

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY RESPONSES

Proposal 1

Align and integrate teams and personnel so that the structure enables efficient and effective service delivery and removes duplication. Where staff and teams are pupil facing; improve outcomes.

For example:

An aspect of the Early Intervention Grant/Early Years EIT is to move 3 teams – the Specialist Learning Team; LACE Team (Looked After Children in Education) and Returners (Redhill) from Complex and Additional Needs to School Effectiveness. This proposal would ensure that due attention is paid to ensuring that these teams are appropriately integrated into School Effectiveness.

This proposal could include a recommendation to make the most of the Workforce Development staff resource involving links with schools; social care; health; private and voluntary sector under the overall umbrella of Children’s Workforce.

Through this proposal we could strengthen the focus on Governor Development

Response to Proposal 1

Four respondents disagreed with the proposal and four respondents did not agree or disagree. The links that need to be maintained between the Specialist Learning and Complex and Additional Needs teams was raised by several of these respondents, with one response requesting reassurance that this would not be lost in the wider school effectiveness agenda. There was also requests for clarification of the statement ‘through this proposal we could strengthen the focus on Governor Development’ and the potential for job losses.

Two of the responses received agreed with the proposal, one of which came via discussion at a team meeting. Numerous reasons for why the proposal was seen as positive was given, including:

- Brings a cohesive service, everyone understands what support is available
- Logical rationalisation of specialist learning team, LACE to Redhill to the more school facing service. There already are links.
- New proposed alignment would offer opportunities for measuring impact of work, avoiding repetition

The team also requested more information about the current roles and responsibilities of the LACE teams.

Proposal 2

Review and strengthen business models for “buy back” services so that we can compete with other providers of the same services.

For example:

A number of services within School Effectiveness are detailed in the single Prospectus of Services to Schools e.g. Governor Support; Schools ICT Unit; Workforce Development and School Improvement. These services are designed as effective business models to enable them to compete in the service market and meet the needs of schools.

Response to Proposal 2

Five responses agreed with the proposal, believing “value for money for customers must be ensured”, and that the strengthened business model not only made the service “indispensable” to schools with the LA boundary, but also “could be bought by other local authorities”. It was also questioned whether different models were needed between schools and settings and a concern was raised that if the LA does not get this it may lead to an increase in illegal child minders and a decrease in Ofsted rating.

The remaining five responses neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal, with two responses questioning whether there were other providers to compete with the service. One response also noted that “the service model requires review and strengthening”.

Proposal 3

Design a “whole system” school improvement model, rooted in collaboration with Stockton Schools so that we can build capacity for school to school support and include a cost recovery mechanism for the LA and participating schools.

For example:

By “whole system” we mean one that addresses the improvement agenda in all schools and embodies the CAMPUS Stockton ethos of schools working with schools, to support each other in a structure partnership model that is designed with openness to cost recovery. It will enable the opportunity to develop a model that is consistent with emerging LA and school role in relation to School Improvement.

Response to Proposal 3

Three respondents agreed with the proposal, with respondents believing that this could “improve struggling schools and spread good practice”, and that “failure to have a whole school model may result in schools going their own way”. It was recognised that the model needed to be flexible to react to changing needs and ensure that schools are properly resourced to ensure the “supporting” schools are not weakened.

The majority of the responses (6) did not agree or disagree to the proposal, and respondents requested further information before they could make a judgement. Similarly, only one respondent disagreed with the proposal, and stated that they were not opposed to the proposal, but needed further clarification on what the ‘whole system’ would look like.

Proposal 4

Bring forward options that create capacity and resources in business planning and commissioning and that will support schools in what they see as strategic partnership priorities.

For example:

The aim of this proposal is to develop options for a cost effective business planning and commissioning function and to consider the school view of gaps in strategic priorities, for example, support for safeguarding in schools.

Response to Proposal 4

The majority of the responses (7) did not agree or disagree with the proposal, believing it to not be relevant to their service or needing further clarification. Three responses agreed with the proposal, believing it to be “appropriate for the environment we are now working in”.

Proposal 5

To review terms and conditions/contractual arrangements currently within the School Effectiveness (Children, Schools and Complex Needs) Service as there are employees on a range of different terms and conditions.

For example

Through the Review we could ensure that staff are on appropriate terms and conditions.

Response to Proposal 5

Five responses did not agree or disagree with the proposal, stating that they needed to understand how the recommendation would impact on staff before agreeing/disagreeing. It was also questioned whether this would take into account budgets from which teams are paid from. Three responses disagreed with the proposals, stating the same reasons as noted above.

One response agreed with the proposal, and one response both agreed and disagreed. The reasons given for agreeing to the proposal included that a review of terms and conditions was overdue and this would clarify conditions for staff. It was also noted that “salaries for LA staff working with schools need to be sufficiently aligned to school salaries to attract competent staff”.

Proposal 6

To monitor the impact of other reviews/changes on service levels and outcomes for children.

For example:

Take account of the Inclusion Review; Early Years strand of EIG; Children’s Social Care Review

Response to Proposal 6

The majority of responses (6) agreed with the proposal, noting the importance of monitoring the impact of reviews. It was also noted the importance in involving all stakeholders, in both informing stakeholders how the changes would impact on them and receiving feedback on how they were working.

The remaining four responses neither agreed nor disagreed, with one response stating they needed further clarification before making a decision.

Proposal 7

Re align premature retirement and redundancy costs

For example:

Reduce budgetary provision by £200k per annum reflecting decreasing payments to the pension fund and a lower call on the use of the funds from schools

Response to Proposal 7

Two responses agreed and two responses disagreed with this proposal. The remaining six responses did not agree or disagree. There was concern that it was not an appropriate time to decrease payments to the pension fund when the majority of staff in one team were over 50.

Additional Comments

The majority of the additional comments received were regarding the timescales for the consultation. As noted above, in response to these comments the timescale were extended to give staff more time to fully consider the proposals and discuss them with their colleagues, union representatives, etc.

List of All Responses

No	Proposal 1 Align and integrate teams and personnel so that the structure enables efficient and effective service delivery and removes duplication. Where staff and teams are pupil facing; improve outcomes.	
	Agree	Comment
1	N	I am unable to agree with this until my queries are answered; Has there been an assessment of potential job loses as a result of the proposed integration? What does 'Through this proposal we could strengthen the focus on Governor Development' mean?
2	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings cohesive service everyone understands what support is available. • Staged integration physical, conditions of service etc to give parity of offer. • Effective deployment of staff initial particularly related to governor support/Work Force Development. • Redhill would benefit from strong strategic development to ensure that the educational provision is central. PRU strategic management could be extended to Redhill. • Workforce development - clearer and consistent consultation with schools and workforce would strengthen the offer and ensure training was tailored to specific needs. • Agree logical rationalisation of specialist learning team, LACE to Redhill to the more school facing service. There already are links. • Agree this would streamline and integrate provision across these elements of children's services. • Agree would link to proposal 2 for Work Force Development and bring school governing bodies more closely in line with our provision. • Ensure that there is alignment of deployment of services so there is consistency therefore schools get a consistent message from LA cohesive package. • SGSS need to be part of the school improvement agenda and be guided about appropriate educational development. • Delivery of courses for Work Force Development/ GTP/NQT need to be focused on using the expertise of EIS staff and then a comprehensive package. Who generates the package? • New proposed alignment would offer opportunities for measuring impact of work avoiding repetition. • Group would appreciate more information about the current roles/responsibility of LACE teams etc. • Some group members noted proposal 1 aligns to current EIS agenda of school capacity. • Group members appreciated the value of co-ordinated more strategic multi-agency working. • Represents a more holistic approach – good sense • Closer work between LAC and Behaviour would support pupils. Better to link learning and behaviour support. • Need to support staff coming in to feel fully in part of team and not just 'Done to!'

List of All Responses

3	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p> <p>As the SLT is moving into the EIS then agree that we move into a structure that enables efficient and effective service delivery. The team strives now to improve outcomes for children and our work would continue to do this. The SLT is not aware of any duplication of their work in the EIS.</p>
4	N	<p>If this proposal was taken forward then care needs to be taken when moving these teams that connections with CAN are observed that there are still strong links with for example EPS. That the focus of the SLT remains on pupil facing, teaching and assessment/monitoring of children with Specific Learning Difficulties. Strong links for immediate school support. Maintaining these links are key drivers to improving outcomes for the Specialist Learning Team.</p>
5	N	<p>I believe our Specialist Learning Team would be more suited to maintain links with Complex and Additional Needs as we have always had close links with the EPS and have been effective within the CAN team. Although our aim is to improve outcomes, and we have achieved this, I do not believe joining School Effectiveness is the most appropriate structure for our team to deliver effectively. We are a team of nine teachers covering all Stockton schools and cannot stretch ourselves further to achieve impossible outcomes in the schools we visit.</p>
6	Y	
7	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p>
8	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to know whether there has been any assessment of potential job losses as a result of Proposal 1? If there has, then the information should be included and if not – why not? • What does 'strengthen the focus on Governor Development' actually mean? I don't understand this point. • What are 'Returners'? This is not the correct name for our service!
9	NA	
10	NA	<p>In order to be able to agree with this comment, we would need reassurance that the complex needs and requirements for the children covered by these teams would not be lost in the wider school effectiveness agenda</p>
		<p>Proposal 2 Review and strengthen business models for "buy back" services so that we can compete with other providers of the same services.</p>
Agree		Comment
1	Y	

List of All Responses

2	Y	<p>Opportunity to develop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cohesive team approach. • Clarification of business model. • Value for money for customers must be ensured. • Schools ICT unit needs aligning and quality assured. • Agree need to compete in a changing market. We know our schools and can engage in longer term support. Need to ensure we are a high quality service and the provider of first choice. The situation of a schools budget will impact on this. • Need to position ourselves as indispensable to our schools and position model which can be bought by other local authorities. • There are embryonic model eg behaviour support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain aspects for Stockton schools should be centrally funded by council. Eg SIA visits enable discussions to take place which highlight where additional support is needed and EIS can intervene. • What do we understand as criteria for core and where do we make additional charges. • Are additional charges pay as you go or small package? • VFM needs i/c relationships. • HTPM could be charged as detailed above. • Core enhanced model evaluated positively. • Marketing strategies need to be strengthened to position our clients to pay for EIS quality services and compete against other businesses. • Need to be very consciously responsive to school needs and encouraging core offers, package offers significant concern re private provider nurseries ability to pay for support, risk of us missing children particular vulnerable. Do we need different model between schools and settings? <p>(eg nominal payment) If we don't get it right will see increase of illegal child minders and Ofsted will go down.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools need to properly understand what new teams look like.
3	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p> <p>Would agree that the SLT could be delivered as a 'buy back' service and that the service model requires review and strengthening.</p>
4	NA	<p>There are no other providers to compete with The Specialist learning Team so not sure how a buy back model would at present be implemented.</p>
5	NA	<p>I am not aware of any other existing service that provides the level of expertise (Literacy and Numeracy) that the Specialist Learning Team provides, hence I cannot conceive who the 'other providers' are.</p>
6	Y	
7	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p>

List of All Responses

8	Y	
9	NA	
10	Y	
<p>Proposal 3 Design a “whole system” school improvement model, rooted in collaboration with Stockton Schools so that we can build capacity for school to school support and include a cost recovery mechanism for the LA and participating schools.</p>		
	Agree	Comment
1	N	I am not opposed to this but would like to receive further clarification on what the ‘whole system’ would look like.
2	Y	<p>Additional observations/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure not to have a whole school improvement model may result in schools going their own way. • Depends on agreement at all levels. • Marketing V Fire fighting. Important to recognise the quality of provision and this is often done through attaching charge to the provision. • Co-ordination and consistency extremely important across teams. • In new climate we need to work in close collaboration with our schools but co-ordinating and directly supporting schools as necessary because schools will be the budget holders. This funding mechanism would need to be centrally managed and most likely from the LA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree give up SCC funding. • Agree move away from focus of identified underperforming schools. • Agree that formal partnerships should not develop in an ad hoc manner need to be co-ordinated and have a governance model which includes monitoring and evaluation of impact/capacity for continuing work. • Cost recovery clearly set out. • Need to consider what capacity looks like through school eg SLT/Curriculum leaders etc. • Dynamic model which is bespoke and reacts to changing needs there needs to be a fluidity not set in stone relationships = Key • Is EIS skill capacity used as effectively as possible? We have potentially a wider skill set than any one school via a more co-ordinated approach, focussing on capacity building. • We need to develop a more proactive model of school improvement, rather than a re-active one.

List of All Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we get this right we tie LA and schools together, including to each other. Need to ensure schools are properly resourced. If they are to support each other without weakening 'supporting' school. • Again we need to ensure we support all schools to reduce risk at underperformance, support good performance and celebrate and share best practise in our schools. • This is work that many in the service are already involved in. • Build further on Ofsted support. • Benefit from actively looking for good practise in our schools which can be shared with our schools generally. They should not need to go to another LA. • Can SIA report include a section good practise that could be shared?
3	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p> <p>As not sure how SLT is going to fit into the 'model' and what the expectations from the team are to be then struggle to comment on this proposal.</p>
4	NA	<p>This seems to be a statement that is very complex and would need much more discussion to agree or disagree. I would need to understand the implications on the Specialist Learning Team of any proposals before agreeing or disagreeing.</p>
5	NA	<p>This is a management issue and therefore not applicable to our service.</p>
6	Y	
7	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p>
8	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither – I would need further clarification on what this means before making a decision
9	NA	
10	Y	<p>Could improve struggling schools and spread good practice</p>
<p>Proposal 4 Bring forward options that create capacity and resources in business planning and commissioning and that will support schools in what they see as strategic partnership priorities.</p>		
	Agree	Comment
1	Y	

List of All Responses

2	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to bring a 'business' approach • Key person/interface with schools on all matters relating to social care extremely valuable. • Resources must include additional quality and specialist (but pragmatic) staff • Definitely requires context co-ordinator of allocation of service areas school and collection of funding. • Total agreement re business manager given up post (CR) but feel a co-ordinated post would serve us well. Would make current colleagues more efficient in work not dealing with forums etc throughout having bigger picture. • Social care post re CP a definite • Well supported – group believed this was entirely appropriate for the environment we are now working in. • Support class routes around social care and child protection within an education focus. • Agree need for business manager.
3	NA	Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.
4	NA	Not sure of the relevance to my working environment.
5	NA	This is not applicable to our service and is a management issue.
6	Y	
7	NA	Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal we feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.
8	NA	• Neither – I would need further clarification on what this actually means, I don't understand the proposal
9	NA	
10	NA	
<p>Proposal 5 To review terms and conditions/contractual arrangements currently within the School Effectiveness (Children, Schools and Complex Needs) Service as there are employees on a range of different terms and conditions.</p>		
	Agree	Comment
1	N	am unable to agree to this as I have no idea how it would affect me personally.

List of All Responses

2	Y&N	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to understand implications to make an informed decision. • However need to consider consistency of day to day working conditions eg flexi time. • Value is attached to job grades. • Should be aligned within teams or similar posts. • A review of terms and conditions is overdue and will bring an opportunity to match jobs to pay. Roles have changed over time and this is an opportunity to rationalise simplify and make the system fairer. • Review how SPAs are determined re Soulbury officers clarity due process require consideration link to line management/appraisal process. • Staff require clarity about T&Cs eg toil/flexible working. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure clarity between, council conditions and Soulbury conditions. • Salaries for LA staff working with schools need to be sufficiently aligned to school salaries to attract competent staff. • Salary structures need to be appropriate to roles. • Conditions need to be clear eg flexi, toil, leave in term time. • Leave arrangements need to be consistent with needs of service <p>Disagree</p> <p>Some group members expressed concern about potential reduction in salary as a result of this review. Implication for some group members would make employment back in school more cost effective.</p> <p>Some group members believed review salary/TC alignment would make teams more co-ordinated/harmonious</p>
3	NA	<p>Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.</p> <p>Would this also take into account the budgets from which the teams are paid from i.e. Direct school grant.</p>
4	N	<p>I would need to be clear on the value of such a proposal.</p>
5	N	<p>This proposal may mean a worsening of conditions for some staff, although it could be argued that some staff should be on an enhanced salary and would welcome this review.</p>
6	Y	
7	NA	<p>The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to specific proposals . Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document's terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means.</p>
8	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither – I cannot make a comment because there is no indication on how the proposal would impact on my own terms and conditions. I am not going to make a decision on something which may have a negative impact for me.
9	NA	
10	NA	

List of All Responses

Proposal 6 To monitor the impact of other reviews/changes on service levels and outcomes for children.		
	Agree	Comment
1	Y	
2	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree to monitor, evaluate and review practice in light of findings. • Who will monitor? And what? • Important feedback is from all stakeholders. • Clarity about which outcomes. • Definitely need to monitor the impact of inclusion and EIG changes and particularly the quality and capacity of delivery for schools. Some schools not sure how the changes are going to impact they need more information on provision and support resulting from the new structure. • Co-location very positive and efficient • Review did result in streamlining approach but impact not fully known and needs to be monitored. • Capacity for future could have been detrimentally affected by cuts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools understanding of impact and work they need to do and take ownership. Eg behaviour management • Need to be clear about the impact of the review in order to inform future strategic/operational direction • Viewed as a supportive/proactive approach including all stakeholders (including schools/settings) • Some concern at what is happening to children's centres and PRU nursery groups and how this will impact on vulnerable children. • Need to continue to monitor impact if we get it wrong impact on vulnerable groups is less. • Inclusion team has been strengthened and strong line.
3	NA	Whilst we don't necessarily disagree with this proposal feel we can't provide written agreement as the time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to this specific proposal.
4	Y	Monitoring is important for any reviews or changes particularly to ensure the primacy of pupil facing teaching.
5	Y	Monitoring is always very important and any reviews or changes should have the best outcomes for children as their primary objective.
6	Y	
7	NA	The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to specific proposals . Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document's terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means.
8	NA	• Neither – I would need further clarification on what this means before making a decision
9	NA	

List of All Responses

10	Y	
Proposal 7 Re align premature retirement and redundancy costs		
	Agree	Comment
1	N	I am unable to agree to this at the moment until it is explained more fully; how would it affect individuals?
2	Y	Additional observations/comments: Caution this is us as well! Agree no need to keep budgetary provision if not needed.
3	NA	The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to specific proposals . Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document, terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means.
4	NA	I would need to understand a full proposal on this issue before responding..
5	N	Most of our team are in their 50's – this is not an appropriate time to be decreasing payments to the pension fund. Moreover, this would obviously involve serious consultation with the teaching unions to clarify this issue.
6	Y	
7	NA	The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via forum or ask questions related to specific proposals . Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document's terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means.
8	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither – I would need further clarification on what this means before making a decision
9	NA	
10	NA	
Additional Comments		
1		The time scale for responses is unacceptable for staff on teachers pay and conditions. We have been unable to get together as a team to discuss because half of my staff do not work on a Friday; I have posted the proposals out to their home addresses otherwise they would not even see the proposals until the day we are supposed to have the responses in by. Staff I have spoken to, feel they need time to take advice from their Unions before they agree to anything and request you arrange a meeting after half term to allow staff the chance to be able to ask questions and get clarification on some of the proposals.
2		

List of All Responses

3		<p>The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via a forum or meeting to ask questions related to specific proposals . This consultation document questionnaire arrived by email Thursday afternoon 9/2/12. Four of the Specialist Learning Team staff do not work on Fridays and the team is term time only so have returned to work today and due to commitments will not be able to meet until the staff meeting on Wednesday. Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document's terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means. This means that as a team and individuals due to the above reasons we cannot agree or disagree at this point without opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via a forum or meeting to ask questions related to specific proposals and terminology .</p>
4		
5		<p>Why has this consultation document been rushed out just before the half-term week when our team was unable to meet as a group and discuss this.</p>
6		
7		<p>The time period for this consultation has been unacceptable and there is no opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via a forum or meeting to ask questions related to specific proposals . This consultation document questionnaire arrived by email Thursday afternoon 9/2/12. Two of the LACE team staff do not work on Fridays and the team is term time only so have returned to work today and due to commitments will not be able to meet until the end of the day. Some team members would like to consult with their unions regarding this document's terminology and clarify what agreement at this stage means. This means that as a team and individuals due to the above reasons we cannot agree or disagree at this point without opportunity to discuss this with colleagues or consult via a forum or meeting to ask questions related to specific proposals and terminology .</p>
8		<p>I would like to say that the timescale for response to these proposals is totally unrealistic and unacceptable. It is obvious that our service (Redhill Education Service for children with medical needs) is going to be greatly affected by these proposals. I think that we should be given adequate time to discuss the proposals and be allowed to take union advice before making any decisions. I feel that we are being rushed to make decisions before a deadline of the 20th. I received this email yesterday pm, today (Friday) is a normal teaching day, we are on half term break next week then Mon 20th is a normal working day. When am I supposed to discuss or take advice? This is all too rushed to be able to make informed decisions. We, as a service along with the other teams involved should be invited to a face to face meeting or presentation where we can ask questions, clarify anything not understood and also invite union representation to be present.</p>
9		<p>I would like to point out that the consultation document has been put forward at a time when teachers are on their school holiday. I received the document on Thursday 9th February. I work part-time and do not work on Friday, hence I resent the fact that I am unable to discuss the proposals with my colleagues. You have requested that comments are to be submitted by Monday 20th February, which is the day we return to work. I feel that there has been no time or opportunity for consultation with colleagues and request that we are allowed more time to discuss the proposals as the outcome will impact upon our future.</p>
10		<p>We found it difficult to comment on all these areas, as it was aimed at head teachers and governors, however, we are happy to offer these opinions.</p>