



Question 14: What needs to be in place in order to distribute existing funding more effectively to alternative provision schools, to ensure they have the financial stability required to deliver our vision for more early intervention and re-integration?

SNJ's response to Question 14	1
Responses from parents/SNJ readers	2
	2
	3
	3
	3

SNJ's response to Question 14

1. While we agree with the plans for providing stable funding for alternative provision settings, we have already detailed in the previous question the inappropriateness of the DfE's plans.
2. To note that the "clear expectations" on LAs to create and distribute an alternative provision-specific budget "ideally for a minimum of 3 years... to give alternative provision schools the funding stability to deliver a service focused on early intervention" isn't a legal duty.
3. You must also consider how Ofsted will hold them to account - it's one thing to say to an LA, "you should be doing this" it's another to make them change their ways.
4. You might also consider whether early intervention funding should be focused on helping children as issues emerge, not when they're in danger of heading for a PRU.
5. Your proposals that Local Partnerships will decide how many placement types will be needed each year, how much they should cost etc, means that there will be a great demand on them - how are they to be staffed

and who will fund the LPs? How will they be trained to make funding decisions and what if their funding decisions are insufficient? How will they be held to account?

6. How could resource mapping (understanding what exists) be used? Part of this also needs to include skills mapping, as APs will need far more than robust behaviour policies to deliver anything effective, and extensive training is likely to be needed
 7. How should accountability be measured from local authority, school, and family perspectives?
 8. How should AP and special school outreach to mainstream schools be funded so that the source schools don't suffer from loss of resource themselves?
-

Responses from parents/SNJ readers

NB: These views are those of parents for whom we have acted as a conduit for their response to the Green Paper. The views expressed from here are not necessarily those held by Special Needs Jungle.



1. I do agree that APs should be able to plan more effectively but I don't know enough about what removing funding from the pupil would mean to that pupil. The key thing is that pupils must be able to attend the school or setting that meets their needs regardless of how the funding is worked out in the background. It seems that funding following children should continue AS WELL as funding the APs properly. So more funding is needed.
2. AP support is not an "early intervention" as it is usually something that happens later on in a child's education when other placements have failed. However, a good AP can really make a positive change to a child's education and life and I think they are a good thing.
3. My point is they do not currently cater for the highly anxious children like my daughter who is not able to attend a mainstream school. This is something that needs to be addressed. Special calm and therapeutic units would be a great help.

4. Most APs take in children with behaviour problems and I think their aim is to address the needs behind the behaviour and properly help the child. All of this is great but there is no room for the highly anxious children who would not fit in with the challenging behaviour kids. The anxious kids are usually not causing any behaviour problems; they just can't attend the mainstream school as they feel totally overwhelmed by it.
5. The mainstream schools focused on punctuality, discipline and results do not work for SO MANY children especially SEN children and this is why there is such a massive need outside of mainstream.
6. I do not think the Local Partnership should decide how many placements of each type are needed – what happens if too many of one type are needed one year – how flexible would they be?
7. So my answer to this question is = more funding is needed to ensure APs are working well. Also, I suggest APs are expanded to include a “calm and therapeutic” section for the anxious children who cannot attend mainstream. This again would require more funding.



1. I strongly disagree with the premise of this question. Funding should be used to support SEND children in their schools - not to shunt them into AP. AP is not 'early intervention' - if things have reached a point where sending the child to AP is being considered, things have already gone badly wrong. AP should never be used as early intervention! The early intervention should be in school.



1. This seems like a bad idea and doesn't understand the nature of SEND children. The vision appears to be about saving money and ignoring the needs of SEND children. Whilst re-integration is a great idea, the first priority should be to give these children the best life opportunities through getting them to achieve their potential



1. All I would ask is whether intervention really can be classed as “early” if a child has arrived in AP without a full needs assessment beforehand?