

Outcome of initial consultation on a proposal to Decommission the Resourced Provision at Gledhow Primary School from September 2022.

Representations received during initial consultation period (6th January 2022 – 3rd February 2022)

Response no.	Response	Comments
1	Neither support nor oppose	This is a decision that was clearly made many years prior to this consultation if the only child in Resourced Provision is In Year 6. I have no idea what the Levels of Need are across the city for children with Developmental Language Disorder and Speech Sound Disorders, however I am aware as a qualified Speech and Language Therapist that these children rarely receive the amount of therapy recommended by the evidence base. If you cannot speak it compromises your life chances as these children struggle to make friends or succeed academically. I would suggest this decision is based on funding cuts as not every school in Leeds cannot be adequately resourced to support the particular needs of this group of children.
2	Strongly oppose	My ■■■ has attended on the speech and language resource place since reception. In my opinion ■■■ has received more support from this place, than he would in Main Stream school with support.
3	Strongly support	No comment provided.
4	Strongly support	Better for children to get support locally.
5	Strongly oppose	Pupils with severe speech and language disorders require more intensive intervention than that which can be offered by all schools through SALT programmes. Pupils accessing a small classroom base and benefiting from intensive daily therapeutic work with a speech therapist can make significantly more progress than a peer in mainstream provision. I feel that instead of closing the provision, the local authority should instead work on publicising that the resource exists - as I had no idea as a ■■■ in the city - and also how you access places in the provision/the criteria.
6	Neither support nor oppose	While we recognise that children who require a specialist provision are not attending Gledhow we want consideration of the alternative provision as this needs to be right in order for children to make progress and meet their outcomes when not in a specialist provision. In Leeds there is a need for specialist provision for children with a diagnosis of DLD/SSD. This provision should provide and evidence based model of delivery. Evidence Based for children with complex SLCN indicates that an SLT deliver the interventions rather than a TA which can work for those with less complex needs. In the past, Language Resource settings commissioned SLT to deliver interventions 3 x a week. Most recently the commissioning only allows for weekly SLT input reducing progress towards outcomes (Grimesyke and Gledhow). Where schools Traded for SLT time (either from NHS provider or independent SLTs) this is possible with sufficient level of commissioning. However, the language resource model also enables specialist development of skills for Teaching staff and access to specialist resources. Some schools do not use FFI appropriately for SLT time and therefore the staff and child do not benefit from the evidence based intervention from an SLT. We are concerned that the alternative provision has not been specified and families choice is reduced. We want to be confident that our SLT teams are making the right recommendations for EHCP requests in local mainstream settings and that locals schools understand what provision is needed for this population.
7	Strongly support	I want children to feel more comfortable during the session in their mainstream school.
8	Strongly support	There will be no children accessing the resource Sept 2022 . Speech and language needs are being met elsewhere in city

9	Somewhat support	Reduced demand for provision.
10	Strongly support	there is no child in school after this academic year who is part of the speech and language resource unit, therefore, the resource could be better utilised in school supporting children with EHC plans or specific SEN needs.
11	Strongly support	Children are now accessing speech and language therapy for DLD through city wide pathways, which has led to reduced numbers in Gledhow's resource. As the numbers are so low (currently 1 child) the offer is not able to be broad and extensive as it once was, and does not deliver much beyond a mainstream school. The school is at financial detriment by having the resource while it is undersubscribed, which is not good use of public money.
12	Strongly support	It is more beneficial for children to go to a school in their community where they will make friends and community links. Language support can be delivered in schools without having to transport children across the city.
13	Somewhat support	Although I would normally not support reducing any kind of provision in schools the evidence in this case points to there being a reduction in need and no children being directly impacted by this proposed change. It seems therefore to be a needless use of funds.
14	Strongly oppose	SENSAP are poor now, but there are provisions available. Quite why you would want to reduce choice is beyond me.
15	Strongly oppose	As a lifelong stammerer, I was taken out of my school as child to attend speech therapy courses for a week at a time, across the other side of my city. My mother didn't drive. 2 buses, early starts. I felt alone. Not only did it disrupt my education, but it caused a disconnect. I felt different & non of my school peers understood stammering. Bullying was rife & I was the target many times. If I had had support in my school, the teachers would have understood more about stammering & could have helped the other children understand too. My education would not have been interrupted periodically & I would have felt included rather than different. My [redacted] suddenly developed a stammer when [redacted] was [redacted] years old. I was on it straight away. I knew to refer to SALT via GP. There was a significant wait, but as a [redacted] myself, I knew how to push [redacted] through the waiting list to get therapy. If I had not been a stammerer myself, or a [redacted], I honestly think we would have waited twice as long. The therapy was excellent. One should not underestimate the psychological damage having a speech impediment can have. Being able to access services locally & easily in school, will prevent thousands of children being psychologically scarred & encourages it to be seen as normal, by their school friends & teachers.
16	Neither support nor oppose	There may be no current need however we might need it again (or an equal service) in the future. It would be good to have this service mothballed until such time that a better offer is available.
17	Strongly support	There is little need for it in our area. The setting hasn't been full for several years.
18	Strongly oppose	Children already at a disadvantage due to their development are required to take further time out of classes to attend another setting, putting further burden on travel for parents also. It believe it would be much more beneficial to keep them at Gledhow where they build a rapport with the team who can easily feedback to teachers and vice versa, producing a much more productive and valuable service.