

However, NASS is concerned that we are yet receive clarification that those with profound and complex needs aged 19-25 would be eligible for continuation of their plans under the new system. This is concerning for our members because, for many of the young people we support, there are few clear cut educational opportunities and they are the ones who are most likely to benefit from the continued protection of the plan. Development for these young people is not about being educated in a more expensive provision but is about targeted transitional activities that can be delivered as part of their day-to-day programmes. Many of the young people have *profound and multiple learning difficulties* and benefit from continued learning past the age of 19, especially as they generally learn much more slowly than their mainstream peers.

NASS believes that young adults with complex needs cannot navigate these transition years as other young adults can. The years between 19 and 25 are socially accepted as a time of experimentation and of finding limits and boundaries; we do not expect non-disabled young adults at the age of 19 to settle down in to adult life or go into an adult home environment where they stay for the rest of their life. Young adults with complex needs require support to make sense of the transition years and to develop a sense of themselves as adults and what it means to be an adult. It is not possible to train young adults with complex needs (who may well find it very hard to generalise) to be adults until they are actually old enough to take part in adult activities. Creating the right environment to achieve an understanding of adult life is an important part of supporting development.

Children with complex needs have an entitlement to education and this entitlement should be extended to them when they become young adults and not stop at this crucial stage in their lives. A considerable time and effort has been put into their education as children but in order to ensure that the social and financial investment that has been made during these school years is protected we feel that the Assembly must guarantee that young people with complex needs have continued support past the age of 19.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

- a) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

NASS welcomes the introduction of Individual Development Plans (IDPs) that will cover the child or young person in question through early years, school age and including further education provision. This will provide a unified system for young people with ALN which will lessen confusion and we hope ensure continuity of service provision for young people as they transfer into further education.

NASS would also like to raise concerns about the impact of the reforms on young people with complex needs who are aged between 19 and 25. The Welsh Government should ensure that proposal to provide an IDP to young people only whilst they “wish to or are receiving” education does not exclude young people with profound and complex needs aged 19-25. There are few clear cut educational opportunities for this group of young people and they are the ones who are most likely to benefit from the continued protection of the plan. Development for these young people is not about being educated in a (more expensive) provision but is about targeted transitional activities that can be delivered as part of their day to day programmes. As you might be aware, many of the young people in our members’ care have *profound and multiple learning difficulties* so need to keep learning past the age of 19 especially as they learn much more slowly than their mainstream peers. Some of our young people also have very high health needs so it is crucial that they get the necessary support to ensure they get longer term adult placements.

- b) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

NASS believes that while local authorities should be accountable for the provision for children and young people set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed, the legislation should ensure that parents of children with IDPs are able to express a preference for any state-funded school – including independent special schools. We are pleased that the White Paper recognises that for some children and young people with ALN it may be more appropriate to attend an independent school to meet their educational needs.

However, we would like the Welsh Government to recognise that providing high quality support for children with SEN/ALN and disabilities is never something that can be done cheaply and yet the pressure to achieve value for money applies, especially in this time of fiscal restraint. In the SEN/ALN sector there has been a lack of information on both costs and value for money, especially when making comparisons between different types of provision. To counter this NASS commissioned a report by Baker Tilly, which explored the value a placement in a independent special schools through considering its social impact. A good school placement, which meets all the needs of a child or young person, has a lasting impact on their future employment, health and social care needs. There is a similar impact on the parents and siblings of the disabled child. Baker Tilly has calculated that the return to society over a 25 year period is between £150,000-600,000 per young person placed, with an average return of c.£250,000.

Therefore the Welsh Government should acknowledge the impact of the sector and encourage the placement of children and young people with IDPs in independent special schools where there provision is most appropriate for the child or young person. To do this the Welsh Government should remove the bureaucratic obstacles currently in place preventing some child or young people from being educated in the sector, which includes the proposals for all independent special schools to be registered and approved with individual local authorities on a case-by-case basis.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

--

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

NASS agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP, as to keep provision equitable and consistent then all relevant settings should be held equally accountable. To ensure that all young people in education have their needs met, all education settings should be accountable for ALN provision and therefore further education institutions should be required to put in place arrangements to identify and support young people with needs.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

We absolutely believe that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN.

We have found that our young adults with complex needs can and need to keep learning past the age of 19 especially as they learn much more slowly than their mainstream peers. While we believe that they are entitled to the same learning opportunities as these peers, their learning needs are different – they need to continue to learn about adult life, be supported to understand and choose leisure opportunities, to access the local community, how to make choices and the consequences of those choices. This is especially pertinent as

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

many more children with complex physical disabilities and high health needs are living into adulthood.

Normally pupils with ALN in NASS schools up to the age of 19 will be in full-time education. However, NASS schools also include care homes that accommodate young people over the age of 19, up to a maximum age of 25, and this is designed to support their transition to an adult placement. Alternative forms of provision should be available for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN, as otherwise young adults with complex needs will not be able to meet their full potential.

As we stated above, young people with complex needs have an entitlement to education and this entitlement should be extended to them when they become young adults and not stop at this crucial stage in their lives. A considerable time and effort has been put into their education as children but in order to ensure that the social and financial investment that has been made during these school years is protected we feel that the Welsh Government must guarantee that young people with complex needs have continued support past the age of 19.

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

We strongly agree with the Welsh Government that for some children and young people with ALN it may be more appropriate to attend an independent school to meet their educational needs. Parents of children with statements of SEN/ IDPs must continue to be able to be given the choice to state a preference for an independent sector special school. However, we believe that all independent sector special schools must be able to support the needs of children and young people as identified in their IDP, therefore we agree that independent special schools should be approved to be able to provide this support.

However, children and young people that attend independent special schools come from all over Wales – and not just the local authority in which the school is situated. Therefore it would become overly bureaucratic and cumbersome for each independent school to register with multiple local authorities in order to be approved to admit children or young people with plans.

We understand the viewpoint of the Welsh Government that local authorities are better placed to decide whether an independent school is able to provide for a child or young person with SEN/ALN, however we believe that this would be both impractical and

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

damaging. The proposal for all independent special schools to be registered and approved with individual local authorities on a case-by-case basis would create a post-code lottery for parents and their children, dependent on whether or not their local authority approves an independent special school and the potentially life-changing provision it could offer a child with an IDP.

The Welsh Government should instead use a reformed list system of approved independent special schools but allow local authorities to review the provision offered by those schools should they see fit to, according to strict guidelines.

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

NASS supports the focus in the proposals on multi-disciplinary working and co-ordination to bring together support and expertise from education, health and social care professionals. NASS's view is that we should look at what support a child requires and bring together professionals from across all settings to meet those needs. In our experience parents "pressurise" LAs to place in the independent sector because they have greater faith in the quality of provision and the ability of the sector to holistically meet children's needs. Independent schools have proven to coordinate joint working between education, health and social care professionals to deliver high-quality outcomes, which that parents have consistently endorsed by voting with their feet.

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

This is a pragmatic approach. However, we would wish to ensure that the educational requirements for supporting LAC are not diluted in any way.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

We would be happy to see parents encouraged to use the complaints process but would stop short of making this a requirement. Parents should retain the right to go to tribunal at a point of their choosing.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

The National Association of Independent Schools and Non-Maintained Special Schools is a membership organisation catering for approximately 10000 very vulnerable children and young people in England and Wales. It provides information, support and training to its members in order to benefit and advance the education of children and young people with SEN.

NASS is the only national organisation representing special schools in the voluntary and private sectors. NASS works in partnership with key national and regional organisations and acts as the voice for Non Maintained and Independent Special Schools (NMISS). NASS has 215 members, spread over the whole of England and Wales. Non-maintained and Independent Special Schools cater for around 13000 of the most vulnerable children in the country with very wide ranging, but complex, needs. Over 99 per cent of places in NMISS are funded indirectly by the public purse, through Local Authorities making placements.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN031: Victoria Owens
Carmarthenshire Ethnic Minority Achievement Service

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Our main concern is that there may be several professionals involved in the support process and who will have input. How will this be managed? Will there be a lead person with overall responsibility?
Do we have the resources/funding to extend the age range and make it effective?

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The system needs to be made fairer and there needs to be clearer definition. Our concerns are that there will be an increased burden on schools/LAs. Who has responsibility?

It is unclear as to whether our EAL learners will require an IDP. It is clear that a child or young person will not be regarded as having ALN solely because the language of their home is different from the language in which they are taught. However, children receiving support for EAL are benefitting from 'provision which is additional to, or otherwise different from, the educational provision made generally for children or young persons of the same age'. We would like to see a continuation of specialised learning plans written by EAL specialist teachers with class teachers rather than IDPs for these children.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes that they should be ultimately responsible for the overseeing that there is consistency in the provision but the responsibility for the preparation of IDPs should lie with the relevant body (school/LA specialist/etc)

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Who will take the lead if the cooperation is required of many interest groups?
How will this information sharing be organised if not an online tool? What
assurances be offered regarding data protection?

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Better communication and clarity of roles.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN032: **Brendan McMorrow**

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The current transition age where young people with additional learning needs leave the education system is too low. It should be raised to 27 if it is in the best interests of the young person.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It should be up to the age of 27.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It ensures the requirements of the ALN are carried out.

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

There appears to be little assistance in preparation for and obtaining work when further education ceases.
--

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The additional funding that accompanies the child should be used for the child and not swallowed up by the general school budget
--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

A disjonted approach is of no benefit to the person with ALN or the authorities.
--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

The code of practice should be compulsory. Not a guide.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Not all decisions are correct when made

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

ALN033: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The term Additional Needs demonstrates that pupils may require support in a variety of ways. This could be short or long term.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

<p>Long term provision is helpful to identify previous support already tried and tested and those which are successful. It also provides additional support at Post 16 where provision is needed but not fully available at present. There is disservice to Post 16 at present and into adult life and the world of work particularly with regards to finding suitable provision after 19 years of age.</p>

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

<p>I agree that provision for some individuals should be in place until the age of 25. However, I disagree with the set up of the IDP as a "one size fits all" approach in place of the graduated response and especially in place of the statement. Every pupil is entitled to have their needs met and support differs depending on individual need. At present the IDP does not state anywhere the primary need for SEN pupils or show how provision should impact on their development. With the proposed set up for the IDP and Annual Review, targets identified do not always match the primary need of the child. Therefore how are we to ensure that primary areas of need are catered for sufficiently and effectively? I thought the purpose of a statement of SEN was to ensure that our most vulnerable individuals were cared for and given appropriate support in order for them to progress and reach their full potential. How can this be the case if targets set hold no real value. Also targets would need to be reviewed sooner than on an annual basis as this does not reflect sufficient progress for</p>
--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

individuals.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The Government should outline the IDP based on the pilot systems used across local authorities. Consistency is paramount and all local authorities should be working within the same framework and against the same criteria.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Guidance should be set out and implemented to give consistency and clear structure for each regulation and area of legislation. Professionals need to be able to follow procedures accurately and be able to trust in government initiatives.

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Further education establishments such as colleges should also provide IDPs to outline how they continue to provide support for individuals with SEN. This should build on the provision and progress and made in secondary education.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Post 16 Pupils often end up with little or non-specialist support. Specialist provision would allow for Post 16 individuals to continue to grow and develop with independent skills preparing them for the world of work or alternative provision.

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Some areas of need require specialist intervention. How can this be achieved if the setting does not provide this? How will this impact on the individual?

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

A multi agency model is where best practice occurs. Termly meetings at the very least should be held. Research has proven that where this occurs the provision in place for individuals is far more effective and makes provision far easier to organise. Every agency has something to offer and through exploring options available the best can be selected to cater for individual needs. This also helps with working across the multi agencies as professionals know who to contact for specialised help and support.

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Sharing expertise and explaining roles and services that each offer.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The role of an IDP and a PEP are completely different. Pupils who are both

looked after and have a statement of SEN at present would not have all their individual needs fully addressed. I would be concerned that important issues were missed.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Guidance from the Government should outline clear procedures to ensure that each case is dealt with fairly and in the same manner as other cases of a similar nature.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

If a disagreement can be resolved amicably obviously this would be the best outcome for all parties concerned. Guidance should demonstrate how local authorities should proceed in the first instance.

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Tribunal should be the last resort. With a clear statutory guidance in place

there should be no need for a tribunal. A timeline of events from birth to 25 would be effective with this.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

How does the lack of a statement of SEN affect individual learning resource bases and special schools who offer specialised support? Surely the use of an IDP should indicate the level of need of individuals. Where IDPs replace the statement there is a possibility that more important needs are overlooked as targets are not specifically set around the primary area of need. If this happens who is at fault and how greatly will the individual be affected?

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

ALN034: Haydn Jones

Whilst I appreciate the well meaning mindset which has been applied to these complex matters, after much consideration I feel unable to support the proposals.

It seems to me that, in the current and foreseeable financial climate, the proposals would dilute attention from the extreme needs of the few in order to provide much more limited support to the less dependent many. In a situation where resources appear to be becoming ever more limited in relation to needs, it is surely wiser to focus those resources where the need is greatest and to then develop that provision from a position of excellence as and when further resources become available, either through improvements in efficiency or through enhanced funding.

Moreover, the proposals would result in a nightmare situation for those required to deliver it, would produce an even greater mountain of paperwork and would end up meeting the needs of nobody save bureaucratic army which would be required to oversee it.

The scenarios in which the current system works well are repeatedly referred to in the document, as are the current weaknesses.

I would suggest that when one has a system that works so well so often, it would be better in the short to medium term to reinforce and develop that same system to be more robust and effective and to offer limited but achievable opportunities to extend that system rather than launch into the sort of 'root and branch' reconfiguration being proposed.

With sincere apologies for my negative response.

D. Haydn Jones

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN035: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

As long as the service fits the need I don't care what it's called.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Need to ensure that an holistic approach is taken so that a strongr partnership can be forged.
--

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

It would appear that this area needs to be held more accountable so that Y.P.'s get a better opportunity.

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

If this task is passed to schools when will they find the time or budget to undertake this task?
--

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

it is essential that an holistic/multi partnership be the way forward

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

However 'best endeavors' is too loose. A 'must' approach would provide more structure and continuity.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This is where the age limit of 25 will ensure that Y.P. with ALN are looked after and have better greater provision.

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

--

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Communication and partnership are the key to making the IDPs a success!

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Regulations and strong Directors.
Punishments - e.g. withdrawal of budgets.

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

One template - less confusion

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN036: Dawn Price
RCT People First

Please find attached the views of some of the people with learning disabilities who attend RCT People First

Special Education Needs vs Additional Learning Needs

50% agreed to change the terminology from Special Educational Needs to Additional Learning Needs

50% did not agree to this change as they felt that if there was a move from Special Educational needs it would become even harder to obtain a statement and obtain the correct services and benefits needed.

Change from Statements on Special Educational Needs and other and assessments plans to Individual Development Plans

50 % agreed to this change.

50% did not agree

Introduction of a Code of Practice

50% agreed and 50% didn't agree to this.

Looked after children – unable to comment

People wanted to know what is the difference between SEN and IDP's?

People felt that these should be the same as services and people should be involved in SEN Statements anyway.

Members also felt that people should take the time to read documents, plans etc. that bear relevant and important information on a persons transition during their life, but it appears that this may not be happening. Why?

50% agreed to the change of names from SENCO's to ADLNCO's

50% didn't agree.

Members also felt that the Welsh Assembly Government should make all information accessible as neither the main consultation document or the document made for children and young people was accessible.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN037: ANONYMOUS

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0–25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

These proposals are overdue and should provide a fairer and more positive way of providing for the learning needs of these disadvantaged young people in our society; but hope that resources will be sufficient to meet their learning needs and that outcomes of the proposed improvements will lead to work being made for people covered by the White Paper.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN038: Norman B Moore
Wales Council for Deaf People

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Agree to this in principle but acknowledge that this will mean a huge amount of increased paperwork, meetings etc. but it should be worthwhile.
The word 'learning' in ALN may be unhelpful as some deaf pupils require ACCESS but don't necessarily have learning needs in a traditional sense. This may also appear inappropriate in our work with babies in the home setting.

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The document is very weak indeed on age 0-2's especially where the child is not in a setting but seen at home. It is crucial to recognise that deaf babies and children require specialist support from a mandatory qualified teacher of the deaf (MQTOD) immediately following diagnosis. The extension of 0-25 will impact on paperwork, meetings, liaison time hugely in services that are already stretched..
There are training implications for professionals in term of the extended age range. Will there be additional funding available for recruitment and training of staff as necessary?
Concern with LA's taking on the responsibility for implementing, monitoring and reviewing IDP's in FE sector where currently they have no control.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This could become a bureaucratic nightmare and will require careful handling by authorities and services to limit the impact. Services are already stretched to capacity, with some HI services in Wales operating with well below a full quota of MQTOD, huge concerns have been raised regarding this. Although there is support for change it will only be successfully achieved if services have the capacity to deliver it.

We need clear guidelines regarding the content of IDP's. Will there be different requirements for low/medium/high level needs? Will there be a statutory element to IDP's?

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0 –25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

There needs to be collaboration with relevant agencies and families. There needs to be a joint commitment to the IDP and where provision falls short in any area action taken. We do not see how LA can take ultimate responsibility for preparing IDP's and ensuring agreed provision is delivered and reviewed. SEN monies are now delegated to schools and have no control over FE provision.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Where a deaf child is concerned the involvement of the MQTOD is essential from diagnosis. Despite the low incidence of HI schools cannot provide this on their own. Specialist services are required.
It is vital that the mandatory requirements apply equally to all organisations, currently Health Boards seem to abdicate responsibility to LA's and there is a lack of accountability. Schools also need to be more accountable, there is an over reliance on LA's.

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?
c)

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes as this could improve transition to FE settings.
The term 'best endeavours' is subjective. There should be clear expectations and duties which should be enforceable – LA's cannot be expected to do this.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes provided the provision can meet the needs of the pupil and will adhere to the IDP and its review process. Funding will also need to be delegated to LA's.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes if the placement does not meet the identified needs of the pupil either before

placement or mid placement. However this may prove difficult where a family have specifically sought a placement which they deem appropriate to meeting the child's needs.

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

We welcome this for all agencies. TOD's have been working in this way for years but moves to strengthen this process would be good especially working practices between health, social care and education. There are challenges in getting all professionals together- time and resources. The potential additional number of IDP's will put additional stresses on multiagency planning and delivery.

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

An investment in IT, additional time and joined up training for the agencies involved. The guidance also needs to have 'teeth' so that pressure can be put on agencies/professionals who do not engage.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This will avoid duplication.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This is already in place in many LA's.
--

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The system should be robust enough to enable the majority of initial complaints/disagreements to be resolved at local level or to be avoided completely in most instances with the IDP process.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

- There are references to mandatory requirements but nothing about Sensory Impairment MQ. It is important that this is made explicit in the Code of Practice and that it should apply to both school based teachers of the deaf and those working peripatetically. This has happened in England.
- Lots of ideas are to be welcomed – improved joint working, involving children currently not with statements in the IDP system, more person-centred assessment and processes including the young person and the family.
- Outcomes are important but for low incidence SEN, specifically hearing impairment, support needs to be ongoing and not dependent on the failure to merit support. HI does not get better, therefore there should not come a time where immediate outcomes are achieved and all support is withdrawn. HI pupils need ongoing support to ensure they reach their potential.
- Early intervention (ie. Preschool at home) is crucial and beneficial socially and financially. This must be acknowledged, supported and resourced and very much part of the CoP.
- There is no specific mention of the support of the wellbeing and mental health of pupils with SEN/ALN. A significant number of pupils and young people struggle with this and receive very little or no specialist support due to lack of awareness, funding and/or specialist provision locally. This has far reaching implications for outcomes for ALN pupils.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here:

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

ALN039: Sally Davies
British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

Question 1 – New terminology

- a) Do you agree that a new term, 'additional learning needs', (ALN) should focus on children and young people who need additional and/or different support with learning to allow them to benefit as fully as possible from the education or training available to them?

Agree	x <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Agree to this in principle but acknowledge that this will mean a huge amount of increased paperwork, meetings etc. but it should be worthwhile.
 The word 'learning' in ALN may be unhelpful as some deaf pupils require ACCESS but don't necessarily have learning needs in a traditional sense. This may also appear inappropriate in our work with babies in the home setting.

- b) Do you agree that the new system should apply to children and young people from birth up to the age of 25? If so, what implications should we consider for the professionals involved in assessing and providing that support?

Agree	x <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The document is very weak indeed on age 0-2's especially where the child is not in a setting but seen at home. It is crucial to recognise that deaf babies and children require specialist support from a mandatory qualified teacher of the deaf (MQTOD) immediately following diagnosis. The extension of 0-25 will impact on paperwork, meetings, liaison time hugely in services that are already stretched.
 There are training implications for professionals in term of the extended age range. Will there be additional funding available for recruitment and training of staff as necessary?
 Concern with LA's taking on the responsibility for implementing, monitoring and reviewing IDP's in FE sector where currently they have no control.

Question 2 – Individual development plans (IDP)

- a) Do you agree that all children and young people with ALN should be entitled to an IDP which sets out their agreed additional learning provision?

Agree	x <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

- b) Do you agree that IDPs should replace statutory assessment and statements of SEN, assessments for learners over 16 (under section 140 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000) and non-statutory plans including individual education plans under School Action and School Action Plus?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This could become a bureaucratic nightmare and will require careful handling by authorities and services to limit the impact. Services are already stretched to capacity, with some HI services in Wales operating with well below a full quota of MQTOD, huge concerns have been raised regarding this. Although there is support for change it will only be successfully achieved if services have the capacity to

deliver it.
We need clear guidelines regarding the content of IDP's. Will there be different requirements for low/medium/high level needs? Will there be a statutory element to IDP's?

- c) Do you agree that local authorities should be ultimately responsible for preparing an IDP for children and young people aged 0 –25 with ALN and for ensuring that agreed provision set out in the IDP is delivered and reviewed?

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

There needs to be collaboration with relevant agencies and families. There needs to be a joint commitment to the IDP and where provision falls short in any area action taken. We do not see how LA can take ultimate responsibility for preparing IDP's and ensuring agreed provision is delivered and reviewed. SEN monies are now delegated to schools and have no control over FE provision.

Question 3 – A new code of practice

- a) Do you agree that a new code of practice on ALN should include mandatory requirements in accordance with which local authorities, schools, further education institutions, local health boards and the tribunal must act?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Supporting comments

Where a deaf child is concerned the involvement of the MQTOD is essential from diagnosis. Despite the low incidence of HI schools cannot provide this on their own. Specialist services are required.
It is vital that the mandatory requirements apply equally to all organisations, currently Health Boards seem to abdicate responsibility to LA's and there is a lack of accountability. Schools also need to be more accountable, there is an over reliance on LA's.

- b) Do you agree that the code of practice should set out guidance for any other bodies, such as third sector organisations or other providers of education and training?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

c)

Question 4 – Securing provision

Do you agree that further education institutions should be included alongside schools, maintained nurseries and pupil referral units, as institutions that must use their 'best endeavours' to secure the additional learning provision called for in an IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes as this could improve transition to FE settings.
The term 'best endeavours' is subjective. There should be clear expectations and duties which should be enforceable – LA's cannot be expected to do this.

Question 5 – Securing specialist provision for young people

Do you agree that local authorities should be responsible for securing specialist education provision for post-16 learners outside of the further education sector where the IDP indicates that this is necessary to meet a young person's ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes provided the provision can meet the needs of the pupil and will adhere to the IDP and its review process. Funding will also need to be delegated to LA's.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 6 – Placement at independent schools

Do you agree that local authorities should be prohibited from placing a child or young person at an independent school which has not been registered to provide the type of additional learning provision identified in their IDP?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Yes if the placement does not meet the identified needs of the pupil either before

placement or mid placement. However this may prove difficult where a family have specifically sought a placement which they deem appropriate to meeting the child's needs.

Question 7 – A multi-agency approach to planning and delivery

- a) Do you agree that local authorities, local health boards and further education institutions should be required to cooperate and share information in assessing, planning and delivering support to meet ALN?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

We welcome this for all agencies. TOD's have been working in this way for years but moves to strengthen this process would be good especially working practices between health, social care and education. There are challenges in getting all professionals together- time and resources. The potential additional number of IDP's will put additional stresses on multiagency planning and delivery.

- b) As well as using the code of practice to provide guidance, are there any other ways in which you think multi-agency partnership working could be strengthened?

Supporting comments

An investment in IT, additional time and joined up training for the agencies involved. The guidance also needs to have 'teeth' so that pressure can be put on agencies/professionals who do not engage.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 8 – Supporting looked after children

Do you agree that IDPs should be able to replace or function as personal education plans for children and young people who are looked after by a local authority?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This will avoid duplication.

Question 9 – Resolving disputes at an early stage

- a) Do you agree that local authorities should be required to put in place disagreement resolution arrangements?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

This is already in place in many LA's.

- b) Do you agree that there should be a requirement to use the appropriate local complaints processes prior to appeal to tribunal?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

The system should be robust enough to enable the majority of initial complaints/disagreements to be resolved at local level or to be avoided completely in most instances with the IDP process.

Legislative proposals for additional learning needs Responses 21-40

Question 10 – Extending the right of appeal

Do you agree with our proposals in relation to extending rights of appeal to tribunal (see proposals 19, 20 and 21)?

Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

Supporting comments

Question 11

We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

- There are references to mandatory requirements but nothing about Sensory Impairment MQ. It is important that this is made explicit in the Code of Practice and that it should apply to both school based teachers of the deaf and those working peripatetically. This has happened in England.
- Lots of ideas are to be welcomed – improved joint working, involving children currently not with statements in the IDP system, more person-centred assessment and processes including the young person and the family.
- Outcomes are important but for low incidence SEN, specifically hearing impairment, support needs to be ongoing and not dependent on the failure to merit support. HI does not get better, therefore there should not come a time where immediate outcomes are achieved and all support is withdrawn. HI pupils need ongoing support to ensure they reach their potential.
- Early intervention (ie. Preschool at home) is crucial and beneficial socially and financially. This must be acknowledged, supported and resourced and very much part of the CoP.
- There is no specific mention of the support of the wellbeing and mental health of pupils with SEN/ALN. A significant number of pupils and young people struggle with this and receive very little or no specialist support due to lack of awareness, funding and/or specialist provision locally. This has far reaching implications for outcomes for ALN pupils.

Responses to consultations may be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here: