



# South Tyneside Council

## Cabinet

Date: 9 December 2009

---

## Review of Special Educational Needs Provision (third consultation)

Report of the Executive Director Children and Young People

Cabinet Portfolio/Lead Member: Cllr Jim Foreman - Children and Young People

---

### Purpose of Report

1. The Report briefly reviews the reasons why maintaining existing Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision in South Tyneside is unsustainable due to changes in parental preference, increased inclusion in mainstream schooling and falling pupil numbers.
2. It briefly reviews the three sets of proposals to reorganise the borough's Special School provision put forward for public consultation since May 2008.
3. It offers an analysis of the three sets of proposals, including responses arising from the third round of public consultation authorised by Cabinet on 24 June 2009.
4. On the basis of this analysis, the Report explores the case for and against the range of possible options for reorganising the borough's Special School provision.

---

Performing Together Reference: C3/2/6 – review Special Educational Needs (SEN) funding to schools and educational settings.

Contact Officer: Peter Cutts – Head of Social Inclusion and Achievement  
(0191 424 7697)

---

cabinet cabinet cabinet **cabinet** cabinet cabinet cabinet

## **Introduction**

5. We want to move to a more inclusive approach to special education, giving more pupils the opportunity to learn alongside their mainstream peers, where it is appropriate, and with the right inclusion support. We also want to continue to offer very specialist provision for children who need that supported learning environment so that they can flourish. In order to achieve this we need the right balance between specialist and mainstream provision.
6. The Cabinet reports of 21 May 2008 and 4 March 2009 included a detailed review of the reasons why maintaining the existing Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision in South Tyneside is unsustainable. These included changes in parental preference, increased inclusion in mainstream schooling and falling pupil numbers in some special schools.
7. The reasons why it is unsustainable to maintain the existing provision remain unchanged.
8. The principles underpinning the review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision are:

### **Educational**

- to ensure that all children and young people with SEN have their needs met and make good progress to achieve the very best that they can; that all children and young people with SEN have the opportunity to succeed;
- to achieve the right balance between high quality, specialist provision and a more flexible inclusive approach within our mainstream schools; that all teachers should expect to teach children with SEN and that all schools should play their part in educating children from their local community, whatever their background or ability;

### **Inclusive**

- to improve inclusive opportunities for children and young people with special educational needs so that those in specialist provision have as much opportunity as possible for educational and social inclusion alongside their mainstream peers; that all children should have opportunities to learn, play and develop alongside each other within their local schools, especially where a pupil has a flair for a particular subject or area of learning;
- that integrated strategies enable a shift in focus to more preventative work; to develop facilities that can be used more generally by the wider community of children, young people

and adults with a disability to access extended educational and leisure opportunities;

### **Compliance with the SEN Improvement Test**

- to ensure, where there are changes, that these comply with the SEN improvement test (details in paragraph 39);

### **Feasibility**

- to ensure, where there are changes, that these are affordable, feasible and sustainable.

9. All analysis contained within this report of the educational viability, feasibility, sustainability and affordability of the proposals put forward for consultation has been conducted with reference to these principles.

### **The consultation process**

10. On 21 May 2008 Cabinet authorised a public consultation on the following proposals for the reorganisation of special schools:
- Close Bamburgh School and establish a new 120 place Generic Primary Special School linked to a mainstream primary school fully operating as a primary provision by 2012 at the earliest. This would enable us to benefit from new, purpose-built accommodation already attached to a new, Disability Discrimination Act compliant mainstream primary school.
  - Establish a new 135-place Generic Secondary Special School, co-located (but with a physical link) with a mainstream secondary school (Hebburn) by 2012 at the earliest.
  - The above proposals to create two generic special schools will require the LA to close: Oakleigh Gardens School, Greenfields School, Margaret Sutton School, Epinay Business and Enterprise School, and Bamburgh School.
11. On 4 March 2009, due to the strength of representation about the above proposals, Cabinet authorised a second round of public consultation on a second set of proposals as follows:
- Establish by 2012 at the earliest a new 130-place all-age (2-19) community special school catering for children with a range of needs and in particular those with Severe, Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (SLD and PMLD) on the current Bamburgh School site.
  - Establish by 2012 at the earliest a new building for Epinay School as a 150-place community special school for pupils aged 5-16, catering for a range of needs including Moderate

Learning Difficulties (MLD) and other needs (for example: vulnerable children and those with physical or medical needs for whom a special school placement is judged necessary), at a suitable location to be identified through consultation.

- Cease to maintain Margaret Sutton School, Oakleigh Gardens School, Greenfields School, and Bamburgh School.

12. On 24 June 2009 Cabinet considered these proposals and then authorised a third round of public consultation on the following proposals:

- Build a new special school with 130 places to cater for children aged 2-19 with Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties and Severe Learning Difficulties (PMLD/SLD). This school would replace Oakleigh Gardens School and Greenfields School, which would close. A feasibility study to be carried out on the following site options: Oakleigh Gardens School, Luke's Lane Primary School, Bedewell Primary School, Hebburn Comprehensive School.
- Create a new special school with 150 places to cater for children aged 3-16 with a range of Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (to include children with complex needs and medical or physical difficulties). This school would replace Bamburgh School, Margaret Sutton School, and Epinay School, which would close. The new school would be housed in the current Bamburgh School building. The Business and Enterprise Centre on the current Epinay School site would remain open as an annex to this new school.

13. This Report analyses the merits of the three sets of proposals against the list of principles underpinning the review of Special Educational Needs provision (paragraph 8) and the SEN improvement test (paragraph 39). This analysis also takes into account the responses gathered during each period of consultation.

14. On the basis of this analysis, this Report explores the case for and against the range of possible options for reorganising the borough's special school provision.

15. The Report covers the following elements:

	Paragraphs:
A review of the need for change	16-25
Pupil numbers	26-27
The consultation process (third round)	28-33
General notes on the analysis of representations	34-38
The SEN improvement test (general principles)	39-41

An analysis of each set of proposals against the list of underpinning principles	42-43 <i>(plus tables)</i>
The feasibility study	44-47
Conclusions drawn from the analyses	48-70

**A review of the need for change**

16. South Tyneside is viewed by central government and by Ofsted as one of the least inclusive Local Authorities in England.

17. In South Tyneside the percentage of pupils educated in a segregated provision is almost twice the national average.

	<b>2005/6</b>	<b>2006/7</b>	<b>2007/8</b>	<b>2008/9</b>
<b>England</b>	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
<b>South Tyneside</b>	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%

18. Recent inspections have highlighted that South Tyneside has been slow to address the inclusion agenda. The Joint Area Review conducted in 2008 stated that the “higher than average numbers of children in specials schools (in South Tyneside are) an important weakness”. It also criticised the Local Authority for being “slow to implement the principles of inclusion.”

19. Progress has been made however, and over the last 10 years increased resources for SEN have been put into mainstream schools, as well as into special schools.

20. Recent Ofsted inspections have judged that mainstream schools are becoming better at providing for a wider range of needs and that pupils with SEN in mainstream schools make progress which is equally as good as that made by pupils in special schools.

21. Because of the improved provision, there has been an increasing trend in the number of parents choosing to continue the education of their child with special educational needs in their local mainstream school.

22. As a result of schools becoming more proficient at early diagnosis and intervention to support children’s educational needs, the number of children with statements of special educational needs is falling. In 2001 there were 930. By 2009 this had fallen to 696.

23. This has led to falling rolls in special schools. This is most noticeable in Bamburgh School (current number on roll: 97) and Margaret Sutton School (current number on roll: 59).

24. A special school with a roll of under 100 cannot afford to deliver a secondary National Curriculum with the breadth necessary for pupils who are functioning within the average to higher range of ability. The use of resources, particularly staffing, is inefficient. With falling numbers there are also issues around having appropriately sized social groups in each year group.
25. Against this changing landscape, South Tyneside Local Authority has undertaken a review of the provision for children with special educational needs (SEN). Its aim continues to be to provide high-quality, viable special school places for those parents who feel that this is the best option for their child(ren); and high-quality places for children with SEN in mainstream schools, with appropriate inclusion support, for those parents who feel that this is the best option for their child(ren).

### Pupil numbers

26. The table below shows pupil numbers in the schools affected by these reorganisation proposals from 2002 to 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Bamburgh</b>	140	143	143	142	140	144	111	97
<b>Epinay</b>	105	102	104	105	107	105	108	105
<b>Margaret Sutton</b>	107	97	98	102	104	84	70	59
<b>Total in these schools (net loss)</b>	352	342	345	349	351	333 (-18)	289 (-44)	261 (-28)
<b>Greenfields</b>	45	43	46	47	49	50	47	49
<b>Oakleigh Gardens</b>	53	51	48	53	49	58	57	53
<b>Total in these schools</b>	98	94	94	100	98	108	104	102

27. Based on current trends, officers predict that the level of net loss will rise in 2010 and then continue at a similar rate to 2009's figures until at least 2012.

### The consultation process (third round)

28. The third round of consultation lasted from 6 July to 9 October 2009.
29. During this period the following opportunities for representation were offered:
- Meetings for parents/carers of pupils at each of the special schools affected by the proposals;

- Meetings for staff and governors at each of the special schools affected by the proposals;
  - A meeting with staff, governors and parents of the Early Excellence Centre;
  - A meeting with staff, governors and parents at Sea View Primary School;
  - Drop-in sessions for residents and members of the public in Jarrow, Cleadon and South Shields;
  - A meeting with young adults with Severe Learning Difficulties supported by Chesshire-Hope.
30. Children in each of the special schools affected by the proposals were invited to participate in the consultation via a questionnaire supported by staff in their own school. Four out of the five schools affected submitted responses.
31. A report on the review of SEN provision and the proposals out for consultation was presented to each of the Community Area Forum meetings. Questions and comments from elected members and members of the public were fed into the consultation.
32. Interested parties were also able to make representation to officers by letter, e-mail, telephone, in person or via a third party (for example through an elected member or local Member of Parliament).
33. An analysis of the representations made during the period 6 July to 9 October 2009 is attached to this Report as Appendix J.

### **General notes on the analysis of representations**

34. Whilst considering
- representations made about proposals, and
  - alternative proposals put forward by interested parties
- Cabinet must take into account not the number of times a representation or proposal is received, but rather the strength of argument in relation to children's education and well-being underpinning that representation or alternative proposal.
35. Account must also be taken of the fact that proposals will affect future generations of children with special educational needs, not just those currently of school age.
36. During the period of consultation numerous identical representations were made. These are reflected in the notes of meetings and the summary of written representations received which are attached to this Report as appendices.

37. For the purpose of analysis, however, each separate representation is considered proportionately in accordance with its educational relevance to the review of SEN provision.
38. In addition, whilst arguments about parental choice usually carry significant weight in matters of school organisation, in a review of provision for children with special educational needs they need to be viewed in a different context. This is because the aim of such a review is to ensure that there is a range of specialist provision appropriate to the needs of the children rather than a diverse choice of schools each offering the same curriculum.

### **The SEN improvement test (general principles)**

39. When proposing any reorganisation of SEN provision, including that which might lead to some children being displaced through closures or alterations, local authorities, and all other proposers for new schools or new provision, need to demonstrate to parents, the local community and decision makers how the proposed alternative arrangements are likely to lead to improvements in the standard, quality and/or range of educational provision for children with special educational needs. Local authorities are required to demonstrate:
- a) improved access to education and associated services including the curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment;
  - b) improved access to specialist staff, both education and other professionals, including any external support and/or outreach services;
  - c) improved access to suitable accommodation;
  - d) improved supply of places.
40. The SEN improvement test has been applied to each set of proposals.
41. Alongside due consideration to the SEN improvement test, account must also be taken of the need in South Tyneside to accelerate the pace of change in developing a culture of greater understanding and acceptance of difference among young people.

### **An analysis of the three sets of proposals against the list of underpinning principles**

42. The three tables below detail the proposals and provide an analysis of the implications of each.
43. Notes taken at public consultation events and representations received by officers via letter, e-mail, telephone or other medium are included in this Report as appendices as listed. A summary of these representations is included as Appendix J.

**First round of consultation (26 June – 31 October 2008)**

***Close Bamburgh Special School and establish a new 120 place Generic Primary Special School linked to a mainstream primary school fully operating as a primary provision by 2012 at the earliest. This would enable us to benefit from new, purpose-built accommodation already attached to a new, Disability Discrimination Act compliant mainstream primary school.***

***Establish a new 135-place Generic Secondary Special School, co-located (but with a physical link) with a mainstream secondary school (Hebburn) by 2012 at the earliest.***

***The above proposals to create two generic special schools will require the LA to cease to maintain: Oakleigh Gardens School, Greenfields School, Margaret Sutton School, Epiny Business and Enterprise School, and Bamburgh School.***

<p><b>Rationale for the proposals</b></p>
<p><b><i>Educational</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The creation of separate primary and secondary provisions will allow for specialist staff and facilities to be used optimally.</li> <li>○ The bringing together of year groups within one facility will allow for more viable, age-appropriate teaching groups. This in turn will mean that the National Curriculum can be taught and that a broader and more balanced curriculum can be offered to all children.</li> <li>○ The need for a transition from primary to secondary school enables children to benefit from experiencing the same transition as mainstream peers, contributing positively to their personal development.</li> <li>○ Both facilities would be used as resource bases for outreach staff and expertise to support children with SEN and the staff who teach them in mainstream schools (one primary team, one secondary team).</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Inclusive</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Co-locating a specialist primary SEN facility with a mainstream primary school and a specialist secondary SEN facility close to a mainstream secondary school maximises curricular inclusion opportunities for those children for whom it is deemed appropriate and social inclusion opportunities for all. It allows for transformational change to South Tyneside’s approach to education for children for whom specialist provision is required.</li> <li>○ The bringing together of year groups within one facility will allow more children with SEN to be educated alongside children of their own age.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Compliance with the SEN Improvement Test</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The generic primary and secondary schools will improve access to a more appropriate curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment (see above);</li> <li>○ The generic schools will improve access to specialist staff as resources will be targeted in a more appropriate and cost-effective way (see above);</li> <li>○ The generic schools will improve access to suitable accommodation by providing purpose-built, DDA compliant schools;</li> <li>○ The generic schools will be of the correct size, thus maximising the use of revenue resources.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Feasibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The creation of a generic SEN primary school in the Bamburgh building is feasible, affordable and sustainable with only limited adaptation work possibly required for children with PMLD.</li> <li>○ The creation of a generic SEN secondary school in a new-build co-located with Hebburn Comprehensive School is possible (however, there are significant feasibility issues). A feasibility study completed in October 2009 indicates that the site of the existing Bedewell Primary School is a preferable option overall.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strength of representation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There was support for these proposals from some professionals in schools on the grounds that a primary to secondary transition would be beneficial to children, some of whom may otherwise be in just one institution for 17 years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Issues raised in respect of these proposals</b></p>
<p><b>Educational</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was felt by some respondents that the scope of a generic school for children with SEN is too wide and that the schools would not be sufficiently specialist.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There were no significant issues raised with regard to the inclusiveness of these proposals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Compliance with the SEN Improvement Test</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are no issues to raise as these proposals meet the SEN improvement test in all respects.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Feasibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The choice of the Hebburn Comprehensive School site for the generic secondary special school has been found to be possible, but in all likelihood infeasible due to the loss of open recreational space required to accommodate the necessary size of school.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strength of representation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There was some representation from educational professionals against these proposals as staff and governors in some of the existing special schools felt that generic schools could not specialise sufficiently to deal with the full range of SEN.</li> <li>○ There was significant representation from parents and members of the public against these proposals. This centred mainly around the siting of a school next to a mainstream secondary school where parents felt that children with SEN could be subject to bullying. It was also felt by some parents that to change schools at age 11 would be too disruptive as some children with SEN require the stability of familiar staff throughout their school career.</li> </ul>

## Second round of consultation (9 March to 1 May 2009)

***Establish by 2012 at the earliest a new 130-place all-age (2-19) community special school catering for children with a range of needs and in particular those with Severe, Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (SLD and PMLD) on the current Bamburgh School site.***

***Establish by 2012 at the earliest a new building for Epinay School as a 150-place community special school for pupils aged 5-16, catering for a range of needs including Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) and other needs (for example: vulnerable children and those with physical or medical needs for whom a special school placement is judged necessary), at a suitable location to be identified through consultation.***

***Cease to maintain Margaret Sutton School, Oakleigh Gardens School, Greenfields School, and Bamburgh School.***

<b>Rationale for the proposals</b>
<p><b><i>Educational</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The retention of Epinay School will ensure that the Borough continues to benefit from a school deemed by Ofsted to have an outstanding curriculum and outstanding leadership, and the expertise of a High Performing Specialist School.</li> <li>○ The retention of Epinay School will ensure that the Borough continues to benefit from Epinay's current specialisms in Business &amp; Enterprise, Cognition &amp; Learning and School of Creativity.</li> <li>○ The creation of one new school for children with PMLD/SLD and the expansion of the remit of Epinay School to cater for children with MLD and physical and medical difficulties will concentrate expertise and resources on specific types of special educational need.</li> <li>○ The bringing together of year groups within one facility will allow for more viable, age-appropriate teaching groups. This in turn will mean that the National Curriculum can be taught and that a broader and more balanced curriculum can be offered to all children.</li> <li>○ Either or both schools could be used as resource bases for outreach staff and expertise to support children with SEN and the staff who teach them in mainstream schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Inclusive</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The location of the school for children with PMLD/SLD in the current Bamburgh School building will enable effective primary inclusion for these children. (Secondary inclusion would be logistically more difficult).</li> <li>○ The location of the new-build for Epinay School will allow for effective primary and secondary inclusion if the new building is located on either the Hebburn Comprehensive School site or the Bedewell School site. Curricular inclusion is particularly relevant for many of the pupils with this range of needs as a significant proportion of them would benefit from access to mainstream lessons.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Compliance with the SEN improvement test</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to a more appropriate curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment (see above);</li> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to specialist staff as resources will be targeted in a more appropriate and cost-effective way (see above);</li> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to suitable accommodation by providing</li> </ul>

<p>purpose-built, DDA compliant schools, although some adaptations may be required to the Bamburgh School building to accommodate pupils with PMLD/SLD;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The schools proposed will be of the correct size, thus maximising the use of revenue resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Feasibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The creation of a school for children with PMLD/SLD in the Bamburgh building is feasible, affordable and sustainable, although there will be some adaptation work required for children with PMLD.</li> <li>○ The creation of a new school for an expanded Epinay is feasible, affordable and sustainable on the Bedewell School site. It is affordable and sustainable on the Hebburn Comprehensive School site, but there are significant feasibility issues to do with the loss of open recreational (green) space.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strength of representation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is strong support for these proposals from the staff, governors and parents of Epinay School.</li> <li>○ There is also strong support for these proposals from a range of other educational professionals and partners of Epinay School.</li> <li>○ These proposals align closely with the recommendations of the Select Committee Scrutiny Commission report dated 18 February 2009.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Issues raised in respect of these proposals</b></p>
<p><b>Educational</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was felt by some respondents that the range of special educational needs to be catered for within an expanded Epinay School is too wide.</li> <li>○ It was felt by some respondents that the existing Bamburgh School building was created for children with medical and physical difficulties and that it would not adapt well to cater for children with PMLD/SLD.</li> <li>○ All-age schools offer no transition at age 11. This means that some children may be in the same school for as many as 17 years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion opportunities for secondary-age children with PMLD/SLD will be limited by a co-location with a primary school. The nearest secondary school, Harton Technology College is 1.13miles miles away by road.</li> <li>○ If the school for children with MLD and physical and medical difficulties were to be sited on the Luke's Lane site, opportunities for inclusion will be significantly limited. The nearest primary school, Bede Burn Primary, is 1.05 miles away by road and the nearest secondary school, Hebburn Comprehensive, will be 1.16 miles away by road. These are the children who would benefit most from inclusion opportunities in mainstream lessons or activities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Compliance with the SEN improvement test</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are no significant issues to raise as these proposals meet the SEN improvement test in all respects (although the choice of site for the school for pupils with MLD and physical/medical difficulties could limit the benefits in some cases – see above)</li> </ul>

**Feasibility**

- The site at Luke's Lane is not feasible as it is too small to provide the correct amount of outside play area for a school of this size. This site should be discounted.
- There are some feasibility issues with the Hebburn Comprehensive School site, as to build a school of this size would require the use of a significant amount of "recreational open space". This would have to be repaid within the site if possible or on an alternative site. This is likely to both attract opposition from Sport England and render the proposal infeasible.

**Strength of representation**

- There is significant opposition to these proposals from staff, governors, parents and action groups. Schools catering for children with MLD (other than Epinay) are opposed to the retention of Epinay on the grounds of equity in relation to staff. One school catering for children with PMLD/SLD is opposed to the creation of an all-age school, preferring separate age phases. Some parents of children at Sea View Primary were initially concerned about the co-location of the school for children with PMLD/SLD with their school on the grounds that these children may pose a safeguarding threat to their own children. Parents of children at Bamburgh School are opposed to their children moving sites on the grounds that theirs is a purpose-built school which has only been open since 2006. There is opposition from some parents of children with MLD to a school being sited alongside a mainstream secondary school on the grounds that their children could be subject to bullying.
- There is also significant opposition to these proposals from residents in Cleadon and Jarrow who are concerned that vacated school sites could be used for housing.

**Third round of consultation (6 July to 9 October 2009)**

***Build a new special school with 130 places to cater for children aged 2-19 with Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties and Severe Learning Difficulties (PMLD/SLD). This school would replace Oakleigh Gardens School and Greenfields School, which would close. A feasibility study to be carried out on the following site options: Oakleigh Gardens School, Luke's Lane Primary School, Bedewell Primary School, Hebburn Comprehensive School.***

***Create a new special school with 150 places to cater for children aged 3-16 with a range of Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (to include children with complex needs and medical or physical difficulties). This school would replace Bamburgh School, Margaret Sutton School, and Epinay School, which would close. The new school would be housed in the current Bamburgh School building. The Business and Enterprise Centre on the current Epinay School site would remain open as an annex to this new school.***

**Rationale for the proposals**

***Educational***

- The creation of one new school for children with PMLD/SLD and the creation of one new school to cater for children with a range of learning difficulties and disabilities including those with complex needs and those with and physical and medical difficulties will concentrate expertise and resources on specific types of special educational need.
- The bringing together of year groups within one facility will allow for more viable, age-appropriate teaching groups. This in turn will mean that the National Curriculum can

<p>be taught and that a broader and more balanced curriculum can be offered to all children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The retention of the Business &amp; Enterprise Centre on the current Epinau School site will allow for the continuation of a range of vocational courses for children for whom this is deemed appropriate.</li> <li>○ If Epinau School were to close, it is possible for its specialisms in Business &amp; Enterprise, Cognition and Learning and School of Creativity to be transferred to the new school.</li> <li>○ Either or both schools could be used as resource bases for outreach staff and expertise to support children with SEN and the staff who teach them in mainstream schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Inclusive</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The location of the school for children with a range of learning difficulties and disabilities in the current Bamburgh School building will enable effective primary inclusion for these children. (Secondary inclusion would be logistically more difficult).</li> <li>○ The location of the new school for children with PMLD/SLD will allow for effective primary and secondary inclusion if the new building is located on the Hebburn Comprehensive School site or satisfactory inclusion if the building is located on the Bedewell School site.</li> <li>○ The location of the new school for children with PMLD/SLD will allow for very effective inclusion for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage if the new building is located on the Bedewell School site, as this is co-located with the South Tyneside Early Excellence Centre.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Compliance with the SEN improvement test</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to a more appropriate curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment (see above);</li> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to specialist staff as resources will be targeted in a more appropriate and cost-effective way (see above);</li> <li>○ These proposals will improve access to suitable accommodation by providing purpose-built, DDA compliant schools;</li> <li>○ The schools proposed will be of the correct size, thus maximising the use of revenue resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Feasibility</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The creation of a school for children with a range of learning difficulties and disabilities (including medical and physical difficulties) in the Bamburgh building is feasible, affordable and sustainable.</li> <li>○ The creation of a new school for children with PMLD/SLD is feasible, affordable and sustainable on the Bedewell School site and on the Oakleigh Gardens School site. It is affordable and sustainable on the Hebburn Comprehensive School site, but there are significant feasibility issues to do with the loss of open recreational (green) space.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Strength of representation</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff and Governor opinion over the school for children with PMLD/SLD shows an acceptance of the value of bringing the two existing schools together and providing them with a new-build.</li> <li>○ There is considerable support from parents and the public for the proposal to bring together the two existing schools for children with PMLD/SLD, with differences of opinion being expressed over the preferred site. Most support has been expressed for</li> </ul>

<p>the Oakleigh Gardens School site, followed by the Bedewell School site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strong representation has been made by the parent body, staff and governors of Greenfields School for the new school for children with PMLD/SLD to be sited in Hebburn, close to local amenities and good transport links.</li> <li>○ There is strong support from the residents of Cleadon for the siting of the new school for children with PMLD/SLD on the current Oakleigh Gardens School site.</li> <li>○ There has been support from the parent bodies of Bamburgh School and Margaret Sutton School to bring the three schools currently serving children with moderate learning difficulties and with physical and medical difficulties together as one school in the Bamburgh School building.</li> <li>○ Overall there is support for this from the staff and governors of Margaret Sutton School.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Issues raised in respect of these proposals</b></p>
<p><b><i>Educational</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The closure of Epinay School would entail the loss to the Borough of a school judged by Ofsted to have an outstanding curriculum and outstanding leadership and loss of its high performing specialist status.</li> <li>○ Staff, governors and parents of Epinay School, and the residents of Jarrow who made representation, question the feasibility of retaining Epinay's Business &amp; Enterprise Centre in Jarrow, as an annexe to the new school, if the majority of pupils were to transfer to a new school in South Shields.</li> <li>○ All-age schools offer no transition at age 11. This means that some children may be in the same school for as many as 17 years.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Inclusive</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion opportunities for secondary-age children with a range of learning difficulties and disabilities (including medical and physical difficulties) will be limited by a co-location with a primary school. The nearest secondary school is Harton Technology College. Many of these children are in the average to high ability range and would benefit from some inclusion in mainstream lessons or activities. The large majority of the pupil population in this school would be of secondary age.</li> <li>○ Inclusion opportunities for children with PMLD/SLD could be limited if the new-build school were to be located on either the Oakleigh Gardens or the Luke's Lane sites due to their relative isolation. Transport would always be required to facilitate inclusion from these sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Compliance with the SEN improvement test</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are no significant issues to raise as these proposals meet the SEN improvement test in all respects (although the choice of site for the school for pupils with PMLD/SLD and for secondary-age children in the school for those with a range of SEN could limit the benefits in some cases – see above)</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Feasibility</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The site at Luke's Lane is not feasible as it is too small to provide the correct amount of outside play area for a school of this size. This site should be discounted.</li> <li>○ There are significant feasibility issues with the Hebburn Comprehensive School site, as to build a school of this size would require the use of a significant amount of "recreational open space". This would have to be repaid within the site if possible or on an alternative site. This is likely to both attract opposition from Sport England and render the proposal unaffordable.</li> </ul>

### **Strength of representation**

- The parent body of Epinay School is very much opposed to the proposal affecting their school, preferring to see the school retained (unchanged) either on its current site or on the Hebburn Comprehensive School site.
- There is strong opposition from the staff and governors of Epinay School to the proposal which affects their school. They cite the loss of high performing specialist school status and the possible loss of specialisms as being significant arguments against this proposal. Epinay staff and governors strongly support the second set of proposals which would retain Epinay.
- Support for the retention of Epinay has also been expressed by the Head Teacher of Hebburn Comprehensive School who, jointly with the Head Teacher of Epinay, has submitted a document setting out how positively the second set of proposals supports inclusion.
- There is strong opposition to the proposal to close Epinay School from the residents of Jarrow. Many feel that the school should remain where it is as it is a successful school. Others do not wish to see the school close as they mistakenly believe that houses could be built upon the land.
- Opinion from the staff of Bamburgh School is that the specialist provision currently on offer at their school should not be diluted by the inclusion of pupils with other needs and that Bamburgh should remain as it is.

### **The feasibility study**

44. In October 2009 a feasibility study on the four possible sites for a new-build school for pupils with SEN was carried out by South Tyneside's Local Educational Partnership (LEP) *inspiredspaces* STaG Ltd.

45. The four sites were:

- The current Oakleigh Gardens School site
- The current Luke's Lane Primary School site
- The current Bedewell Primary School site
- A site to the south west of Hebburn Comprehensive School, within the school's current boundary, alongside the Clegwell Community Association.

46. The Local Authority asked that the study investigate the feasibility of each site in terms of:

- whether it is large enough to accommodate a school for 130 pupils with PMLD/SLD (the largest building required by any of the three sets of proposals);
- whether there is sufficient access to the site, both for construction traffic and for a permanent access, taking into account other buildings on or near the site;
- whether there are any features of the site which would preclude the cost-effective building of a new school (eg steeply sloping ground).

47. The feasibility study concluded the following on the four sites:

- The **Bedewell Primary School** site is the **preferred option** as it is easily large enough. Access to the new school, however, would preferably be off Victoria Road East and the demolition of the existing Bedewell School to leave the Early Excellence Centre could be costly and problematic.
- The **Oakleigh Gardens School** site is **second choice option**. There are two identified sites within the grounds which could accommodate the school and access would not be a problem. The land around the school, however, is green belt which could give rise to difficulties obtaining planning permission.
- The site to the south west of **Hebburn Comprehensive School** is the **least preferred** of the possible options. Siting the school next to the Clegwell Community Association is not possible due to the size of the available land. Another site has been identified, which could still be accessed off Mountbatten Avenue, but this would entail the loss of playing field which would attract objection from Sport England. The repayment of this land would be costly, and may not be feasible.
- The **Luke's Lane** site is too small to accommodate a school of this size plus the associated outdoor play areas and playing fields. **For this reason, this site should be discounted.**

### **Conclusions drawn from these analyses**

#### **First set of proposals (26 June – 31 October 2008)**

48. These proposals offer the best outcomes for children and young people when measured against the principles underpinning the review of provision for children with special educational needs (paragraph 8)
49. They meet all of the underlying principles plus the four outcomes of the SEN Improvement Test (paragraph 39).
50. They are feasible, viable and affordable (with a change of site for the generic secondary special school).
51. These proposals meet optimally the principles of inclusion as they offer primary special education co-located with a mainstream primary school and secondary special education close to a mainstream secondary school.
52. Whilst professional, educational opinion was broadly supportive of the proposals, the strength of public representation against them resulted in Cabinet requesting a further round of consultation on alternative proposals.

### **Second set of proposals (9 March – 1 May 2009)**

53. These proposals offer good outcomes for children and young people when measured against the principles underpinning the review of provision for children with SEN.
54. They are feasible, viable and affordable if the new-build for Epinay is sited on the Bedewell School site.
55. They meet less well than the first proposals the principles of inclusion for children with SEN, particularly in the secondary and post-16 sectors.
56. During the second round of consultation, representation demonstrated clear divides in professional and public opinion in relation to these proposals.
57. The retention of Epinay School with its high performing specialist school status and specialisms in Business & Enterprise, Cognition & Learning and School of Creativity is a significant factor which requires consideration. Implementation of the First and Third sets of proposals would entail the loss of Epinay and, although it is technically possible to transfer its specialisms to a new school, its high performing status would be lost.
58. Parental representation was very much against the location of a special school for children with Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties and Severe Learning Difficulties (PMLD/SLD) on a site linked to a primary school. Professional opinion on this is that the PMLD/SLD schools are currently all-age (2-19) and do not experience safeguarding problems of the type feared by the parents of the children in the mainstream primary school, so this should not be a concern.
59. These proposals align very closely with those contained in the Report presented to Cabinet on 18 February 2009 by the Select Committee Scrutiny Commission. This was a cross-party Report which resulted from substantial consultation with stakeholders and educational experts.

### **Third set of proposals (6 July – 9 October 2009)**

60. These proposals offer more limited outcomes for children and young people when measured against the principles underpinning the review of provision for children with SEN.
61. They are feasible, viable and affordable if the new school for children with PMLD/SLD is sited either on the Bedewell School site or the Oakleigh Gardens School site.
62. These proposals offer the greatest challenge to implementing the principles of inclusion, particularly for those secondary-age children

with more moderate learning difficulties and those with physical and medical needs who would benefit most from supported inclusion into a mainstream school. With effective leadership, they have the potential to build satisfactory inclusion opportunities with other local schools.

63. The nearest secondary school to Bamburgh School is Harton Technology College. This means that inclusion for secondary-age children with physical/medical and other learning difficulties into the mainstream curriculum is feasible, but some travelling will be necessary.
64. Inclusion opportunities for children with PMLD/SLD will be dependent upon the choice of site for the new school. All sites with the exception of the Hebburn Comprehensive School site would require the use of transport to facilitate inclusion for the majority of children.
65. The choice of the Bedewell site would facilitate inclusion for children with PMLD/SLD in the Early Years Foundation Stage, as it is co-located with South Tyneside's Early Excellence Centre.
66. During the third round of consultation there has again been a divide in professional and public opinion.
67. There has been considerable support from parents and the public for the proposal to bring together the two existing schools for children with PMLD/SLD, with differences of opinion being expressed over the preferred site. Most support has been expressed for the Oakleigh Gardens School site, followed by the Bedewell School site. The feasibility study ranks the Bedewell School site above the Oakleigh Gardens School site, but determines that both are feasible.
68. Staff and Governor opinion over the school for children with PMLD/SLD has shown an acceptance of the value of bringing the two existing schools together and providing them with a new-build. The same differences of opinion were expressed over the choice of site. Some support has been expressed for phase-appropriate provisions to reflect a primary/secondary/post-16 identity. This is a design issue to be addressed at a later date. There are no current indications that this would not be possible.
69. There has been support from the parent bodies of Bamburgh School and Margaret Sutton School to bring the three schools currently serving children with moderate learning difficulties and with physical and medical difficulties together as one school in the Bamburgh School building. The parent body of Epinay School is very much opposed to this proposal, preferring to see the school retained either on its current site or on the Hebburn Comprehensive School site.
70. Staff and Governor opinion on the proposal to bring the three schools together is strongly divided. Overall there is support from Margaret

Sutton School, some opposition from Bamburgh School and strong opposition from Epinay School. Opinion from the Bamburgh staff is that the specialist provision currently on offer in their school should not be diluted by the inclusion of pupils with other needs and that Bamburgh should remain as it is. Opinion from staff and governors at Epinay cites the loss of high performing specialist school status and the possible loss of specialisms as being significant arguments against this proposal. Epinay staff and Governors strongly support the second set of proposals which would retain Epinay.

### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

71. The aim of all three sets of proposals is to address the inclusion agenda through a reduction in segregated provision and an opportunity to commission services from schools and partners through the development of Service Level Agreements. This will enable us to meet individual needs more effectively through a focused approach that allows pupils, where appropriate, to access their local mainstream school with support.
72. In addition, the aim of these proposals is to develop excellent specialist provision for those children and young people who require different and more intensive support.
73. Inclusion is not a cost saving option and in many cases requires additional investment in order to deliver better outcomes for pupils. Whilst it is the case that these proposals should deliver best value in the longer term, they are not driven by a desire to save money.
74. Any reserves and deficits at the time of a school closure would revert to the Council. Any reserves could be redirected into supporting inclusion in mainstream and the development of new specialist accommodation. Reserves could also cover the cost of redundancy, removal costs and project management costs.
75. Any vacated school sites would be managed as part of the property strategy. The property strategy has not been considered in development of these proposals nor in the analysis of options.
76. The proposals will require significant capital investment. This will be funded through the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme which has an allocation within it sufficient to build two new specialist provisions. One of these is designated as a new school for the Galsworthy Centre School, co-located with a new provision for the secondary phase of the Alternative Education Service.
77. Value for Money appraisals will need to be carried out as each scheme enters the design development stage

## Legal Implications

78. School reorganisation is subject to statutory regulation. The consultation periods 2 June to 31 October 2008, 9 March to 1 May 2009 and 6 July to 9 October 2009 were in addition to, and preliminary to, the legally required process of statutory consultation which would follow any decision by Cabinet to proceed to implement any proposal.
79. The Council must ensure that proper consultation protocols are and have been observed and must comply with the statutory guidance, and have regard to the non-statutory guidance, published by the DCSF on the process for ceasing to maintain school, establishing new schools and making alterations to existing mainstream and special schools. The Council must allow adequate time and provide sufficient information for those being consulted to form a considered view on the proposals.
80. Any proposed new buildings and extensions or changes to use of existing buildings will be subject to planning permission. Further details on these aspects will emerge during formal statutory consultations.

## Risk Implications

81. The key risks associated with **not** proceeding with any modernisation and/or restructuring of the provision for SEN in South Tyneside are:
- failure to address, or to address only partially, the over-provision of places for pupils with SEN will mean that further reviews will become necessary in the future, prolonging uncertainty for pupils, parents and staff;
  - the numbers of pupils in segregated provision will continue to be high and will continue to attract adverse comment, and possibly action, from outside inspectorates;
  - pupils who could attend mainstream schools with appropriate support will miss the opportunity to attend their local school with their peers;
  - children in mainstream schools will continue to have limited contact with, and understanding of, children with difficulties and disabilities;
  - the opportunity to ensure a more rational distribution of resources to specialist and mainstream settings will be missed;
  - continuing falling numbers in some special schools, most notably in Bamburgh School and Margaret Sutton School, will result in these schools becoming financially unsustainable;
  - failure to maximise the investment potential of BSF and the Primary Capital Programme would not provide Best Value;
  - the length of time taken to reach decisions could have an adverse impact on staff retention and recruitment throughout the process;

- failure to redistribute effectively any savings generated could lead to a reduction in the Council's capacity to deliver Best Value;
- uncertainty and low morale throughout the process could have an adverse impact upon standards;
- the reputational risk to the Council is high in that national bodies have identified South Tyneside as being too slow to address the inclusion agenda and as having too many pupils educated in special schools.

82. The key risks associated with proceeding with any modernisation and/or restructuring are:

- a perceived lack of consultation may lead to challenge;
- reorganisation may lead to future appeals by parents to the SEN tribunal;
- the process could result in public controversy;
- a decision which is not based upon sound evidence could give rise to Judicial Review;
- the competition rules relating to the opening of new schools might impact upon the ethos of any new schools;
- there is a need for investment in a targeted programme of workforce development. Improperly targeted, this could lead to an insufficient range of skills in schools;
- pupil movement between schools may be prompted by the process and proposals;
- there is a need to invest in Council resources and personnel to meet the demanding schedule of reorganisation;
- potentially there may be redundancy costs which the Council does not have the resource to meet;
- there may be challenge to planning applications by Sport England re their requirement to retain designated playing fields.

83. The key risks associated with proceeding with the First Proposals are:

- there may be public controversy generated by proceeding with these proposals as public opinion against them has already been expressed;
- there may be challenges raised at the point of statutory consultation to close the five existing special schools and open two new ones.

84. The key risks associated with proceeding with the Second Proposals are:

- there may be public controversy generated by proceeding with these proposals as public opinion against them has already been expressed;
- there may be challenges raised at the point of statutory consultation to close four of the five existing special schools and open one new one;
- there may be challenge from professional associations if one school is retained whilst others are closed;
- there may be continued criticism from outside inspectorates as inclusion opportunities will still be limited for some pupils, particularly in the secondary SEN sector.

85. The key risks associated with proceeding with the Third Proposals are:

- there may be challenges raised at the point of statutory consultation to close the five existing special schools and open two new ones;
- there may be continued criticism from outside inspectorates as inclusion opportunities will still be limited for some pupils, particularly in the secondary LDD sector and for children with PMLD/SLD;
- the retention of the Business & Enterprise annexe in Jarrow may mean that this facility is underused, and does not offer good value for money, due to the distance from its parent school in South Shields

86. These risks are contained within the School Reorganisation Project Risk Register and are regularly monitored and acted upon where necessary.

### **Equality and Diversity Implications**

87. In the interest of equality and diversity, the Council recognises that, as part of the competition process, there may be external parties who are interested in the provision of special school education and who would want to contribute towards a greater diversity of educational providers within the borough.

88. In order to reflect the diversity of groups with an interest in the two periods of consultation, we have involved children and young people who have a range of SEN or disability in addition to stakeholders and other interested parties.

89. It is our intention to continue to involve children and young people who have a range of SEN or disability in addition to stakeholders and other interested parties should any of the proposals proceed to the next stage of representation.

90. The SEN improvement test has been applied to all proposals put forward by officers and other interested parties.
91. It is a statutory requirement under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 that both the Council and schools have policies and procedures in place to meet the requirements of the Disability Equality Duty. To meet these requirements, an Equality Check will be applied to any proposals which are agreed by Cabinet. Equality checks cover all six strands of equality (age, race, disability, gender, sexual orientation and faith). The most relevant to these proposals to children with special educational needs will be disability. However, all areas will be covered.

### **Environmental and Sustainability Implications**

92. A number of the proposals put forward would result in a reduction in the number of school buildings, which would have a positive environmental impact. In addition, new buildings will be more energy efficient – aiming for BREEAM excellent ratings. The design process will take into consideration the local context and any environmental issues identified by professionals or the local community.
93. There will be a need to review potential transport implications to new provisions/sites. In addition, safe routes to schools from a road-safety aspect, and as an aspect of promoting healthy lifestyles through walking/cycling, will be considered as part of the design-phase for any new provision.
94. The proposed changes would contribute to sustainability in a number of ways:
- reducing the overall energy usage of our school portfolio and hence a reduction in carbon emissions;
  - new buildings will incorporate modern and sustainable design features including energy-saving and renewable technologies (solar panels, wind turbines etc);
  - reducing the overall water consumption of our school portfolio;
  - reducing the number of journeys by delivery vehicles.
95. There is a commitment to school travel plans which will seek to address school-run issues.

### **Options to be considered by Cabinet**

96. Cabinet can decide to proceed with the **first set of proposals** (details in paragraph 10), taking into account and accepting the merits and issues raised in respect of these proposals (tables on pages 9-10 and paragraphs 48-52). A site other than the Hebburn Comprehensive School site would have to be considered, taking into account the

conclusions of the feasibility study. The preferred option would be the Bedewell Primary School site.

97. Cabinet can decide to proceed with the **second set of proposals** (details in paragraph 11), taking into account and accepting the merits and issues raised in respect of these proposals (tables on pages 11-13 and paragraphs 53-59). In this case, the recommended site for the new-build for Epinay School would be the Bedewell Primary School site.

98. Cabinet can decide to proceed with the **third set of proposals** (details in paragraph 12), taking into account and accepting the merits and issues raised in respect of these proposals (tables on pages 13-16 and paragraphs 60-70). In this case, the recommended site for the new school for children with PMLD/SLD would be the Bedewell School site, with the Oakleigh Gardens School site as second preference.

### **Recommendations**

99. It is recommended that Cabinet consider at length the merits and issues of all three sets of proposals taking into account the underpinning principles of the need to review SEN provision, professional opinion, and parental and other parties' representations.

100. It is recommended that Cabinet reach a decision as to which set of proposals should be pursued by the Council in order to modernise special school provision within the borough.

### **Reasons for Recommendations**

101. The Council must modernise and/or reorganise its special schools to ensure that future provision makes optimum use of resources whilst providing high quality specialist facilities for children with special educational needs.

102. The key risks associated with not proceeding with the modernisation and/or restructuring of special school provision are detailed in paragraph 81 of this report.

---

## Title of Report

---

**The following is a list of the background papers (excluding exempt papers) relied upon in the preparation of the above report:**

<b>Background Paper</b>	<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>File Location</b>
Review of Special Educational Needs Provision Cabinet report – 21 May 2008		Intranet
Review of Special Educational Needs Provision Cabinet report – 4 March 2009		Intranet
Review of Special Educational Needs Provision (second consultation) Cabinet report – 24 June 2009		Intranet
Select Committee Scrutiny Commission Report to Cabinet - 18 February 2009		Intranet
Feasibility study on four possible site locations for a new school for children with SEN.		CYP

---

Contact Officer:

---

## APPENDICES

1. **Appendix A1** - Notes of a meeting held with parents at Bamburgh School
2. **Appendix A2** - Notes of a meeting held with staff and governors at Bamburgh School
3. **Appendix B** – Notes of a meeting held with staff, governors and parents at Bedewell Early Years Excellence Centre
4. **Appendix C1** – Notes of a meeting held with parents at Epinay Business and Enterprise School
5. **Appendix C2** – Notes of a meeting held with staff and governors of Epinay Business and Enterprise School
6. **Appendix D1** – Notes of a meeting held with parents at Greenfields School
7. **Appendix D2** – Notes of a meeting held with staff and governors at Greenfields School
8. **Appendix E1** – Notes of a meeting held with parents at Margaret Sutton School
9. **Appendix E2** – Notes of a meeting held with staff and governors of Margaret Sutton School
10. **Appendix F1** – Notes of a meeting held with parents at Oakleigh Gardens School
11. **Appendix F2** – Notes of a meeting held with staff and governors at Oakleigh Gardens School
12. **Appendix G** – Notes of a meeting held with staff, governors and parents of Sea View Primary School
13. **Appendix H** - Notes of a meeting with adults with severe learning difficulties (SLD) supported by Chesshire-Hope (Cookson House), South Shields
14. **Appendix J** – Summary of representations received during consultation period

## APPENDIX A1

### **Notes taken at a meeting for PARENTS of BAMBURGH SCHOOL held on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September at 6 pm**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to  
October 2009

Meeting PARENTS OF BAMBURGH SCHOOL

Date: Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: BAMBURGH SCHOOL

Start Time: 6.00 p.m. Finish Time: 7.00 p.m.

Chair: Stephen Inglis

Presenters: Peter Cutts, Karen Pemberton and Maurice Walsh

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 18 parents/carers  
9 children  
1 Press Officer

Ref. No.	P(arent) or S(taff) or G(overnor) or O(ther)	Point Made
1	Parent/Carer	The current numbers of pupils in the schools adds up to 454 but there is a reduction in the number of places proposed for the new schools, why?
	Officer response (if any)	The figure of 454 includes 56 pupils at the Galsworthy School, which is not included in this consultation. In addition there are very large year groups in Years 10 and 11 who will be leaving the schools but much smaller numbers lower down in the schools. The Local Authority has plotted out the numbers of children in the schools to 2012. This year there were 44 children who left the schools and it is predicted that the same number will leave next year. If there was a massive surge in numbers the Local Authority would have to re-plan but there will be places for all existing pupils in the proposed new special schools.
2	Parent/Carer	A lot of the parents at Bamburgh School are concerned, they understand the other schools are old and new schools are required but Bamburgh was an old school and now they have a new building. The children have a bond with the Sea View pupils and it would be upsetting if the children were uprooted again.

	Response (if any)	The proposal is for all the children at Bamburgh School to remain in the same building and other children would join from other schools.
3	Parent/Carer	Will there be new teachers?
	Response	The officer outlined the process if the proposal went ahead and advised that technically the 3 schools would close and a new governing body would be created. Their first role would be to appoint a head teacher for the new school who would then advise to the governing body about how the school would be staffed. It was reported that the Local Authority has so far had a policy of not making compulsory redundancies and would look for voluntary redundancies if necessary. In addition as the numbers of pupils in the 3 schools reduce by 2012 the number of staff would reduce during this period.
4	Parent/Carer	I am worried about pupils at Epinay School having to travel across the Borough.
	Response	At present there is a number of pupils attending Epinay School who live at this side of the Borough.
5	Parent/Carer	Autistic children do not like change and there may possibly be a new Head Teacher and new teachers, which may disrupt children.
	Response	There would be no change to the building or routine but there would need to be a transition plan put in place. It would be up to the governing body to staff the school but staff would be required with experience of teaching autistic children. There may be no change of staff but if there was it would be essential that these children had a smooth transition and the move was managed so the children were familiar with the members of staff. The Local Authority will be looking carefully at transition.
6	Parent/Carer	Will the national curriculum still be taught and not diluted through mixed classes etc?
	Response	This proposal offers better opportunities in the curriculum, if anything there will be a wider range on offer to pupils.
7	Parent/Carer	Concerns from parents regarding behaviour issues of the pupils from Margaret Sutton and Epinay Schools. Son is 6 years old and is well behaved but easily led. If there are bigger classes what will be in place to ensure this does not happen and will strategies be put in place to help pupils with the merge?
	Response	It will be the new Head Teacher's role to ensure the school is well staffed. It is wrong to think that these 2 schools have a problem with behaviour. The Galsworthy School caters

		<p>for pupils with behavioural issues and has a different curriculum to deal with this.</p> <p>Epinay School was judged as outstanding for pupil behaviour in its last Ofsted inspection.</p> <p>A transition plan will be prepared for the merger and it will be important for the different groups of children to have opportunities to meet before the new school opens.</p> <p>The Local Authority has been through this process several times and has ensured that it works well.</p> <p>The Behaviour Support Service will look at strategies to minimise disruption.</p>
8	Parent/carer	<p>The Local Authority has listened and tried to take on board the parents' comments but they feel the Local Authority is being bullied by government to reduce places in the special schools.</p> <p>Do you know why parents are opting for mainstream education for younger children?</p>
	Response	<p>Parents want to keep their children in mainstream if things are going well and mainstream schools are getting better at adapting the curriculum.</p> <p>In addition there is now additional funding available in mainstream for support.</p> <p>For many years there was a clear difference between the provision that was available for children and young people with special educational needs in mainstream schools and in special schools. More recently there has been a gradual increase in funding and staff expertise within mainstream schools.</p> <p>This has meant a greater proportion of parents are happy for their children to be in a mainstream setting, which has led to a reduction of pupils in special schools.</p>
9	Parent/carer	<p>Problems in mainstream schools for children with special needs seem to start at a certain age and they tend to be moved into special schools later in their school career.</p>
	Response	<p>The officer indicated that you do tend to get a number of children of secondary age requiring places in a special school but this is led mainly by parents looking to find the most appropriate setting for their child.</p>
10	Parent/carer	<p>Parent stated that his daughter came into the school in Year 7 having been accepted at her previous primary school but he felt she would not have coped in a mainstream secondary setting. Children of a certain age can be quite cruel.</p>
	Response	
11	Parent/carer	<p>Will there be a swimming pool built at the new South Shields Community School for use by this school for inclusion?</p>

	Response	There would not be a swimming pool, as the pool would remain at Brinkburn Community Association.
12	Parent/carer	Can a bigger pool be put on the Oakleigh Gardens site?
	Response	The Local Authority is looking at pool provision borough-wide and there are plans in place to have new pools with hydraulic floors etc. These will serve the needs of both primary and secondary pupils as well as the community.
13	Parent/carer	Is the money ring-fenced for this project?
	Response	Yes the money is there through Building Schools for the Future.
14	Parent/carer	Will there be a nurse in school the whole time that pupils are in school?
	Response	The governing body would make the decisions regarding the staffing in the new school but can see no reason why there would not be a nurse, if schools already employ one.

## APPENDIX 'A2'

### **Notes taken at meeting for staff and governors of BAMBURGH SCHOOL held on Thurs 10<sup>th</sup> Sept**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation July to October 2009

Meeting for STAFF & GOVERNORS

Date: Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: THE OPEN ZONE

Start Time: 4 p.m. Finish Time: 5 p.m.

Chair: Tony Duggan

Presenters: Karen Pemberton, Maurice Walsh and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 16

Ref. No.	S(taff) or G(overnor)	Point Made
1	S	I wish to make a comment about the excellent GCSE results gained by the pupils at Bamburgh. Some pupils have 10 GCSEs to their credit. Most of our pupils have already tried mainstream schools and have not settled. They come to us and exceed expectations. What provision will be available for bright children who have already failed in mainstream?
	Officer response (if any)	The provision for all abilities of Special Educational Needs is paramount in our planning. If parents chose a special school then they should be offered a place. Inclusion is not one universal model and we have said from the beginning that each child's needs would be looked at individually. If some pupils want to be educated in mainstream schools, with the right level of support and this is what their parents request, then this will be arranged.
2	S	How will you be able to deliver the full curriculum when there are 150 pupils?
	Response (if any)	Between the three schools we can deliver a full range of GCSEs and staff will be deployed accordingly to achieve this.
3	S	Within the population of the new school there will be more pupils with MLD and it may be difficult to aim to achieve the high standards that we do now. In our Year 6 class three pupils have achieved level 4

		in science. If there were more children with MLD in the class, how would we manage to get these results?
	Response	The rationale is to look at the needs of all children and identify the staff to meet the needs of those children, including the high achievers. Pupils in any school with special educational needs will have their needs met.
4	S	The date to implement the proposals is Sept 2012. Is this correct?
	Response	Yes, to allow for a competition to be held to see who will run the new school in the current Bamburgh building. There is a statutory process to go through.
5	S	Is it possible that the new school could be created in the Bamburgh building before 2012 since the building is already there?
	Response	Any adaptation works to the building may also require planning permission and the application for planning permission should be submitted two years prior to the building being delivered. All heads and governors will be involved in the forward planning to minimise disruption for staff and pupils. If the three schools join together, a temporary governing body will be established comprising of representation from the three schools and they will be responsible for appointing a headteacher. The headteacher will set the staffing structure.
6	S	Will there be a higher staff to pupil ratio?
	Response	It depends on how the head sets the staffing structure.
7	S	Can we have separate classes for the high achievers and low achievers?
	Response	The head will use the resources as effectively as possible.
8	S	Will we continue to get additional funding for pupils with medical conditions?
	Response	Of course, the funding stays with the pupils.
9	S	Setting our budget has been very difficult. We cannot lose any more staff and continue to deliver the curriculum that we do now.
	Response	There is a finance meeting arranged to address this.
10	S	There are currently 251 pupils between the three schools and it is proposed to provide a 150 place school in 2012 so in three years 100 pupils will be lost.
	Response	Our pupil projection figures predict this. There are more pupils leaving Special Needs Schools and fewer numbers entering, in addition to which more parents are opting for their children to be educated in mainstream schools with support.
11	S	What about the Business and Enterprise Centre? They offer a work placement facility for pupils. The staff there are qualified to assess NVQ levels.

	Response	The staff at the Enterprise Centre will be included in the whole scheme and also subject to redeployment in the new school.
12	S	If there are 100 pupils to be lost, who decides what pupils will get into the new school?
	Response	We have made it clear that no pupil currently in a special school will be asked to leave.
13	S	I think the numbers at Bamburgh are reducing because the Council are not promoting Bamburgh as a school for pupils. The professionals who issue the statements are not putting Bamburgh forward as an option.
	Response	This is not so. Bamburgh is included in the Information for Parents booklet as a choice of school and also available on the Council's web-site as a choice. We are not withholding information on Bamburgh from anybody.
14	G	What about future pupils with MLD? Will they go to Bamburgh, Margaret Sutton or Epinay? What if they go to Epinay and then have to move to another building at Bamburgh? This will be unsettling to move twice.
	Response	Once proposals have been approved by Cabinet, then we'd work with all schools to see how best we can implement them.
15	S	Some of our pupils are school refusers – they are frightened of their own shadow and may well flounder when all the new pupils join the school.
	Response	As professionals, we will address this and make sure that the other pupils know and understand the needs of the Bamburgh pupils. Similarly, the Bamburgh pupils' awareness of the needs of the Epinay pupils must be raised.
16	S	We have tried joint projects before with the Epinay pupils and our pupils were intimidated by the size of Epinay pupils and they were frightened, particularly because of the way that the Epinay pupils spoke to the staff.
	Response	
17	S	There is a proportion of our pupils who may refuse to attend if they feel intimidated by the other pupils.
	Response	
18	S	Is there a possibility that Bamburgh could remain and that a new school could be built to replace Margaret Sutton and Epinay?
	Response	We are not consulting on having 3 special schools
19	S	Our numbers could increase if our school was promoted more.

	Response	
20	G	What we want is for Bamburgh to remain. However, we know we have an opportunity now. The building will remain and take in two other schools and a lot of pupils from Epinay and Margaret Sutton who could have come to Bamburgh in the first place.
	Response	
21	S	Parents may decide to go through the legal system to ensure that their children receive the correct provision

## APPENDIX 'B'

### **Notes taken at a meeting held for STAFF, GOVERNORS AND PARENTS OF EARLY YEARS EXCELLENCE CENTRE**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS, STAFF AND GOVERNORS OF EARLY YEARS EXCELLENCE CENTRE

Date: Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009

Venue: BEDEWELL

Start Time: 6.15 p.m. Finish Time 7.15 p.m.

Chair: Gary Wallis-Clark

Presenters: Karen Pemberton and Maurice Walsh

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 31

Ref. No.	P(arent) or S(taff) or G(overnor) or O(ther)	Point Made
1	S	There are currently 454 pupils in special schools and the plan is to create two schools with 280 places. This seems like a drastic drop in places.
	Officer response (if any)	Numbers are falling. There are more Year 11's leaving and fewer pupils coming through the system. We have predicted pupil numbers for 2012 and calculate we will only need 280 places. In addition to this many parents are opting for their children with SEN to go to mainstream schools with the relevant level of support. We intend to have a high quality provision offering a choice for parents.
2	S	In total there are 100 pupils between Greenfields and Oakleigh Gardens. The new school is to have 130 places – Is this right?
	Response (if any)	Yes, we have built in additional places to accommodate additional pupils. We acknowledge that due to medical improvements, pupils with PMLD and SLD may increase.
3	S	What is the current capacity at Bamburgh – will the school need extending?
	Response	The school currently has capacity to take 150 pupils however, adaptation works will be carried out if necessary.

4	S	If the Bedewell site was chosen for the new school, whereabouts on the site would the school go?
	Response	The school would be a new build, purpose built for pupils with PMLD/SLD. Bedewell Primary School will close in 2012 to move to a new school on Hebburn Comprehensive site. The Bedewell building would then be empty. We would need to investigate access issues to the site and the problems we might encounter. There are no plans at present. It could be that selective demolition could take place.
5	S	In previous surveys it has been discovered that there are flooding problems with the site. Will this be an issue?
	Response	Feasibility studies are being carried out on the four proposed sites to make sure they are adequate size and that there are no restrictions to allow for a new build school. By the end of October the results of the feasibility studies will be available.
6	S	It is up to the parents to decide whether they want to have their new school on a site so their pupils can be included, or alternatively whether they wish for them to go on a remote site. I acknowledge that there will need to be a compromise and that there will be some people not happy with the end result.
	Response	
7	S	I think the Oakleigh Gardens site is the best site for the new school – plenty of fresh air – no pollution.
	Response	This is noted, however, we need to look at the opportunities for inclusion.
8	S	I think this could be an opportunity for us to develop our service on this site. There would be no inclusion here for special needs pupils up to the age of 19. Could the new school not be built on the Greenfields field?
	Response	The Greenfields field is actually community sport land and if this was used we would need to replace the land for community use. There are also quarries underneath some of the land on the Hebburn Comprehensive site so we would need to look carefully at a location on that site for the new school.
9	S	My concern is that if the new build was to go on this site, what would the impact be on our building, given that we are attached to Bedewell school building. During the process of demolition, pupils will undoubtedly be disrupted.
	Response	Specialists will investigate the technical issues and we will ensure that any building works are safe and secure and that there is minimal disruption for pupils.

10	S	Who will build the new school?
	Response	We need to go through the competition process first to establish who will govern the school. The school will be built by Carillion.
11	S	What will the Early Years Excellence Children's Centre relationship be with the new school if it is on this site? What would the expectations be?
	Response	Once the governing body is established, this would be addressed. However, the EYEC will stand as it is and continue in its current form.
12	S	There could be mine works under the Bedewell site – how will you discover what problems are on this site? Also, what about access from heavy goods vehicles – this could cause health and safety problems for our children/parents.
	Response	A survey will be carried out and any 'abnormals' discovered. Road traffic issues would be investigated and there would be a safe access point for heavy goods vehicles. If the new school were to be built here, there could be a shared main vehicle entrance at one point which could spur off to the individual schools.
13	S	When will a final decision be made on the location of the site for the school?
	Response	A Report will go to the Council's Cabinet in December and a decision will then be made.
14	S	The children with SEN are all in unsuitable accommodation at present, so it seems like they will have to remain there for another three years until the new school is built. Have the Council considered any other proposals?
	Response	Bamburgh building is only three years old. We did initially consult on a proposal to have two generic special schools, one for primary pupils on the Bamburgh site and one for secondary pupils on the Hebburn Comprehensive site. However, parents indicated that they preferred to have separate schools for the pupils with PMLD/SLD and the pupils with MLD.
15	S	We acknowledge that there are a lot of political issues to do with the location of the new school but wonder if any thought has been given to putting the new school on alternative sites to those that you are currently consulting on.
	Response	We are only consulting on the four options referred to at present
16	S	What about the land where the fire station is? What about Chuter Ede site – that building is awful and should be demolished

	Response	The fire station land has access difficulties. Some of the Chuter Ede land is contaminated.
17	S	Is the Oakleigh Gardens site big enough to build the new school on?
	Response	A Plan was shown illustrating the Oakleigh Gardens site and locations on the site for possible building of a new school.
18	S	I think the outdoor areas are very important – and the pupils with SLD need outdoor classrooms/space.
	Response	
19	S	I think it is important that the pupils with SLD have a stronger sense of belonging – they need to experience lifeskills to prepare them for life when they leave school. Whilst I appreciate that some pupils with SEN can go to mainstream schools and receive specialist support, for some they have profound needs and it is paramount that their needs are met in the right setting.
	Response	

## APPENDIX 'C1'

### **Notes taken at a meeting for PARENTS of EPINAY SCHOOL held on Thurs 24<sup>th</sup> September 2009**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS OF EPINAY SCHOOL

Date: 24<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: EPINAY SCHOOL

Start Time: 1.30 p.m. Finish Time 2.30 p.m.

Chair: Mike Conlon

Presenters: Karen Pemberton and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 18

Ref. No.	P(arent)	Point Made
1	P	If the Council intends retaining the Enterprise Centre as an annex to the new school, why not just have the new school here and add on to Epinay's current building?
	Officer response (if any)	This would not be practical. The current parking facilities are not satisfactory and this site is not large enough to accommodate additional building.
2	P	It is a cost savings exercise – just moving our school and Margaret Sutton school into the Bamburgh building. We should have a new building.
	Response	
3	P	Will the new school have the same amount of staff and staff to pupil ratio?
	Response	We are not anticipating changes in the staff : pupil ratio. The new school will be staffed with teachers to meet the individual needs of the pupils.
4	P	Pupils with ADHD (Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder) who are in small classes are not easily distracted, however, when they are in a large sized class there is too much distraction and they can disrupt the whole class.
	Response	The intention is that there will be no detriment to pupils. We would work with staff to ensure that the implementation of changes minimises disruption to pupils
5	P	It is important that pupils socialise with others of their own age.

	Response	The outstanding provisions that we currently have will be built on.
6	P	My child would not return to a mainstream school.
	Response	We made this clear from the onset. Any pupil currently in a special school would not be expected to return to a mainstream school.
7	P	I think this whole process has been really insensitive. Initially the Council said they would keep Epinay open and Bamburgh parents were upset about this. Now the situation has changed, Epinay parents and staff are upset since Bamburgh will remain in their current building. It's like a game of football with the proposals in the Town Hall. Parents are getting fed up of waiting – why not chose a site somewhere in the middle of the Borough for our new school?
	Response	We are not retaining Bamburgh school, just the building. The school would have a new name, head teacher and governing body. The building at Bamburgh was only built in 2006 and as a resource will serve the entire Borough.
8	P	Has any thought been given to having a campus for pupils with SEN - A facility which would offer provision for pupils with PMLD/SLD and MLD all on the one site?
	Response	This comment will be taken back and reported.
9	P	My daughter has been here three weeks. Her improvement has been outstanding. If she can't continue coming here she'll refuse to attend.
	Response	This comment is noted.
10	P	The types of pupils here have very different levels of need. How will these be met in the new school?
	Response	We have experience of generic special schools. They are structured in expertise to meet a variety of needs. Whatever proposals proceed, we will ensure that arrangements are in place to meet individual pupil needs.
11	P	The differing needs of some pupils may encourage distraction in a mainstream class.
	Response	We are not aiming for inclusion at any price. We appreciate that some pupils will never cope in a mainstream school.
12	P	How will the three sets of staff work together?
	Response	A temporary governing body will be established and a headteacher appointed. The staffing structure for the school will then be established. However, there will be only one headteacher's post.
13	P	Will the headteacher's job be ringfenced to the current headteachers.

	Response	No, the headteacher's post will be advertised nationally. Other staffing posts would be ringfenced to staff in similar posts
14	P	Pupils have a lot of trust in their teachers and they have small groups of friends. They find it very difficult to deal with change.
	Response	In order to minimise disruption we would have Individual Action Plans for each child. We do recognise that children with Autism cannot adapt easily to change. We appreciate pupils will need familiar faces and we will organise events to help children adapt to changes easier.
15	P	I have a niece at Margaret Sutton school and she complains of bullying. There is no bullying here.
	Response	
16	P	Is the Bamburgh building big enough, without some of the pupils in the special schools going back to mainstream?
	Response	Pupil prediction figures indicate that by 2012 there will be approximately 150 pupils between the three schools. Whilst we appreciate Epinay pupil numbers have remained static, the numbers at Bamburgh and Margaret Sutton schools have fallen.
17	P	How many pupils can Bamburgh take in now?
	Response	150
18	P	Has the Council thought about any other sites for the new school? What about the Brinkburn school site for example?
	Response	That site is large enough, however, the current buildings would have to be demolished. Time is also of the essence, in addition to which the current Bamburgh building is only 3 years old, we have to use that building.
19	P	Can you not use the Bamburgh building to extend the Sea View Primary School?
	Response	We do not need to extend Sea View Primary School.
20	P	There is no inclusion at the Bamburgh site for secondary pupils, only for primary pupils with the Sea View primary school. At present Epinay have excellent inclusion with Hebburn Comprehensive pupils.
	Response	
21	P	Why not leave Bamburgh School as it is and join us and Margaret Sutton together? The Bamburgh parents don't want our pupils in there – they want their building just for their pupils.
	Response	We are also having a meeting with the parents of Bamburgh pupils to get their views.

22		It's a known fact that people from Jarrow and Shields don't mix.
	Response	
23		There are now 454 pupils between 5 Special Schools – however, this is due to decrease to 280 in 2012 – what about future pupil projections?
	Response	We know from pupil predictions that numbers are decreasing, especially in the early years. We will see an increase in the pupils with severe and profound disability due to improvements in the medical provision. Apart from these facts, we have improved the provision that we have in mainstream schools. The schools are improving their facilities and retaining pupils with SEN within their schools.
24	P	Basically, Bamburgh numbers are falling so we are having to make up their numbers.
	Response	
25	P	Why not move the Margaret Sutton school into Bamburgh and wait until 2012 to see if Epinay can stay as it is then give further thought to merging Epinay into the Bamburgh building in 2012?
	Response	We will take this comment on board.
26	P	I am concerned about the travel to the Bamburgh building. Also, the school is in a deprived area and I would have concerns about my child travelling independently to get there.
27	P	I think the pupil prediction numbers are based on the fact that some of the pupils in Epinay should be in mainstream.
	Response	The type of pupils in Epinay have changed over the last 10 years. We know that the pupils we now have in Epinay would not cope in a mainstream school.
28	P	The Bamburgh building is no good. It is out of the way, there is no scope for inclusion with secondary pupils and the building is adapted for physical handicapped pupils. We should have a new building and the Bamburgh building could be the new school to replace Oakleigh Gardens and Greenfields.
29	P	Our pupils need to go out and learn how to be independent. Some pupils with SLD basically go to school to give their parents a break and they don't have the capabilities that our pupils have.
30	P	What are the plans for the future of the swimming pool at Oakleigh Gardens?

	Response	If the new school went on that site then it would stay as it is. If the new school went on another site then the swimming pool could revert back to Asset Management – it is possible that it would still be used, given that it is in good condition.
31	P	How would the counter-proposal be put forward?
	Response	This will go in the Cabinet Report and Cabinet will decide.
32	P	What about the school standards – Epinay in 2006 was judged by Ofsted as very good, which is better than Bamburgh’s judgement in 2009
33	P	Epinay numbers stay static – why not let it stay – wait and see what the pupil numbers are in 2012 – before you consider moving us onto the Bamburgh building?
34		I am concerned because I live in Hebburn and if the children move to school at Bamburgh, and there is an emergency – it will be difficult for me to travel there

## APPENDIX 'C2'

### **Notes taken at a meeting for staff and gobs of EPINAY SCHOOL held on Thurs 10<sup>th</sup> Sept 2009**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation July to  
October 2009

Meeting for STAFF & GOVERNORS of EPINAY SCHOOL

Date: Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: THE OPEN ZONE

Start Time: 6 p.m. Finish Time: 7 p.m.

Chair: Tony Duggan

Presenters: Karen Pemberton, Peter Cutts, Maurice Walsh and Maggie  
Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 29

Ref. No.	S(taff) or G(overnor)	Point Made
1	S	I think that this set of proposals is based on the biased view of a lot of parents.
	Officer response (if any)	The consultation process was very extensive, taking on board the views of a vast range of parents, including parents of pupils with SEN who are in mainstream schools. There were certain parents who went to all the consultation meetings and expressed their views. The views were basically duplicated and they formed the basis of the notes, which were an appendix to the Cabinet Report in June. The duplication was taken into account when the analysis was done.
2	S	Inclusion is high on the agenda. If the new school is to be based in the Bamburgh building, inclusion is available with primary pupils from Sea View up to the age of 11. Where do the secondary pupils go for inclusion?
	Response (if any)	Harton Technology College is the nearest secondary school and they are pro-active in inclusion. However, this comment is noted that inclusion for the secondary pupils with MLD may be difficult to achieve.
3	S	All the Special Schools have falling numbers. We have 104 pupils and our numbers are not declining. The original proposals retained Epinay because we have brilliant inclusion facilities. Also, if the Business

		<p>and Enterprise Centre is to remain as an annexe to the new school in the Bamburgh building, it will take 20 minutes at least to travel there which is a waste of teaching time.</p> <p>We now have another specialism in Creative Arts.</p>
	Response	
4	Gov	<p>The school's specialist status may be retained but if the team of expertise is not there then the status would not be maintained. I do not think the proposed location at Bamburgh is practical and the specialist status would be lost. South Tyneside is making a huge mistake. It is a waste of money investing in the current Bamburgh building. It is to please the "Friends of Bamburgh" that the new school is proposed to go there.</p> <p>Epina y should be retained on the current site where inclusion already works very well. The pupils with MLD can travel to school independently whereas they won't be able to at the Bamburgh building because it is out on a limb. Their independence would suffer.</p> <p>What are the educational advantages to locating the new school in the Bamburgh building?</p>
	Response	The consultation process is to listen to views on the proposals and your views are noted.
5	Gov	Inclusion for primary pupils on the Bamburgh site is fine, and the use of the hydrotherapy pool is an advantage however, there is nothing to improve the education. We need to build on and maintain the excellence and success of Epina y not close it.
	Response	<p>We did put forward arguments around inclusion and travel and we recognise there are certain advantages to co-location. However, this is your opportunity to make clear how you feel some practical issues would hinder inclusion.</p> <p>The pupils who currently attend Bamburgh, Margaret Sutton and Epina y would form the pupil group for the new school which would have a new name.</p>
6	S	What about future pupils with MLD coming through the system?
	Response	More parents are happy with the provision in mainstream schools with support. We need to look at the whole school stock and it is no longer viable to have five special schools. We want to provide high quality provision and there will always be a demand for special schools.
7	S	<p>We already do valuable work on inclusion with our partners. An amount of trust exists between staff and partners. If we move to another provision with a different management team we would lose this.</p> <p>We do have an inclusion document which we have</p>

		worked on with Mr. Anderson, the Head of Hebburn Comprehensive School. We will submit this as part of the consultation.
	Response	
8	S	The Staff in the Enterprise Centre are qualified to assess NVQ qualifications. Since the Enterprise Centre will remain the staff should stay there.
	Response	
9	S	The new school is to cater for 150 pupils - how is this figure reached?
	Response	The school data and pupil projections predict this figure. Also, a new school will need to go through the competition process. A temporary governing body would be established, a Headteacher would be appointed and the staffing structure would be established. Some posts will be lost, for example there will only be one Headteacher, there may only be one Deputy.
10	S	Who will make the final decision?
	Response	The members of Cabinet make the final decision, based on the recommendations of officers and views of all of the stakeholders.
11	S	It is very disconcerting that members are not listening to what officers are recommending.
	Response	This is just one opportunity for you to voice your comments. You can also complete a comment form and return it to the Town Hall or e-mail your comments.
12	S	My concern is that the pupils with MLD may have to go to mainstream schools in the future. Epinay teachers help other schools to cope with their pupils with SEN. Teachers from mainstream schools ask for help from our staff. This good practice could be lost.
	Response	
13	G	I find it alarming that the Scrutiny Commission recommendations were ignored by the Cabinet. This set of proposals has been rushed through. The Local Authority's recommendations have been overturned and Scrutiny advice ignored. Epina's exam results are very good. If the school closes, we lose this expertise and the pupils will suffer.
	Response	Cabinet decisions are ratified by the full Council
14	S	When will you be reporting back to Cabinet?
	Response	In December 2009. So far we have only met with the staff and governors. We need to take on board the views of parents and the public from the drop-in-sessions.

15	S	What about the views of pupils?
	Response	We did consult with pupils in the previous round of consultations with Alison Parker however, this did bring about some anxieties for some of the pupils. However, we could arrange for some pupils to be consulted.
16	Council Officer	If the proposals are approved then we need to go out to competition to see who would want to run the new schools. We need to put together a specification advert indicating what facilities the new school should have. We already know the age range, size, funding available and what community the schools will serve. We need to indicate what extended services/community facilities should be available
	Response G	We realise that changes are needed. I have been a governor for 14 years and we do need to address the situation of inclusion and surplus places in schools. We feel that we have been very pro-active. However, we feel that Members are ill informed and ignoring our views. The decision on our schools' future affects our children for the next 25 years – Members should be educated to make the correct decision and the LEA should support members to make the right decision and this is not it.

## APPENDIX 'D1'

### Notes taken at a meeting for PARENTS of pupils at GREENFIELDS SCHOOL held on Thurs 17<sup>th</sup> Sept 2009

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS OF GREENFIELDS

Date: Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: GREENFIELDS

Start Time: 10 a.m. Finish Time 11 a.m.

Chair: Rick O'Farrell

Presenters: Peter Cutts and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 14

Ref. No.	P(arent) or	Point Made
1	P	Why is the Hebburn Comprehensive school site still being included as an option for the new school? Both sets of schools have said that they do not want the new school to be built there.
	Officer response (if any)	Noted, this point has been made quite strongly.
2	P	Why can't we just have the new school built here on our current site?
	Response (if any)	This current site is too small for a 130 place school. We have to comply with the requirements of Sports England and provide adequate amount of playing fields. The DCSF provide a Building Bulletin which dictates the amount of space that we must provide.
3	P	I have a three year old child in a wheelchair and depend upon public transport to get my child to school. I currently use the metro and think it will be difficult to get to Cleadon since there is no Metro station there. The Bedewell site is nearer a metro station so I think this site could be preferred.
	Response	Noted
4	P	Oakleigh Gardens is an isolated site – it does not have good transport links
	Response	
5	P	If the new school is built in Cleadon it means that all the Borough's specialist provision is in South Shields. None would be in Jarrow or Hebburn
	Response	
6		My son has just started here. We did look at Oakleigh

	P	Gardens but thought it was like a residential home for children with disabilities – stuck away in a field at the bottom of Cleadon Hills.
	Response	Some people like the fact that Oakleigh Gardens site is isolated. However, the Hebburn Comprehensive site would offer more opportunities for inclusion since there would be a primary and secondary school on that site.
7	P	Where is the Lukes Lane site? How easily accessible and what facilities are there for inclusion.
	Response	The Lukes Lane site is on Lukes Lane Estate and the location was identified on a map (shown to audience).
8	P	I thought there was only one way into the Estate and one way out. Also, it's not near a metro station.
	Response	Noted.
9	P	The local residents at Oakleigh want the school to stay there.
	Response	Most parents are comfortable with the proposals – what we need to discuss are the options for the siting of the new school.
10	P	What factors will influence the Council's decision?
	Response	The educational issues such as how inclusive a site is, how easily it can be accessed by public transport. Officers make recommendations but Cabinet makes the final decision.
11	P	I am against Hebburn Comp site because I don't want my child to go to that site. I feel she may be bullied and inclusion won't work. I don't think Lukes Lane or Oakleigh Gardens are suitable because they are too isolated. I favour the Bedewell site – it's near to the metro and Hebburn Town Centre. Would there be a new building on that site?
	Response	Most likely since the current building is on two floors and refurbishment will be too expensive – it will be more cost effective to rebuild.
12	P	What about the sites of other primary schools that have become or will become available through the TOPS programme? For example Monkton Infants/Juniors sites.
	Response	This is a sensible suggestion, however, the sites of Monkton Infants and Juniors will not be available until 2015.
13	P	There are alternative sites – what about the Boldon C of E site – that school closed in the summer.
	Response	This is a good idea and all your suggestions for alternative sites will be reported back to Cabinet. There were specific technical reasons why the current four sites have been suggested.



## APPENDIX 'D2'

### **Notes taken at a meeting with staff and governors – GREENFIELDS – 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009 at 5 pm**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation July to October 2009

Meeting for STAFF & GOVERNORS

Date: Wed 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: THE OPEN ZONE

Start Time: 5 p.m. Finish Time: 6 p.m.

Chair: Christine Smith

Presenters: Karen Pemberton, Maurice Walsh and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 26

Ref. No.	S(taff) or G(overnor)	Point Made
1	S	I do think this revised set of proposals is more acceptable and I concur that our pupils with PMLD/SLD do deserve a new build.
	Officer response	
2	S	The siting of the new school should be accessible by the whole Borough and Oakleigh Gardens site is not accessible. It is nowhere near a metro station. People living in Jarrow and Hebburn would find it difficult to get to. Also, the new school should be near to shops so we can encourage our pupils to have life-skills. I feel that Oakleigh Gardens site is on the outskirts and does not offer much scope for inclusion. It does not seem fair to have two Special Schools on one side of the Borough.
	Response (if any)	Noted
3	S	Will the Hebburn Comprehensive site be large enough to have a secondary school, a primary school and a new Special School?
	Response	A map of the Hebburn Comprehensive site was provided and it was illustrated where the comprehensive and primary schools would be. The possible location of a special school was indicated. This would allow for inclusion with the comprehensive, the new primary school and the current St. James' RC

		Primary school. The Special School could have its own access via Mountbatten Avenue.
4	S	I understood that Hebburn wanted a high quality sporting provision on that site and also that there were problems with the drainage.
	S	I think that there will be problems with the additional traffic on Solway Road. The area is already congested, particularly at school start/finish times.
	Response	
5	S	The Bedewell site could be good. It is near to the metro and the shops.
	Response	Noted
6	S	What about our current site? I think it's perfect.
	Response	We have been advised that the current site is not suitable
7	S	There are former mine-workings on the Westoe Crown Site and a new school was built there, so I think our current site could be a possibility.
	Response	If this is your preference then you must express it.
8	S	If the drive is for inclusion, will there be any additional funding to help with this? There will be additional travelling etc.
	Response	We need to look at the new school's vision. We need to carry out an exercise to find out how much additional finance is required to improve and increase inclusion.

## APPENDIX 'E1'

### **Notes taken at a meeting for PARENTS of MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL held on Wed 23<sup>rd</sup> Sept**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS OF PUPILS AT MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL

Date: Wed 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009

Venue: MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL

Start Time: 1.30 p.m. Finish Time 2.30 p.m.

Chair: Phil Boyd

Presenters: Karen Pemberton and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 10

Ref. No.	P(arent) or	Point Made
1	P	Will the class sizes and pupil to teacher ratio be the same. Will the teachers from Epinay move to the new school with the children?
	Officer response (if any)	A temporary governing body will be constituted and a staffing structure established. We realise we have a lot of expertise and we will recruit from that pool, so there will be a degree of continuity with staff.
2	P	If the new school is not going to be available until 2012, some staff may leave in the meantime.
	Response (if any)	We aim to maintain teacher retention – there should be no compulsory redundancies and teachers are aware of this. We may lose some staff through retirement age
3	P	Are jobs guaranteed?
	Response	We can't say this – we can say that we only invite voluntary redundancies and there should be no compulsory redundancies. It is acknowledged that some schools may face surplus to requirements situations where there are too many teachers for the number of pupils
4	P	Why are the numbers of pupils reducing in Special Schools?
	Response	More children are having their needs met in mainstream schools with the relevant level of support and we are providing training for teachers to refresh their skills to teach pupils with SEN.

5	P	An anonymous person phoned to ask for a place at Margaret Sutton school and was told that this school was full.
	Response	If a decision is made that a special school place is needed then we will find one.
6	P	Parents are having problems with the statementing process. Some pupils are spending half their time in mainstream schools and the other half in special schools.
	Response	
7	P	When the schools merge, will the dinner hall at Sea View/Bamburgh building be more staffed than it is now?
	Response	I made an unannounced visit to the school dining hall recently and the children were well supervised.
8	P	How many places will the new schools have?
	Response	There will be 130 places in the PMLD/SLD new school and Bamburgh school building already has 150 places and this is what we are suggesting. There are 250 pupils between the three schools now however, we predict that this will go down to 150 by 2012
9	P	Will the parents be able to get involved in the training that is provided for staff on SEN?
	Response	It depends on who the training providers are and what relevance the training would have for parents.
10	P	What if in say 2016 there is a surge of statements being issued and more demand for special school places? At present children are staying in mainstream schools with an IEP (Individual Education Plan) and parents being told that special schools are full. Many parents are expressing this view.
	Response	We have to provide a place in a special school if this is what is recommended and requested by parents. If we can't do this within the places that we have then we would have to create additional space. At present, Ofsted have criticised the Council for having too many special schools.
11	P	My son has a statement and has been told he must go to a mainstream school until the SEN review is sorted out, although we have requested a special school place.
	Response	
12	P	I have a three year old and the Doctor has recommended Bamburgh school and he has a Statement, however, he has to remain in a mainstream school.
	Response	
13	P	My daughter attends Margaret Sutton school and

		frequently gets awards for her performance. My son is in Greenfields and is very happy there – Both the schools are doing very well – why disturb them at all?
	Response	We have the funds available to build brand new provisions – our current buildings are not fit for purpose.
14	P	If Epinay School is to close, how will the Enterprise Centre remain?
	Response	Some five years ago the Centre was created to provide vocational qualification training to NVQ level. So, the new MLD school will continue to use this facility, as an annexe.
15	P	What will happen to the empty building at Epinay?
	Response	The Council's Asset Management department will decide.
16	P	Are there already plans for the future of the Margaret Sutton school site?
	Response	Yes, the Galsworthy School will have a new school built on this site.
17	P	Instead of spending money on a new build, why not refurbish the current buildings and why is the Margaret Sutton site not an option?
	Response	Cabinet have already decided that the Galsworthy School should be rebuilt on the Margaret Sutton school site
18	P	Why not split the pupils in Epinay between Bamburgh and Margaret Sutton?
	Response	This will not address the reduction in pupil numbers.
19	P	What happens if Cabinet do not approve the Council's recommendations this time?
	Response	They may ask us to consider other proposals and consult on them.
20	P	What about pupils, do they have a say in what they want?
	Response	Yes, pupil councils were interviewed before. Pupils have been consulted this time.
21	P	The pupils just keep hearing about the new buildings, new equipment, new chairs, new dining halls and they don't see the larger picture. They would have to make new friends and there could be additional travel.
	Response	There are pros and cons to the proposals and these are what we want to hear.
22	P	Some mainstream parents think that pupils with Special Educational Needs may hinder their children's Education.
	Response	This is an individual perception and the internal arrangement in schools is very important. Teachers need a full range of skills

23	P	Autistic children do not cope well with change. How will this be managed?
	Response	Each individual child will have a transition plan. We already have a lot of success with our Post-11 autistic provision in Jarrow. We are fortunate that some of these pupils are included in Jarrow mainstream school. We have already indicated that any child currently in a special school will remain there unless their parents request a mainstream place.
24	P	What about class sizes? There should be some guidelines and classes should not be any larger pupil to teacher ratio, than they are now.
	Response	It will be up to the headteacher to identify the numbers of pupils and numbers of staff available, thus determining class sizes.
25	P	When these changes take place, my son will be in Year 11, a crucial time because he will be taking exams. I am concerned about the disruption.
	Response	At the start of this process we have ensured parents that whatever proposals are accepted we would put together an implementation plan to minimise disruption for pupils.
26	P	It is important that parents are involved in the design of the new school.
	Response	Noted.

## APPENDIX 'E2'

### Notes taken at mtg. with staff and governors of MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL – held Thurs 10<sup>th</sup> September

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation July to October 2009

Meeting for STAFF & GOVERNORS of MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL

Date: Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: THE OPEN ZONE

Start Time: 5 p.m. Finish Time: 6 p.m.

Chair: Tony Duggan

Presenters: Karen Pemberton, Peter Cutts, Maurice Walsh and Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 11

Ref. No.	S(taff) or G(overnor)	Point Made
1	S	The proposed age range for the new school is 3 – 16. New government legislation provides that education age range should be increased to 18. This means our current Year 7's will be entitled to education until the age of 18. Since we are proposing a new school, we should change the age range to 18 now.
	Officer response	Good point, noted.
2	S	The Target date to implement the changes is 2012. Is this set in stone?
	Response (if any)	We need a target date so we can plan. The new school will be subject to the competition process. The period of three years allows sufficient time for the competition process and design and planning for both the new build and adaptation plans for the Bamburgh building.
3	S	When will a decision be made on these proposals?
	Response	We will report back to Cabinet in December 2009 and a decision will be made then. Cabinet may approve the proposals or ask Officers to carry out further consultation on alternative proposals.
4	S	Since the closure of Epinay, Margaret Sutton and Bamburgh and the creation of a new school in the Bamburgh building does not require a new build, could the date not be brought forward?
	Response	The timescale to 2012 has been based on pupil projections up to that date

## APPENDIX 'F1'

### **Notes taken at a meeting for PARENTS of Oakleigh Gardens School – held Wed 16<sup>th</sup> September**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS OF OAKLEIGH GARDENS

Date: Wed 16<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: OAKLEIGH GARDENS SCHOOL

Start Time: 2 p.m. Finish Time 3 p.m.

Chair: Gary Wallis Clark

Presenters: Karen Pemberton and Maurice Walsh

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 19

Ref. No.	P(arent) or	Point Made
1	P	Will the class sizes increase?
	Officer response (if any)	This is not anticipated. There are currently 100 pupils between the two schools and we propose to have 130 places in the new school. The government's Building Bulletins are quite specific and set out details of the amount of space that is required.
2	P	I liked the school we went to visit at Beacon Hill. We need a school like that built here on the site of Oakleigh Gardens. Can I make a suggestion that parents should visit the Beacon Hill school to see the layout?
	Response (if any)	Noted
3	P	From Day 1 at every meeting, we have insisted that Oakleigh Gardens will not move to a site next to a mainstream primary or secondary school. On 20 <sup>th</sup> April at the meeting we had in the Town Hall we asked for a new build school to go on this site. I think Officers should read the Hansard Report. There are 1.6 million people with SEN in this Country – some of these fall through the net. I think the Council's figures are wrong. They are not reviewing the SEN provision in other authorities.

	Response	
4	P	The location of our school is excellent. Half the children are already here and Greenfields are quite happy to come here. The local residents all support the school. Our pupils spend a lot of time out of the school. I have concerns that mainstream pupils are resenting our pupils. None of our children will gain anything by being located on the Hebburn Comprehensive site.
	Response	
5	P	What if there is a massive increase in the number of children born with SEN?
	Response	We make predictions and an allowance for the improvements in prenatal care.  Early screening can also lead to a decrease in the numbers
6	P	I think the Hebburn Comprehensive site is on the site of former lakes. If a new primary school is also being built there I don't think the new special school should go there.
	Response	Noted
7	P	The Lukes Lane site is too remote. There is only one way into the estate and one way out.  The Oakleigh site is the best location. It is in beautiful surroundings. Is there any reason why the new school can't go here?
	Response	No, this site is one of the options we are consulting on.
8	P	Is there an appeal process once the decision is made?
	Response	Cabinet's decision could be subject to call in by Scrutiny.
9	P	I understand that some have expressed concerns that the Oakleigh Gardens site is isolated. However, we are close to Cleadon Village Primary School and also the new South Shields Community School so we can have inclusive links with them.
	Response	The South Shields Community school is due to move to the King George V site in Sept 2011 and your points concerning the location of a nearby primary school and South Shields Community school are noted.

## APPENDIX 'F2'

### **Notes taken at a meeting for staff and governors of OAKLEIGH GARDENS SCHOOL on Wed 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation July to October 2009

Meeting for STAFF & GOVERNORS

Date: Wed 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: THE OPEN ZONE

Start Time: 4.00 p.m. Finish Time: 5.00 p.m.

Chair: Christine Smith

Presenters: Karen Pemberton, Maurice Walsh, Maggie Brooks

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': 26

Ref. No.	S(taff) or G(overnor)	Point Made
1	S	Has the Council considered any options for separate buildings for the primary and secondary sector in the new PMLD/SLD school?
	Officer response (if any)	In the first proposals this was suggested but parents expressed more support for an all-age range school. A lot of parents thought it would be disruptive for their children to be moved to separate schools. They expressed a preference for their child to be on the one site for their entire education. We did argue that the split site works well in other authorities. Most arguments were around the continuity of staff. Parents felt that the knowledge of a child's needs may be lost in a separate primary/secondary school system.
2	S	What about having two separate buildings on the same site? One for primary PMLD/SLD and one for secondary PMLD/SLD. The age range of 2 – 19 and the child remaining in the same school building for that duration does not prepare them for change. For PMLD/SLD children it would be too much of a wrench at the age of 19 to accept change. I feel there should be a change in the middle of the age range. Separate primary and secondary buildings on the same site would help prepare the children for change.
	Response (if	This is a possibility and we could put this into the

	any)	specification for the new school
3	G	Earlier proposals were for an age-phased generic provision – many parents were against this. However, an age-phased provision for the PMLD/SLD children would be more acceptable
	Response	
4	S	In mainstream provision there are primary and secondary schools on the same site
	Response	
5	S	If the new school went on the Hebburn Comprehensive school site, where would it go and what else would be on that site?
	Response	A map of the site was displayed. KP explained that Hebburn Comprehensive School and a new Primary school to replace Bedewell and Lukes Lane would also be on that site. KP indicated where the new PMLD/SLD school could be situated and where access to the school could be provided for traffic etc. The location of the PMLD/SLD school on the Hebburn Comprehensive site would provide opportunities for inclusion with the co-located primary and secondary school
6	S	I am not convinced that the inclusion of the PMLD/SLD pupils with the Primary and Secondary pupils would work
	Response	For some pupils it will. If they build up relationships and trust and this is what the parents want. Logistically it is possible because the schools are all on the same site. Hebburn Comprehensive school is pro-active in its approach to inclusion and St. James' RC school is also pro-active in its approach to inclusion. We have the foundations and it will work. The Bedewell and Lukes Lane sites don't offer the same opportunities for inclusion.
7	S	There are some secondary schools that are not pro-active in their approach to inclusion.
	Response	This is noted
8	S	I think the new PMLD/SLD school should be built on the current Oakleigh Gardens site.
	Response	The current site is Green Belt land. A site plan was provided. In order to satisfy Sport England requirements, a specific amount of playing fields would be required. The possible location of a new build on the Oakleigh Gardens site was identified on the plan and the access to and from that site was discussed. Building a new school on this site is perfectly possible.
9	S	There are pitfalls with all the suggested sites. The Bedewell site is attached to the Early Years Excellence Centre – what would happen to this? The Lukes Lane site is difficult to access for traffic.

	Response	If you prefer the Oakleigh Gardens Site then you should express your preference – write in your preference on comment forms
10	S	The pupils with SLD/PMLD benefit from the use of a swimming pool and there is already a suitable swimming pool that was fully refurbished three years ago on the Oakleigh Gardens site. The current site is a lovely location in a safe environment with scope for outside classrooms. Also, the community want the school to stay here.
	Response	Generally, we gather that you prefer the Oakleigh Gardens site for the new school.

## APPENDIX 'G'

### **Notes taken at a meeting held for STAFF, GOVERNORS AND PARENTS OF SEA VIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Official Notes and Feedback Form from SEN Review Consultation – July to October 2009

Meeting PARENTS, STAFF AND GOVERNORS OF SEA VIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL

Date: Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Venue: SEA VIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL

Start Time: 6.00p.m. Finish Time 6.30pm

Chair: Rick O'Farrell

Presenters: Karen Pemberton and Maurice Walsh

Approximate Number of People Present in 'Audience': .....5.....

Ref. No.	P(arent) or S(taff) or G(overnor) or O(ther)	Point Made
1	G	Oakleigh Gardens is a fantastic venue/site. The Council is considering a move to the Bamburgh site, as it's a new school. Is Oakleigh Gardens being considered?
	Officer response (if any)	<p>We are proposing to build a new special school to cater for 2-19 for children with profound and multiple learning difficulties and severe learning difficulties and also create a new special school to cater for children aged 3 to 16 with a range of learning difficulties and as these schools will be serving the Borough it's not particularly relevant where they are sited.</p> <p>As children have to travel to school now, there is no significant advantage to where a school is sited</p> <p>A new build will be on 1 of 4 possible sites and schools have made representations as to where they feel they should be.</p> <p>Greenfields preference is Hebburn, Oakleigh Gardens preference is the Oakleigh Gardens site. Hebburn feel part of a vibrant centre whereas Oakleigh Gardens prefer being on a secluded site. Two entirely different points of view.</p>

		Oakleigh Gardens is a potential site for pupils with severe learning difficulties. Bamburgh school is a possible site to replace Bamburgh, Epinay and Margaret Sutton Schools under a new name.
2	HT	I prefer this proposal rather than the others. However, it covers 2-19 and I feel it should be focussed on the Primary age range, as it will be sharing a site with a Primary school.
	Response (if any)	Previous proposals did address this point. It is an ideal site for Primary links. A secondary school would have to travel to South Shields Community School or Harton Technology College.
3		Regarding extended provision - extra facilities in halls? Larger space could be utilised for performing arts.
	Response	150 is at the upper limit. Primary numbers are falling. New Building Schools for the Future buildings are Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant, therefore we are able to accommodate up to 150 pupils in the school.
4	HT	Need increased space for more and better facilities in school. Food court is also a problem.
	Response	There seems to have been a design fault from the start which could be addressed. We will look at the healthy schools agenda. It needs to be a social event and time allowed for pupils to eat in comfort and not rushed.
5	HT	The playing fields design is not practical. Bamburgh's older pupils have lost space, which does need to be looked at.
	Response	
6	G	Extended schools and community use. Does it mean community facility?
	Response	It is up the Governing Body to decide how the site will be used e.g. opening after school or weekends but the Local Authority can put in the specification how it could be used.
7	G	Need to get the message out to the public that it would be a community facility not a community centre.
	Response	

## APPENDIX 'H'

**SEN review (third consultation)  
Notes from meeting with adults with Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD)  
supported by Chesshire-Hope (Cookson House, South Shields)  
6 October 2009.**

As part of the review of Special Educational Needs provision (third consultation) officers contacted Chesshire-Hope, an organisation supporting adults with special educational needs, to collect the views of adults with severe learning difficulties who had recently been educated in a special school.

Questionnaires were sent to the Manager at Chesshire-Hope which the clients were supported to fill in. Fourteen clients filled in a questionnaire. An officer then visited and spoke to the clients for an hour. The responses from the clients in the table below are lifted directly from the questionnaires. Below this is a summary of the notes taken by the LA officer. Seventeen clients were present at the interview.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
<b>1. Where did you go to school?</b>	The Royal Blind School (Edinburgh) Greenfields x 2 Oakleigh Gardens x 3 Epinay x 2 Bamburgh x 2 Margaret Sutton x 3
<b>2. What did you like about your school?</b>	It was good, I saw Val, I enjoyed being in class. Liked all my friends. Going to lessons. Meeting other people, making friends x 2 Teachers x 2 The work. Mates, teacher, food. Learning English, art, science. Everything x 2 Nothing.
<b>3. What could have been better? Lessons? Facilities? Space? Visits out? Contact with other pupils/schools?</b>	Nothing x 2 Cooking. I liked everything about school. Lessons / more activities. Science and IT. Staff because we always go told off by the French teacher. Better lessons. Would like to do horse riding. I had been to France with my old school. Did not like the Head Teacher. Painting. Lessons. Contact with other schools.

	It was good
<b>4. Did you have a chance to go into any other schools? Which ones? What did you do? Was this useful?</b>	Harrogate College – lessons – yes. Epinay – child care – it was useful. SSCS. Mortimer. David Lewis College – learned to live independently. Monkton Nursery, Lord Blyton, Bamburgh, Margaret Sutton. No x 7.
<b>5. Would you have liked to have the chance to share some lessons with pupils in mainstream schools? Or some social activities?</b>	I was happy where I was. No x 3 Yes, I did some lessons with other students from Epinay Yes x 5 Art
<b>6. If you were in charge of organising special schools for students with severe learning difficulties, how would you do it? What can we learn from your experience?</b>	Don't know x 3 I work in mainstream school to help other special needs students work in the lessons. I would help them understand the questions provided for them and assist them around the classrooms and make sure they were aware what was going on around them. Help them to understand questions given to them and help them communicate with other people. Football, art, more activities x 2 I would like to do child care. I don't organise myself. Routine to be a Head teacher. I would have liked to have gone and mixed with mainstream children.

Summary of notes taken when speaking directly to clients:

**Buildings:**

Special schools need to be on one level. Outside annexes are not ideal.

Oakleigh Gardens is a very old building – ready to collapse!

If there was just one school, travel would be easier. This is better financially and for the environment.

We think the idea of having one school for PMLD/SLD is a good one.

We think the site at Oakleigh would be a good one for a new school. It is safe, there is no main road, there are large fields and a swimming pool.

Here in South Shields we have the shops, the community, bowling, the library, the Customs House. A school in the town centre would be best.

*Summary: overall the clients felt that to be close to a community was the best thing.*

**Inclusion:**

I would have liked to have mixed in mainstream, but not if asked at the time. Looking back, it would have been better. Mainstream seems scary – the children are bigger. There was no inclusion in the two (South Tyneside) special schools I attended. I would have liked to go into a mainstream secondary. We had a limited curriculum and did no GCSEs.

My Mum would not have liked me to go into mainstream. Now I think it would have been a good idea.

At special school I never had the chance to “blend in” – we were in the same building all of the time.

Our school tried to get inclusion going, but it never got off the ground.

I would have liked to have mixed.

Staff need to explain to children what SEN means at a very early age. Children with SEN are then accepted.

It is better to mix children who need wheelchairs with children who don't. This prepares everybody for later life.

Mainstream children do pick on children with SEN.

More mixing earlier would have helped the transfer to college and real life.

Special schools can be like an institution, a family where no one is allowed in.

I had the same support worker right throughout school and when I left I needed counselling because I could not cope without her.

*Summary: overall the clients felt that there was not much inclusion promoted by special schools in their experience. They said that had they been asked as children if they wanted to go into other schools, they would have said no (and their parents would not have liked it), but now looking back they realise that had they mixed earlier they would have had fewer problems adjusting to the adult world (college, independent living).*

**Moving between schools:**

*(Some of the clients had experience of several special schools, others of mainstream followed by special school, others had been in one special school throughout)*

I felt very safe in my second special school. I had friends and someone to talk to.

Before that I was in another special school, but I was moved because I was bullied.

Mixing schools might not be a good idea.

*Summary: overall the clients gave a picture of frequent moves between schools which was unsettling. Bullying was as likely to happen in a special school as in a mainstream school.*

**Facilities / ideas for a new school:**

Earlier mixing

Proper play areas

More support staff

New swimming pool

Modern (DDA compliant) facilities

Be with my friends

Support workers/teachers to change as we move up the school

It must be safe (have alarms etc)

*Summary: several of the clients expressed an interest in being involved in the design processes for any new school. Officers feel that this is an idea which could be pursued.*

## APPENDIX J

### SEN REVIEW – THIRD ROUND OF CONSULTATIONS

#### SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

##### EPINAY BUSINESS AND ENTERPRISE CENTRE

No of letters received:		62
<i>From parents:</i>	12	
<i>From governors:</i>	1	
<i>From pupils:</i>	47	
<i>From staff:</i>	1	
No of comment forms received:		4
<i>From parents:</i>	2	
<i>From staff:</i>	1	
<i>From ex-pupils:</i>	1	
No of e-mails received:		6
<i>From parents:</i>	2	
<i>From staff:</i>	1	
<i>From residents:</i>	1	
<i>From Councillors</i>	1	
<i>From unknown</i>	1	

*One letter to Gazette (out of time)*  
**Individual representations:** **72**

These include:

Petition No. 1 – Objecting to closure and wishing rebuild on current site (966 signatures).

Petition No. 2 – objecting to closure (26 signatures).

The Jarrow Petition (photocopied) wanting Epinay to remain (1190 signatures)

Comment forms from people of Jarrow wanting Epinay to remain (45)

Returned pupil questionnaire forms (63)

Joint submission by Head Teachers at Epinay School and Hebburn Comprehensive School (inclusion document) stating the case for the second set of proposals, which retain Epinay School, on the grounds that Epinay already offers excellent inclusion opportunities. These would be enhanced by a move to a site co-located with or close to Hebburn Comprehensive School.

Letter from Chair of Governors stating the case to retain Epinay which in turn would mean the retention of specialist status and excellent staff.

Letter from the Friends of Epinay stating the case for the retention of the school and suggesting that Bamburgh School should be used for children with SLD.

Letter (received after 9 October, but still considered) from Professor Stewart Evans of Newcastle University expressing opposition to Epinay's closure.

On-line petition to 10 Downing Street (165 signatures) supporting the retention of special school provision in Jarrow and Hebburn.

#### **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:**

<b>Support a re-build on Hebburn Comp Site:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Concerns about disruption for pupils:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>The Council want Epinay's land:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Need transport links to new school and nearby community links:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Want the school site to stay the same:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Both special schools will be in South Shields:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Epinay have excellent standards and Status :</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Inclusion document – Epinay already have excellent inclusion:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Loss of government funding for specialist status:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>No inclusion at Bamburgh for secondary pupils:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Use the Bamburgh building for SLM/PMLD pupils:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Horsley Hill is a deprived area – there could be bullying/intimidating our pupils:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Loss of excellent staff from Epinay:</b>	<b>3</b>

#### **General comments from students:**

**Concerns there will be bigger class sizes. I manage better in Epinay than mainstream. Want the school to remain on the Epinay site (58). Concerned about disruption to our education. Prefer the school to be with a mainstream school such as Hebburn Comprehensive school (5).**

## **OAKLEIGH GARDENS**

No. of letters received		3
<i>From parents/carers:</i>	2	
<i>From residents:</i>	1	
No. of e-mails received:		6
<i>From staff:</i>	3	
<i>From parents/carers</i>	3	
No. of comment forms received:		37
<i>From staff:</i>	20	
<i>From residents:</i>	17	
<b><i>Individual representations:</i></b>		<b>46</b>

These include:

Petition received from pupils at St. John Bosco School, Sunderland, total signatures (44)

Letter from chair of Cleadon Village Residents' Association advocating the use of the Oakleigh Gardens site due to its open-air location and the existence of the swimming pool.

Letters from the Head Teacher and the Deputy Head Teacher urging the Council to reach a decision as this process has taken too long, and advocating the provision of separate primary and secondary units for children with PMLD/SLD.

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:**

<b>Oakleigh already have good inclusion links:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Need better equipment in new school:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Need a new build on Oakleigh Gardens site:</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Need separate primary and secondary Units and college facilities up to age 19 in the new build:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>We are fed up of waiting for a decision:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>We could lose the swimming pool already here:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The philosophy and vision of inclusive education:</b>	<b>3</b>

## **BEDWELL EARLY YEARS EXCELLENCE CENTRE**

No. of letters received:		1
<i>From: Jarrow Labour Party</i>		
No. of comment forms received:		13
<i>From staff:</i>	9	
<i>From parents:</i>	4	
No of e-mails received:		2
<i>From governors:</i>	2	
<b><i>Individual representations:</i></b>		<b>16</b>

These include:

A staff document setting out the case for retaining the Bedewell Primary School site for use by the Early Years Excellence Centre.

Letter from the Jarrow Constituency Labour Party advocating the use of the Bedewell Primary site for the new school for children with PMLD/SLD.

### **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:**

<b>Use another site or Oakleigh Gardens current site:</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>We want to use Bedewell building to extend our provision:</b>		<b>11</b>
<b>Hebburn Comp site is best for inclusion:</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Object to Bedewell being made into a special school:</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>There will be problems with access/traffic here:</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>There will be disruption during selective demolition:</b>		<b>1</b>

## **MARGARET SUTTON SCHOOL**

No. of letters received:		0
No. of e-mails received:		0
No. of comment forms received:		2
<i>From parents:</i>	2	

***Individual responses:*** 2

These include:

Student comment forms returned (19)

### **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:**

**Want the new school to go on Bamburgh site:** 1

**Concerns about disruption for pupils:** 1

**Want to stay on the current site:** 1

**Need the staff to go with the children:** 1

**General comments from students:**

**We need a new building. We are scared for the move, there could be bullying. People could make new friends, but some people may not want to mix. We need to have the same teachers.**

## **GREENFIELDS SCHOOL**

No. of letters received: 1  
*From 33 members of staff and 1 governor*

No. of e-mails received: 2  
*From Parent 1*

No. of comment forms returned: 4  
*From staff: 1*  
*From governors: 2*  
*From parents: 1*

***Individual representation: 7***

These include:

Student comment forms returned from each year group

Document signed by 33 members of staff including the Head Teacher and the Chair of Governors stating that the new school needs to be close to community facilities and on a public transport route. This would make the site of Bedewell Primary School a possibility.

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

**Prefer a new school on Oakleigh site: 2**

**Oakleigh Gardens site is too remote: 2**

**Lukes Lane site is too remote: 2**

**Bedewell site could be a possibility: 2**

**Would prefer Greenfields site: 2**

**Hebburn comp site is too crowded: 2**

**Staff from both schools should stay with the pupils: 1**

**Temple Park Junior site is an impartial site: 1**

**Boldon C of E School site would be good: 1**

**The new school must be on a bus route/  
accessible by public transport 2**

**Need to be close to community facilities: 1**

**Need access to health facilities within the school: 1**

**General comments from students:**

**We need a bigger school and more equipment. We need to be able to walk to the metro and shops. We need a common room for the Post 16's. It's a good idea, we can make new friends with the pupils from Oakleigh Gardens. We need to have school clubs.**

## **BAMBURGH**

No. of letters received:		3
<i>From staff:</i>	2	
<i>From unknown:</i>	1	

No. of e-mails received:		2
<i>From staff:</i>	2	

No. of comment forms received:		3
<i>From parents:</i>	3	

***Individual representations:*** **8**

These include:

Student Comment forms received (24)

An e-mail from an unnamed member of staff making the case for the retention of Bamburgh School.

On-line petition to 10 Downing Street (329 signatures) objecting to the closure of Bamburgh School.

### **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:**

**Areas of deprivation have higher numbers of SEN pupils:** **4**

**Concerned about disruption in education:** **1**

**Please retain the caring staff:** **1**

**Good to retain the Bamburgh building:** **1**

**Restricting choice for parents:** **4**

**More intense training in SEN for staff is needed:** **5**

**It's a cost cutting exercise:** **4**

**The proposals will not improve education for pupils:** **3**

### **General comments from students:**

**Concerned about bullying, larger class sizes, we want the same teachers. Dinner hall will be too crowded. We don't want change or to mix with the Epinay and Margaret Sutton pupils. We do not want to go to mainstream. We could share some events/lessons.**