

## Appendix 1: Consultation Responses – Policy Positions

Question Number	Survey Section	Policy Position	Responses	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
				Count	Proportion	Count	Proportion	Count	Proportion	Count	Proportion	Count	Proportion
6	Guiding Principles	A transparent, choice of provision and providers should be available to students and families.	54	48	88.89	5	9.26	1	1.85	0	0.00	0	0.00
7	Guiding Principles	Clear and consistent pathways should be offered within Wolverhampton's high needs estate.	54	46	85.19	7	12.96	1	1.85	0	0.00	0	0.00
8	Guiding Principles	A broad range of high needs provision, including a comprehensive graduated response, should be available within the City.	53	43	81.13	9	16.98	1	1.89	0	0.00	0	0.00
9	Guiding Principles	High quality, local solutions should be developed to support a reduction in the required number of out of city placements.	54	40	74.07	12	22.22	2	3.70	0	0.00	0	0.00
10	Guiding Principles	Solutions should be developed to offer opportunities for students with SEND to attend mainstream provision, unless doing so would be incompatible with the provision of efficient education.	54	31	57.41	15	27.78	5	9.26	1	1.85	2	3.70
11	Policy	The City of Wolverhampton Council should work closely with health partners when planning or proposing changes to the high needs estate in the City.	54	39	72.22	13	24.07	2	3.70	0	0.00	0	0.00
12	Policy	A longer term, estate wide approach to the development of the high needs estate should be adopted that both maximises the use of existing facilities and develops flexible local provision.	53	34	64.15	15	28.30	4	7.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
13	Mainstream	The vast majority of students with SEND in Wolverhampton should access mainstream school provision.	54	16	29.63	14	25.93	14	25.93	6	11.11	4	7.41
14	Mainstream	The accessibility of mainstream facilities should be considered within the design and delivery of all school capital projects commissioned by the Council.	53	29	54.72	15	28.30	7	13.21	2	3.77	0	0.00
15	Resource Bases	A broad geographic spread of resource base provision should be developed across the City.	54	24	44.44	18	33.33	8	14.81	4	7.41	0	0.00
16	Resource Bases	A range of resource bases to cater for the broad areas of need identified in the SEND Code of Practice should be developed.	53	33	62.26	13	24.53	4	7.55	3	5.66	0	0.00
17	Resource Bases	Opportunities to extend the range of needs that existing resource bases cater for (excluding sensory resource bases) should be explored.	53	28	52.83	14	26.42	5	9.43	3	5.66	3	5.66
18a	Resource Bases	To what extent do you agree that school performance should be considered when prioritising the potential development of resource base provision in the City?	54	21	38.89	22	40.74	7	12.96	3	5.56	1	1.85
18b	Resource Bases	To what extent do you agree that Leadership should be considered when prioritising the potential development of resource base provision in the City?	52	25	48.08	20	38.46	4	7.69	2	3.85	1	1.92
18c	Resource Bases	To what extent do you agree that local needs should be considered when prioritising the potential development of resource base provision in the City?	53	29	54.72	19	35.85	3	5.66	1	1.89	1	1.89
18d	Resource Bases	To what extent do you agree that viability should be considered when prioritising the potential development of resource base provision in the City?	52	23	44.23	23	44.23	2	3.85	3	5.77	1	1.92
19	Resource Bases	The Council will consider the discontinuance of maintained resource base provision if a setting meets two or more of the following criteria.	54	18	33.33	16	29.63	10	18.52	7	12.96	3	5.56
20	Special Schools	Special schools in the city should offer a minimum of 75 places and a maximum of 250 places.	52	13	25.00	9	17.31	18	34.62	7	13.46	5	9.62
21	Special Schools	The expansion of existing special schools should be investigated in the first instance, prior to considering the introduction of new provision.	53	17	32.08	15	28.30	18	33.96	1	1.89	2	3.77
22	Special Schools	Special school age ranges should be consistently aligned to standard mainstream transition points.	54	14	25.93	16	29.63	9	16.67	8	14.81	7	12.96
23	Special Schools	The development of both all-through special school provision and primary and secondary phase special school provision should be explored.	52	20	38.46	23	44.23	8	15.38	1	1.92	0	0.00
24	Special Schools	The Council will consider the discontinuance of maintained special school provision if a setting meets two or more of the following criteria.	54	12	22.22	16	29.63	7	12.96	14	25.93	5	9.26
25	PRUs and AP	PRUs in the City should not exceed 120FTE places	52	19	36.54	7	13.46	16	30.77	8	15.38	2	3.85
26	PRUs and AP	The age ranges of PRUs in Wolverhampton should be consistently aligned to standard mainstream transition points	54	17	31.48	20	37.04	13	24.07	2	3.70	2	3.70
27	PRUs and AP	Local PRUs should provide distinct provision for students with mental and physical health difficulties and students with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties.	55	26	47.27	17	30.91	10	18.18	2	3.64	0	0.00
28	PRUs and AP	Opportunities to house distinct alternative provision on separate sites should be explored.	54	16	29.63	17	31.48	20	37.04	0	0.00	1	1.85
29	PRU and AP	The Council will consider the discontinuance of maintained PRU provision if a setting meets two or more of the following criteria.	53	16	30.19	15	28.30	12	22.64	7	13.21	3	5.66
30	Post 19	Young people with SEND in Wolverhampton should be provided with a choice of appropriate high-quality provision from a diverse range of local post 19 educational providers.	54	43	79.63	9	16.67	2	3.70	0	0.00	0	0.00
31	Policy	The City of Wolverhampton Council should explore opportunities to work closely with neighbouring LAs when commissioning provision for students with SEND.	54	31	57.41	17	31.48	5	9.26	0	0.00	1	1.85