

Ref.	Option	Reasons	Other comments	
1	3	A more effective delivery of specialist provision, cutting out a lot of wasted time. More efficient use of public money and resources.		Headteacher
2	3	Most comprehensive, most flexible and includes speech and language.	Adequate funding is vital - schools need to be able to fund initially and in future. Necessary training to be provided.	Deputy Headteacher
3	3	It would be totally unfair to move my child from Altwood as it would be for any child. I would wholeheartedly fight option 2.	I do understand change is necessary to move things forward. Don't fix something that isn't broken! I am concerned that you will use unqualified staff to train more unqualified staff. How will this benefit students?	Parent of child with SEN
4	1	Throwing resources into mainstream schools for children with disabilities does not work. The SPAL unit at Ellington is the ideal resource for my child. It is well established, well run and does not require any change.	Although it doesn't state that these proposed changes are part of spending cut backs by the local authority, it is clear this is the case. Money invested into our children is money invested into our future.	Parent of child with SEN
5	None	I have a child at the Ellington S&L Resource who already has severe needs is making very good progress. I do not want her to move, it will effect her progress and self esteem. Ellington School includes the resource children well and all the teachers are skilled in dealing with language issues.	What is the point of wasting money, closing a good resource and spending money setting up another one. My daughter was not coping in mainstream and the resource has transformed her. She is so much calmer and happier and making progress. She is included in all of school life, and I'm very grateful to the resource for making my child's life as normal as possible, by staying in this school.	Parent of child with SEN
6	3	Feel very strongly that speech and language therapy is a vital part of their education and learning. Individual S&L lessons are vital. The units are a place they feel they can go when it all gets a bit much for them.	These children need specialist S&L teachers, not teachers that have been on the odd course. It takes years to qualify as a speech and language therapist. They need to interact with mainstream children and have the specialist teaching in lessons when required. These children do not like to stand out and 9 out of 10 pretend they understand when they don't. If you invest well in the early years you get great rewards.	Parent of child with SEN

7	None	<p>My son has come a very long way since attending Ellington School and with the help, expertise and patiences of the Apple Resource Centre staff. Without their help my son would be unable to bearly communicate, let alone understand some of the everyday conversations and be totally unable to socially interact with other children/people . He still has a very long way to go as he has great difficulty comprehending everyday matters and needs a lot more help with his social interaction on a consistency basis. If he has to move schools this will be a very big <b>change</b> for him and will be disastrous as he needs to feel safe in his everyday environment (as does all children with learning difficulties, whatever level). All the hard work that Ellington's Apples Resources Centre has put into helping my son would be wasted and I can assure you that he would go backwards and not forwards- probably reverting to how he was before attending the school. Changing anything relating to his everyday environment would be a drastic problem for my son and would only cause him confusion and distress</p>	<p>More information needs to be sent to parents before any changes happen - this letter came completely out of the blue and has caused me considerable distress and worry for my son's future. The changes you say you want to make will cause my son and many other children with severe problems, confusion if they have to adjust to a new school and/or routine. Children with special needs need consistency to their routine, any changes are disturbing to them and also very confusing - thus doing more harm than good. Each child with a Statement or even applying for a Statement should be treated as individuals as all have different learning needs - these needs should not be taken away from the children once the Statement has been confirmed. Instead of the Royal Borough wasting money on non-important items and administration they should plough more money into these resource centres to enable children with problems who are not being treated to be included - after all they do say that Children are our future!!! - what future will you be offering my son and others if you change their environment and take away the chance of them being unable to progress and lead a normal life. I have to say that I think it is disgusting that the Royal Borough can even suggest such a change for children who unfortunately have been born with these problems and need all the help to ensure that they can work and live a normal life in the future.</p>	Parent of child with SEN
8	1	<p>I feel the resource unit do a fantastic job and feel that taking this unit away from the children will do more harm than good, especially emotionally.</p>	<p>My daughter has improved so much in her confidence to try new things with the support of resource unit. It is a lifeline for her, she knows that if she has any problems or worries she can go to the resource unit. I feel if this is taken away, she will go backwards. I feel she needs somewhere to go that she can be herself and if she makes a mistake, she won't be laughed at and I certainly don't want her confidence knocked now.</p>	Parent of child with SEN

9	3	As a parent of a son with Down Syndrome we are delighted with his progress in X Primary School. However, had focussed and coordinated support in this area to have been available to him from the start (he's ending year X now) then I feel that his communication capability would be improved above where it now is. A major part of the (inevitable) isolation that he is faced with results from his inability to effectively communicate with his peers. It is a major factor (i.e. the isolation that we fear for him in a secondary school environment) in our leaning towards a special educational needs school rather than mainstream.		Parent of child with SEN
10	3	This seems to be the most obvious and comprehensive option, encompassing the majority of needs of the children.	I'm not sure that the idea of advisory staff assisting in covering for staff absence is something that is good practice. Presumably advisory staff will have their own timetable and agenda, and to be pulled out of that at short notice is not good, particularly for the clients, who are prone to being upset by change.	Teacher
11	3	The initial information provided indicates that Option 3 would provide all the required services under one umbrella and hence allowing better management of each child's needs.	Of concern is the fact that the current budget will not be changed as per the review document. It is mentioned that the funds can be redirected so that not only children with special needs benefit but also many other pupils already in mainstream schools who have less severe difficulties in communication and interaction: how is this possible when the current situation indicates that often the assistance required and what is being provided currently is often not sufficient?	Parent of child with SEN
12	3	Option is more inclusive and less disruptive to child's day. Furthermore, ensures sensitive provision for children who could be experiencing low self esteem. My understanding is that provision in school would foster greater communication between teachers and specialist providers. Also, I believe this option will allow more children quicker access to the specialist help they need.	I would like to know what the implications are for teachers under option 3. Also, what provision would schools need to make to support the specialist provision in school for individual pupils?	Teacher

13	None	<p>When my son X first started at Ellington he was purely in need of help. With a lot of hard work from him and the specialist unit at Ellington, linked with the regular routine and familiar faces, from teachers to pupils he sees everyday his confidence and abilities have grown immensely. Whilst he still has a long way to go to achieve and better the national average, I, like his mother, am very encouraged with his development in all areas of his learning and want this to continue. I am totally bemused and disgusted to hear that this could all be taken away by the idea of shutting the unit down and possibly moving it somewhere else.</p>	<p>Why, when something purely works (X and others like him at Ellington are proof of this) governments and local authorities continue to play with peoples' minds and lives in this way by thinking of closing units down to justify their budgets on a spreadsheet. I will not accept any decision other than that to keep the unit intact and continue to support its development, where Mrs Juna and her staff can continue the great work carried out to date for the benefit of my son and other children like him at the school. Aren't the children today our future..</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
14	3	<p>Offers an integrated service approach to families, the option is needs led. Schools will find it easier to access training and support they will have expertise when needed and not a crisis point for schools/child and family.</p>	<p>Please link to children's centres and under 5's provision - early identification is crucial.</p>	<p>Headteacher</p>
15	3	<p>Move to multi-agency working. Aims to develop capacity and confidence of school staff to support the needs of the vast majority of pupils with SLCN within their local schools - supporting inclusion. Provides locally based resources for pupils with the most significant needs, reducing reliance on out of area placements. We would be interested to know more about where these bases will be located to access possible implications for Slough based pupils with SLCN/ASD.</p>	<p>More information is required with regard to pupils already placed in Altwood Resource - issue with regard to potential confidence although acknowledge statement that there will be no negative impact. In Slough we already maintain a primary resource for pupils with significant SLCN and a secondary resource for ASD. We are planning to open a secondary school for pupils SLCN from September 2009, reducing reliance on WMH provision.</p>	<p>Other LEA</p>

16	3	<p>Sirs, I was greatly concerned to read the consultation document detailing communication and interaction provision in the borough which includes the proposal to close the ASD unit at Furze Platt Senior School. I write as the mother of a X-year old (Yr X) boy who has Asperger's syndrome and attends a mainstream Junior School in the borough. We had very much hoped he would be able to follow his siblings into Furze Platt Senior School by gaining a place at the special ASD unit, which I have already visited and thought would be the best possible match available. I am however acutely aware that more needs to be done to provide more effective support to the growing number of children with communication difficulties. My concern is that in removing the only specialist unit for ASD children in the borough, many more children like my son, who is academically bright with good verbal skills, but very vulnerable due to his ASD, will face a much more difficult challenge trying to cope in the mainstream setting. I am sure you have had a great deal of information from teams such as SAMS to stress the importance of environment, routine and well trained staff to enable youngsters such as my son to access an education in the mainstream setting. Without the 'safe haven' of the ASD unit, and its well qualified staff to champion the cause of autistic children around the school I fear that he and others like him will simply not cope.</p>	<p>Autism is a highly complex disorder which I believe needs its own highly specialised response if children are to be taught effectively in a mainstream setting. If it is swallowed up under the general banner of 'communication difficulties' there is surely a risk that those who have good verbal skill such as my son will be seen as more able and his very real needs will be missed. The National Autistic Society reports a great increase in the numbers of educational tribunal appeals heard by SENDIST and the largest number of those cases concern children with an ASD. The proposal suggests better and more widespread training from a strengthened team such as SAMS, which I strongly support as many children with ASDs are currently supported by Teaching Assistants with no qualifications or experience of autism. However, I would hope that sufficient time and funds are directed to achieving this goal before the current provision is removed. Finally, I would urge you to consider the impact not only on children with an ASD, but their siblings and parents when the education system fails to meet their needs. It is a truly unedifying experience to have to shout loudest, longest and battle on behalf of your child, acknowledging that whatever help they receive may be at the expense of another less informed or able family. I am currently in touch with several families looking for alternatives to the secondary system that has failed their child with an ASD, either by opting for home tuition or private schooling. I have been told my own son is 'not bad enough' for a special school and we hope he can remain in mainstream education. He has indeed made good progress with the full time support of his well qualified and experienced teaching assistant. He has a promising future - please ensure that the communication review takes care of his needs and the many others struggling to cope with Autism.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
17	3	<p>I believe a joined up approach would be beneficial for all as long as the support given to children currently in need does not diminish.</p>		<p>Headteacher</p>
18	3	<p>It offers the greatest level of expertise for the teachers/children in school and a central bank of support.</p>	<p>Would funding be a concern for a small school?</p>	<p>Headteacher</p>
19	3	<p>Option 3 provides greatest range of expertise and flexibility. Involvement of all agencies - hopefully continuity for pupils. Pupils in system remain "unaffected". Pupils supported in local area - not having distance to travel. Cannot use this as an excuse for non attendance.</p>	<p>What level of involvement from the various agencies - just as guidance? Direct involvement with pupils? Specialist training teachers? Or TA's? Are we not returning to resource units in schools? Where does Sp&amp;L agencies involvement with children's centres come in this review?</p>	<p>Teacher</p>

20	None	See letter		Parent of child with SEN
21	None	See letter		Parent of child with SEN
22	3		Please ensure that when a child reaches 5 or joins school that SALT does not just stop. The current system does not work therefore failing hundreds of children.	Headteacher
23	3	SALT would need to be included within an option as it is key to communication	It is still a concern that the SALT provision is so limited. Training staff in school is a limited option as we cannot afford to employ any more staff to undertake this role.	Headteacher
24	None	I think that, as a parent, I can only usefully comment on what has worked for my own child. I don't know what would be best for other children and families with differing levels of special need, nor do I have any appreciation of financial or other constraints which might inform the decision making at RBWM.	I want to say that the placement at AURA at Furze Platt has worked well for my child. He makes full use of the unit as a "safe place" to relax in before school and at break and lunch times. The only big drawback has been having to use transport, as Furze Platt is not within walking distance. This causes great levels of autistic stress when the taxi is late in the mornings. Therefore, I think it would be ideal if all secondary schools could have some form of special needs unit for children to retreat to as necessary. I believe it is common for special needs children, even those relatively mildly affected, to find it too stressful to be absorbed into the crowd of mainstream children all day, every day. Having no retreat to them in the mainstream setting would trigger more challenging behaviour and would be counterproductive.	Parent of child with SEN
25	2	Less central admin. Schools know their pupils best.		Governor
26	3	Stability for children. Speech and language needs to be included. I think the process has already begun with the absorption of SAMS.	Appropriate investment, training, etc have to be maintained if inclusion is to succeed.	Headteacher

27	1	<p>The current service provided from the AURA Unit at Furze Platt School, offers my son the best service for his level of needs. I am concerned that he would not meet the criteria detailed for the specialised units for pupils aged 5-19 with 'severe difficulties', which would leave him in a position that he would receive no specialised support within the main stream school. I feel that the new service proposed will not specifically be aimed at children who are on the edge of the autistic spectrum, and do need the existing system within AURA at Furze Platt School to acheive their potential.</p>	<p>I did not receive notification of these proposals until September 2008, which may have altered my decision on which school my son would attend on moving to secondary school. I am pleased, however, that during a meeting at Furze Platt School on 18/09/08, that Mr Rhidian Jones assured myself and other parents present, that the AURA unit at Furze Platt would remain in place for the existing pupils until they conclude their secondary education.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
28	1	<p>What is proposed for options 2/3 will change the character of the unit at Furze Platt completely, from a fully inclusive style with excellent support. My feelings are that this is only an exercise for the borough to save money by not sending those with severe learning disabilities to independent schools outside the borough, to the detriment of those that are a success within it. The joining up of all the services can easily be achieved without going to options 2/3.</p>	<p>SAMS was an excellent service in primary school who helped my son access the national curriculum to a high standard and their work is to be applauded. They believe that the AURA unit will be a real success for him as well. The proposal that it will continue side by side with the proposed new unit is not credible with the units being amalgamated after a year or two paying lip service to it.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
29	3	<p>As a school who has to deal with children with both speech &amp; language problems and autism, we would welcome specialist advice from a dedicated service which includes both disciplines and is readily available to our school.</p>	<p>It is essential both of the excellent services provided by these specialists continues to be well funded to ensure our pupils and staff are well supported in the future.</p>	<p>Headteacher</p>

30	1	<p>Why mend what is not broken? AURA at Furze Platt has been a godsend for my son and he is doing well, I do not want to move him or have changes ASD kids do not "do" change well. Also, good for kids coming through the schools who will benefit from this resource as it is.</p>	<p>I feel that the meeting at Furze Platt with AURA parents was a "done deal". Option 1 was glossed over, option 2 was not mentioned and a very positive spin was put on option 3. This must be the borough's first choice as Mr Jones intimated. Our children are very important to us and their education is paramount, stating nothing will change for our children while they are at Furze Platt is also very hard to believe if option 3 goes ahead. I feel this review is based on cost and how to reduce costs on a long term basis. Option 3 favours children with significant issues with speech and interaction. What happens to children who are high on the spectrum, will they get lost in the mainstream system and be left to fend for themselves. Bullying is a particular issue. You are making vulnerable children even more of a target. Children with a greater degree of disability will be even more at risk. Bringing children back into mainstream smacks of cost cutting rather than what environment is right for the child.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
----	---	--	--	---------------------------------

31	None	<p>My reason being that you have reported yourselves that Options 1 and 2 are inappropriate, therefore Option 3 is the only option proffered by yourselves that is the least inappropriate, however this was put forward as an option in the previous review of the Speech and Language resource at Altwood School and was dismissed at that time (2005) by all parties involved with the review – this was only three years ago. There was a lot of work that went into the review by the parents association &amp; speech and language specialists as well as many other experts and qualified parties who agreed that the model of the Speech and Language resource at Altwood School was correct (albeit may have required minor adjustment – which was quoted out of context by the LEA to engender a change in the service provision).</p>	<p>I am concerned as to how a review can be commenced offering options without any substantiated measures, details or any actual organisation being developed for each option - particularly as this was a key criticism in 2004/5 of the option now known as Option 3, in that a movement of closure of the speech and language provision at Altwood School had been progressed without anything concrete put in place to replace it with - and it appears here we are again with the same dilemma! I am also most concerned at the prospect of the children who desperately need the specialist Speech and Language Resource being taken away from the mainstream environment and so will lose the much valued mixing with their peers that allows them to make friends with other non-special needs children assisting their own development and preventing alienation out of school for children with communications problems whilst also developing their much needed social skills - in preparation for leaving school and living in the "real world". As Option 3 is the only option put forward by yourselves that you have endorsed as the best option it appears this is the line you wish to take - however of the many concerns put forward in the previous review, there were worries that the speech and language (S&amp;L) children would be marginalised as SAMS could likely become the dominant aspect thereby the risk of reducing resources/funding for S&amp;L children whom it seems by your proposal would end up being put into the same environment as SAMS children by closure of the S&amp;L units which would not be in the S&amp;L children's best interests. If the merging of the service under this new "Communication and Interaction Service" could leave the S&amp;L children in their mainstream school resource then that would be wholly more acceptable - however should the LEA decide against this in favour of closing the units then that could only be because this is a cost saving measure and therefore could not be in the best interests of the S&amp;L children as your very own Summary supports teaching of special needs children within local mainstream schools. Lastly, I think it is incorrect to progress such a review without more information being available to base a decision on - there are very many positive affects on the children being in a Specialist resource in a mainstream school, and without this type of support these children could be left isolated from learning, become frustrated and turn away from education to unruly behaviour that so often accompanies children who have learning difficulties - and thus become a far greater cost to society than the amounts trying to be saved now.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
----	------	--	--	---------------------------------

32	None	<p>The existing service in the borough is already insufficient for children with complex and special needs associated with Autism. There is a speech and language unit at Altwood, some provision for higher- functioning children (Aspbergers) with special needs at Furze Platt and a speech and language resource base at Ellington. The current service does not deal adequately with the fact that children with autism have very different requirements for educational support to children with straightforward speech and language difficulties. The proposal makes this problem even worse by generalising the support to children with difficulties in "speech, language, communication and interaction".</p> <p>b) No specialist provision in mainstream school</p> <p>=====</p> <p>All of the options in this proposal will further dilute any form of specialist provision at mainstream schools. The essence of the proposal is to hand-off the responsibilities of educational support to teachers who are not trained in specialist provision and to reconstitute the current service to be an advisory service providing expertise and assistance to teachers.</p> <p>The current approach in the areas adjacent to the borough - Slough, Bourne End, Bracknell - is to have at least one school to which is attached an Autistic Resource Base - i.e. mainstream curriculum but with a centre devoted to assisting autistic children directly. This recognises that autistic children need hands-on educational support from specially trained personell. Not matter how much guidance and assistance is given, mainstream school teachers are simply not equipped to teach children with complex special needs. The proposal ignores this. This is one of the reasons that autistic children attend school outside the borough - a fact that the consultation acknowledges. The options presented will serve to exacerbate this trend and more parents will continue to seek to school their children outside the borough for this reason.</p>	<p>The proposal (and the existing service in the borough) takes a two size fits all approach: you go mainstream with mainstream teachers (assisted by a new service) or you attend Holyport Manor. However, there are a very large group of autistic children for which the best and only suitable type of schooling is to have specialist support within a resource base attached to mainstream school or at a school with a curriculum specially adapted to autistic children such as Heathermount, Ascot.</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
----	------	---	--	---------------------------------

33	1	We fail to see how closing the existing units can benefit pupils when those units provide such a necessary service. Our son has benefitted enormously from the individual attention and guidance he has received at his unit - the authority should be opening more of this type of facility, not trying to close them down.	Options 2 and 3 propose closing the existing units in favour of an "outreach and advisory service" - but such services already exist in the form of the EP Service, SAMS and SALT. They also favour "teaching units" attached to one or two schools - so why close the existing units or move them to different schools?	Parent of child with SEN
34	1	Having only recently made the transition to the AURA unit at Furze Platt, I consider that this supportive model promotes inclusion. It works well and has made a marked impact on my son. I am concerned that the proposed teaching base would change the character of the school and ethos of the unit. Also that resources and the high level of expertise and support that exists currently will be directed elsewhere, as happened previously when the Borough closed the resource at St Edward's Middle School, Windsor.	My son would not be able to cope without a resource unit, he has experienced mainstream with and without a facility. The benefits that a facility provides have been invaluable in helping my son to cope with his difficulties.	Parent of child with SEN
35	None	See letter		Speech and Language Therapist
36	3	Joined up thinking all agencies know what others are doing.	Sadly, there is no capacity at the school for accommodating any new provision. We are land-locked at Furze Platt Infant	Headteacher
37	3	See letter (Option 3 with reservations)		ICAN

38	None	I have been a member of staff at Ellington for 11 years. I worked for the school as a welfare assistant/TA supporting a child with learning difficulties and who was on the autistic spectrum.. For the past four and a half years I have been employed by the NHS working as a Speech and Language Therapy Assistant, within the Language Resource. I am aware that provision for children with communication difficulties is an area that needs some change but without diluting the provision that most of our SLI children require.	I have been involved with a lot of children who have thrived once being placed in the resource. The individual therapy, groups and small group teaching is a must as it builds their confidence and self-esteem and helps them to access the curriculum as well as being part of the school.. I have worked with some children who have been in a mainstream setting and who have entered the resource quite late, their self-esteem being at its lowest as well as their emotional wellbeing. They have been withdrawn and isolated from their peers but once in the resource have gradually improved their language skills enabling friendships to form and raising their ability to learn. Catching children early enables us to identify their specific need and work on that area, and hopefully re-integrate them back into KS2 mainstream. Having some experience with children on the Autistic spectrum I feel that quite often their behaviour can be quite difficult and I would not want this to affect the more quiet child who has SLI. I feel our Resource offers a perfect environment for children who have SLI as all the staff and their expertise are invaluable.	Teaching Assistant
39	1	See letter		Parent of child with SEN
40	3	See letter		PCT Speech and Language Therapy Service
41	3	I have an autistic son who is in year X. Option 3 would seem to fairly distribute resources and expertise to the majority of children instead of a chosen few who attend resource units.	I live in X and am choosing X School for my son. X LEA don't seem to have the resources and expertise as well as willing schools who will support autistic children properly in secondary schools.	Parent of child with SEN
42	3	See letter		Parent of child with SEN

43	1	I do appreciate the need to provide more expertise for mainstream schools but think then that Ellington School Resource Unit should be used as a model. It is a centre of excellence. Why close this centre when it clearly works? Use Ellington as a model to expand into other schools and expand the area currently covered, if considering Option 2.	The children within the resource benefit from the integrated learning and being part of the school. My son X has benefited so much from being at the Resource at Ellington. Had Option 2 been in place now I am not certain his needs would have been picked up. My fear is that by taking such 'expertise' out to all schools children will be 'missed' or 'overlooked' and will not receive intensive enough support for their needs. Such expertise will be diluted.	Parent of child with SEN
44	1	See letter		Parent of child with SEN
45	3	I would select option 3 as this could provide a greater wealth of support more readily accessible. In my experience schools are currently educating children with a range of difficulties in communication and interaction and this is done well. Children without statements can present with acute difficulties and it is often timely to gain the appropriate support. Teachers and Teaching Assistants have developed good practice. There will be tangible benefits for other children by expanding and developing the expertise within the school.	Speech and Language support is at a critical point and limited or no provision is being offered at present for statemented children, therefore this support is currently being delivered by experienced teaching assistants. Bringing these services under one umbrella would seem a sensible way forward.	Headteacher
46	2	Speech and language is so specialised and specific to individuals that it needs to be widely spread unless all children with S&L on their statements are going to be provided for in the school teaching bases by trained therapists. We are finding that S&L is the most common need now when children come in to school at five.	We really value the input we receive from the services. They provide us with specialist help and expertise we do not have ourselves. Despite being always so very busy they make time to help us. Thank you.	Headteacher
47	None	See letter		Grandparent of child with SEN
48	3	See letter		Headteacher

49	1	See letter	In summary, the school supports Option 1, with some modification that will allow the service being extended to other mainstream schools through outreach work, as well as targeting younger children who most benefit from early intervention. The staff and governors would like to continue to maintain the Speech and Language Resource at Ellington School.	Headteacher
50	3	My daughter currently gets lots of visits from many professionals including SAMS and a SALT, to be able to reduce this and get increased consistency would be great. I also think that there are great benefits to be gained from teaching the teachers at her school how to cope/work with, rather than focusing, on her problems in isolation from everyday class life.	I am concerned that the support parents currently get from these services would diminish. I personally currently get quite a lot of contact with my daughter's SALT and no support from the SAMS service, and am worried that I would get less. I do think that there is an overall issue about parents with children who have SEN feeling isolated when their child is educated in a mainstream school.	Parent of child with SEN

51	1	<p>The system that is in place at the moment works well. The Altwood Speech and Language Resource provides an excellent service and has achieved excellent results.</p>	<p>Each child is an individual with very specific and complex needs. What the new system you are planning to put into place does not take into consideration is the care, nurturing and security these resources provide for these children. Not all children that have speech and language difficulties are autistic and cannot be tarred with the same brush. These children lack confidence, self esteem, and find it difficult to make friends, so it can be a very lonely world for them. So it is VITAL that they have somewhere secure where they feel that they are understood and are provided with the right support. With your plan to only put the most severe children in resources and the rest into main stream school with LSA support is ludicrous. They do not have the expertise and training to be delaing with such children with such a complex difficulty. You can give all the training and advice you like to teachers but will this put be into place in the classroom?? More than likely not because they dont have the time. Alot of the differentiation for these children is done in the resource AFTER the lesson has taken place, making sure that they underatnd the vocabulary etc. Unless you have a child with special needs you do NOT understand how stressful it is making sure that the right provision is provided for them. All we are confronted with are people like yourself who dont care and are trying to save a bit of money and have no understanding of what its like to be a parent of a child with special needs and most importantly no understanding of how these children feel and cope with day to day living. They all deserve a decent education and deserve to become happy, confident self sufficient adults. The resource also helps these children with important life skills and strategies on how to cope with their difficulties in adult life. Im sure if you were in my situation and had worked and fought hard for your child (and will continue to fight for my child) you would feel the same way. We were told that our children would not be affected by these changes, but how are you planning on staffing this new resource? Im sure you will be taking staff away from the current resources to get this off the ground which WILL affect my child because there wont be any staff to support him!!!</p>	<p>Parent of child with SEN</p>
52	1	<p>As you have acknowledged, we have a Resource at Ellington that does a very good job, and as a result a number of our children return to their local mainstream school. I believe that is because we are able to offer a small group teaching where necessary at an early age. With intensive speech and language input, the children are able to access language in the classroom (with support).</p>	<p>Is there an opportunity to develop early intervention for children with specific speech and language impairment? This would enable them to be integrated back into their local school at perhaps KS2, and then to support them with a developed outreach service.</p>	<p>Teaching Assistant</p>

53	1	I have enjoyed working as a Teaching Assistant within the Speech and Language Resource at Ellington School for over 10 years. I do believe that some change to the provision for children with communication difficulties is necessary and that it could redress the equality of provision. Whilst I can see the benefits of some parts of Option 3, I do have some concerns. I would question why a successful resource is to be considered for closure. Perhaps it could be modified and slimmed down, with effective use made of current staffing expertise.	I am particularly worried that the needs of well behaved pupils with severely disordered language will be overlooked. During the ten years I have worked at Ellington I have supported several children who have been quiet and withdrawn when they have entered the Resource. These particular pupils have had severely disordered language and have lacked confidence and self esteem to interact with peers and adults. They have benefited enormously from attending the Resource in terms of their improved language skills and their resulting confidence and emotional well-being. Young children with speech and language disorder find it difficult to access the lessons in the mainstream classroom due to their limited language and so often become withdrawn. By attending small groups from an early age these children benefit from restricted language and the resulting improved understanding and consequent self confidence. This means that they can often be re-integrated into the main class in KS2.	Teaching Assistant
54	1	I feel that the Speech and Language Unit supports children with very specific needs. In a mainstream setting, even with their needs identified, these children may often be misjudged as disruptive and non-co-operative. Therefore they may not receive the support and understanding they deserve. The children may then go on to lack self esteem and confidence and ultimately withdraw from education.	Ellington has a fantastic Nursery so is therefore in a position to support children with speech and language difficulties at the earliest possible stage of their education.	Teaching Assistant
55	3	In the Consultation Paper one reason for seeking change is given as "The need to intervene earlier and more effectively". The Nursery at Ellington is a prime example of where intervention is being made early and where excellent support is provided for those children with the speech and language needs.	If Option 3 were to be adopted it is logical to locate the new teaching base at Ellington School where the Head is very supportive and there is physical space where children can be taken out of the classroom and taught in small groups when necessary.	Teaching Assistant
56	1	I have worked in the Speech and Language Resource for several years and agree with my colleague's comments.	In addition, I feel that because these children form a collective group, they gain confidence from each other rather than being a single individual with a difficulty. They bond together and look after each other in the Resource.	Teaching Assistant

57	1	The SAMS service was set up as it was considered preferable to teach ASD children at their local mainstream school and it has provided a specialist service for almost 200 children who have an Autistic Spectrum Disorder for eight years. The consultation document talks about reaching more children but currently this specialist service does manage to reach all children in RBWM who have ASD and attend mainstream school. The greatest worry with the proposal of becoming a Communication and Interaction service is that the now specialist service will become diluted. Autism is a different way of thinking - it is a difference culture - and social understanding is it's biggest deficit. I wonder if the folks making the decision to change the service understand the nature of Autism.	The proposed service sounds like it may not address all of the needs of the pupils with autism - specialists need to be on hand who understand the nature and culture of autism. Without staff trained extensively in autism awareness then more pupils are likely to end up in 'out of county' placements, as was the case before SAMS and AURA were in place. Why change something which works so well, has good results and with which the service users are happy? The only reason for doing this must be a cost cutting one.	Other - BAS development worker (cat as Assistant)
58	1	See letter	See letter	Headteacher
59 and 60	3	See letter	See letter	Teachers in charge
61	None	Not enough information	Concerned that too many might have unmet needs in mainstream; strong need for good outreach	Local voluntary organisation