

**SEND Steering Board Meeting
Tuesday 13 November 2018, 12 - 2 pm
Ascot / Bray Room, Ground Floor, Town Hall, Maidenhead**

Present:

Sarah Bellars (Chair) – Director of Nursing and Quality, Clinical Commissioning Group-present
Liz Kelsall (Vice-Chair) – Chair of PaCiP - present
Kevin McDaniel - Director of Children’s Services - present
Alison Crossick – Service Leader, Inclusion and Pupil Support (AfC) - present
Cllr N. Airey – Lead Member for Children’s Services RBWM
Lisa Vickers – Secretary, PaCiP -present
Debbie Hartrick – Designated Clinical Officer SEND, Clinical Commissioning Group
Chris Tomes – Head Teacher, Churchmead School
Helen Alderman - Operational Lead for CAMHS & CYPIT East and Strategic Lead for CYPIT, BHFT - present
Nick Stevens – Head Teacher, Riverside Primary School and Nursery
Joolz Scarlett – Head Teacher, Manor Green School

Apologies:

Karen Cridland – Director of Children’s Service, BHFT
Jennifer Humphreys – Communications and Marketing Officer, RBWM
Louise Kerfoot – Learning Disability Service Manager (Optalis)
Janette Fullwood – Head of CYP&F Clinical Commissioning Group

Minutes:

Delia Smith - Business Support Manager

Minutes

1. Welcome and Apologies

2. Minutes of last meeting, actions and matters arising

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 16 October 2018 were approved and all actions relating to the Written Statement of Action were confirmed as completed.

There was one action outstanding: AC to confirm that the data tech would be ready.

LV queried data sharing and SB confirmed that BHFT submit data to the CCG for monitoring purposes; best practice is to agree with BHFT what data we share, if we want the data on a local level, there is no charge for us to report differently, and HA will take this point back.

KMcD stated that if the system needs to be modified slightly differently in order to have the data in a different way then the question is will there be a cost? HA will take this back.

ACTION: HA to discuss data sharing and costs with BHFT

Feedback on meeting attended by KMcD, SB, LK, AC and visit from Dfe, Charlie Palmer

Due a monitoring visit from the DfE as per KMcD's update, which was the fourth monitoring visit, updates to the minister, wide ranging discussions. Charlie decided he was not going to take the WSoA in its current version that day, but instead wants a final version to be submitted by end of this week. The Steering Board discussed whether our action plan has progressed as much as it looks? LK raised some concerns about the WSoA, and following a previously conversation between LK and SB a report was generated. It was determined that from today the Steering Board want a WSoA that is agreed by all parties.

SB noted that the fundamental question is about how we work together and how we sign off on actions, in agreement. There is a feeling that some of it is around how we structure working groups to report to the Steering Board, how do we support people in their roles to challenge us, as in their role as professionals.

3. Review of the Steering Board Paper (cut and paste from action points and see summary below against each)

i. Review of Report - Please read minutes in conjunction with Appendix A

Action 1.2 a: Agreed to "soft launch"

Action 1.2 b: Agreed for action and progress to read "publish"

Action 1.2 c: Keep blue RAG rating. Going forward will continue the work, evidence the impact.

Action 1.2 d: Not sufficient evidence for action to remain blue.

1.2a to 1.2d. SB stated that we are all in agreement that a Summit was held, a strategy has been published, there is stakeholder engagement, although we are slightly struggling with the evidence of this action.

Action 1.3 bi & ii: On local offer, continuous review (remove word successful), further opportunities to include the link and will continue to review and get the best feedback possible.

SB discussed the SEND Handbook - very positive feedback from Op Area 1 (things we said we would put in it we didn't, they didn't and there are multiple copies on the internet).

LK & LV key noted there were things that stakeholders had agreed to be included that have not been; the 'Golden Binder' (back office operational piece), the view was that this wasn't truly co-produced.

Items detailed on the WSoA have not been included e.g. specific timescales not included,

AC stated that she agrees that things agreed in the statement of action should be included in the Handbook. Two versions of the handbook (old version) still on the local offer.

There is a spelling error noted on page 13.

Action 1.3 c: Concern raised that Kickback is not representative of all children and how to move forward to include wider group.

Action 1.3 d: Change to termly

Action 2.1 a: Amber for one action but if overall outcome is achieved the action can remain blue. If DH gets agreement from the Steering Board that a newsletter is not longer requires as there are other communication avenues then the action remains blue.

Action 2.2 ci: Needs to be carried forward onto next years action plan; to remain blue

Action 2.2 d: Narrative in progress needed to reflect that we have one post doing complex cases and we have increased capacity for a case office.

Action 2.3 biii: It was agreed that the PfA pathway has been introduced and this action remains blue. The Steering Board would like to see continued working in the pathway through the SEND Strategy Implementation Plan.

Action 2.3 bv: DH will take to Berkshire Send Group

Action 3.1 d: Agreed that the action remains blue.

Action 3.2 a: Action does not match the outcome. The outcome will be carried forward into next year's plan, this action is about those in the system who are not getting their needs met.

Action 4.1 a: A link to the Local Offer was suggested

Action 4.1 d: Operational handbook - put all documents available on the Local Offer together in one document, the 'Golden Handbook' (operational handbook), what is our ambition as a local area? Need to explore this and have a conversation about the cost implication / how.

The Steering Board agreed to explore this, come back to next steering board (documents are there just not easy to navigate). Date to be changed to April/June 2019, and the action to be rated 'green'.

Action 4.2 d: Carry forward to next year's action plan

Action 5.1 cii: Carry forward to next year's action plan. It was agreed the action was rated 'blue' prematurely. AC will gather the information from the training.

Action 5.2 b: In doing this work we will communicate what needs to be done (a communications plan hasn't yet been written). In the document we talk about a plan or a strategy, we refer to how we all articulate. KMCD will write a one page communication strategy to cover this and how we all articulate this.

Action: KMCD to write a Communication Strategy

Action 6.1 ai, aii: Cover in handbook discussion

Action 6.1 bi: We have reviewed and refreshed our processes. There is still discussion around how the reported progress delivers the action?

All actions relating to Theme 6 were discussed together: we produced something re, decision making and transparency but how do we know the outcomes have been met? Parents receive feedback via a letter, which always goes out with the reasons for a decision clearly stated. Recently changed the letter and tried to make it more informal. All cases are discussed at a panel.

Action 6.1 c: The positive was the use of the online survey, feedback was polarised. Low volume of data. AC to change progress headline to reflect this conversation.

Action 6.2 d: The action will be updated by HC making sure that as senior quality assurance, the plans and quality of information is of a good standard.

Action 6.3 a: Carry forward to next years plan. The action is complete but the outcome needs to be addressed.

Action 7.3 b: Covered in communication strategy plan

Action 7.3 d: Covered

Action 8.1: Money for schools, plan on how it will be spent, there is no finalised plan, the action is not on track and therefore is rated 'amber'.

Action 8.2 a: A reviewed matrix will be published after consultation with the Schools Forum.

All members of the Steering Board are now in agreement with the status of the action plan.

The Chair thanked all members of the Steering Board as it has been difficult to get to this stage. SB thanked all for the participation in this process, and look at relationships and that people can communicate openly with each other. We need to consider ways to support people who have to challenge.

The working group will be changed to an implementation group going forward with AC as the Chair. The Implementation Group will focus of identifying appropriate actions to meet the desired outcomes.

KMcD stated when we met Charlie Palmer from the DfE he was very positive about moving forward, Our focus will be completing the actions with clear supporting evidence.

9. AOB

LK talked about the pressures PaCiP are under, given the hours and input we have questioned have we got this right? LK stated that the forum have been praised by their peers for the level they are working at and the knowledge they have. LK is concerned about the stress we are under as a committee, and it is with regret that LV has decided to resign. LK is taking stock of where we are at now, and how the forum needs to look in order for her to stay involved, including more parental involvement, and is hoping after November 2018, following a parent carer meeting, to fill more of the roles. If not LK will also have to tender her resignation.

All thanked LV and LK for all they have done.

10. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 11 December 2018, 12.00 - 2.00 pm

APPENDIX A

Purpose of paper

The purpose of this paper is to ensure that the RBWM SEND steering board have shared perception of the status of actions in the WSOA.

Background

Between 3 July 2017 and 7 July 2017, Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission (CQC) conducted a joint inspection of Education, Social care and Health services within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) local area to judge its effectiveness in implementing the special educational needs and disability (SEND) reforms set out in the Children and Families Act 2014. As a result of the findings of the inspection, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) determined that a Written Statement of Action (WSOA) is required to address eight areas of significant weakness in the local area's practice

The Council and the CCG were jointly responsible for submitting the written statement, which has been produced in conjunction with Parents and Carers in Partnership (PaCiP). Reports in relation to the WSOA are reviewed regularly at a steering Board composed of representatives from the Council, Health, PaCiP and schools. The DFE attends a quarterly monitoring meeting with responsible representatives from Council, CCG and PaCiP, to review progress.

During the WSOA monitoring meeting, it became apparent that there was a potential difference in opinion with regards to the status of some of the actions in the WSOA. There was not time to discuss each of the individual actions during the monitoring meeting and it was therefore agreed that the chair of the steering board would meet with representatives of PaCiP to go through the WSOA, the outcome of this meeting would then be shared with the DFE representative.

Action plan review comments for discussion:

Page 11:

- 1.22 In the action please can we change the word launch to publish, and in the correlating progress report can we say send strategy published.
In order to further and develop the spirit if the action at next year's inclusion summit it would be good if we could have a session on the inclusion summit about objectives and principles and how we have started to implant them (PaCiP to raise at inclusion summit planning).
With this that objective can remain blue.
- 1.2b launch needs to change to publish on action and progress

Page 12:

- 1..2c in the action please can change to, the strategy will be communicated with key stake holders, eg PaCiP, Health and LA and published via the local offer, the progress can then reflect this and the objective will remain blue.
- 1.2D in order for PaCiP to agreeing to this remaining blue with the current written narrative, they would need to see percentages signed up to support the charter evidenced in the progress headlines, however if we think as a steering board things have moved on we could choose to undertake a quick survey to ask the schools if they have put the posters and delivered the inclusion assembly to the children.

Page13:

- 1.3bi in the outcome section, how do we justify the word successful, thinking back to a recent conversation we had at a steering board, where it was reflected that whilst the

methodology during the trial around phoning parents gleaned more results, returning to the electronic method has reduced this. The question had been raised regarding methodology it was acknowledged that AC is reviewing this.

- 1.3bii it would be really good to open up the decision about the contents of the SEND guidance handbook, whilst everyone is comfortable with using the adapted AFC material and the coproduction from Kingston, the local adaptation meetings were good and useful, however the final document doesn't reflect the agreed wording in both the PCIP and IAS section and this makes it very difficult then to agree an outcome of coproduction. (additionally through scrutiny of the action plan alongside the handbook there are other things that we have said will be included that haven't and may trip us up later). Also through doing this noticed that both old and new handbooks are on the local offer, please can we remove.

Page 14:

- 1.3c Because kickback is the LAC panel, it is one method of collection, potentially this limits the effectiveness of this feedback as this is not representative of children with SEND as a whole, however pragmatically if this action were slightly reworded to say that in year 1 kickback was the vehicle however in year 2 we would develop a mechanism for greater reach. We need to add this to next year's plan.
- 1.3D typo please change to termly remains blue

Page 15:

- 2.1a In the progress can you add that the DCO SEND newsletter distributed via EB SEND group. Remains blue

Page 16:

- 2.1Dii please take wording out of shared with implantation group- remains blue.

Page 17:

- 2.2ci in this outcome we probably underestimated the actions required to deliver the outcome and welcome all that LA are doing and are planning to do, but feel for this outcome to be embedded it needs to go into the year two plan, this would mean that this would remain blue.

Page 18:

- 2.2d action says two, progress says one need to explain

Page 22:

- 2.3biii lots of really good work has happened however more needs to be done and therefore not blue but realistic to be added to the next plan.
- 2.3bV can the results be shared at the EB SEND group

Page 24:

- 3.1d this action is green as the embedding we will be demonstrated in future inclusion summits and picked up via the inclusion summit on next year's plan.
- 3.2a we need to revisit and have a conversation about this, as the wording in the progress doesn't explain how either the action or outcome is met. –please can we add to steering board agenda

Page 26:

- 4.1a old role chart still on local offer please can we remove- job titles don't always

explain roles and this was meant to explain roles and responsibilities to support understanding of those new to SEND and making sure people are able to understand the early help phase

Page 27:

- 4.1D in Kingston and Richmond in addition to golden booklet they have the golden binder which is their operational handbook which is the outcome we are trying to achieve, do we have something else and what is it as we are not clear that we have the binder.

Page 29:

- 4.2D the last paragraph in this box is not recognised- does anyone know which steering group it was agreed at and the progress reports only demonstrate feedback for the plan which doesn't meet the original requirement

Page 31:

- 5.1c2 the package is in place however in order to make outcome blue needs to transfer to following year and measure be applied e.g attendance rates

Page 32:

- 5.2b progress headlines refer to a communication plan, the conversation is remembered, is there a formal plan or are we using previous minutes as the plan- this is because the outcome says we will have a published plan. There is a slight typo, it should say SEND steering group chairs report rather than working group.

Page 34:

- 6.1Ai +6.1Aii The handbook doesn't include what the action said it would include therefore when conversation about handbook please can we discuss. We haven't yet communicated the hand book is on local offer therefore part this can't be blue.
- 6.1Bi how does the reviewed and refreshed decision making progress allow transparency for parents and schools.
- 6.1Bii the document that it's on the local offer does not appear to reflect PACIP coproduction feedback and may have legal inaccuracies.
- 6.1c the progress report says the feedback was positive the discussion at the steering group the feedback was reported as being polarised , is this a typo?

Page 36:

- 6.1D action and progress different I case officer in progress 2 in action- clarification needed
- 6.2A in the last point after the comma before and an agreement need to add 'in the future'

Page 37:

- 6.2D has the EB SEND group reviewed the outcome of the routine audits as this isn't clear in the progress. EHCP multi-agency report needs putting on local offer

Page 38:

- 6.3a not really sure we have addressed the point of the outcome, can we think how pick this up in the next plan as it could come back to haunt us in a follow up inspection.

Page 42:

- 7.3b see previous comments on strategy/pan.

Page 43:

- 7.3D explanation of coproduction needs adding into the handbook as we said in the plan we would do this

Page 44

- 8.1 is this really green as no determination as how to spend the money

Page 45

- 8.2a what's the plan for this going forwards? Dates have changed October date deleted in different versions.

Discussion

Following the meeting between PaCiP and the steering Board Chair, the Chair reflected on how the situation had developed and how this could be prevented in the future.

The situation in this local area is different to other areas in terms of outcomes and monitoring them, this is because children generally did have good outcomes when compared with national data, however as identified in the WSOA the challenge locally was that the experience for Children, young people and their families was not good enough, relationships between organisations in relation to implanting the SEND reforms were not formed in a way that allowed for joint commissioning and monitoring arrangements.

Whilst there were some actions that were relatively simplistic tasks, much of the implantation required relationship building, changes in perception and experience, which take time to change.

The parent carer forum (PaCiP) remains a relatively new forum, having only just celebrated its first birthday and relies heavily on a small core of individuals, this means that the pressures of challenge to professionals and challenge from other parents can weigh as a very heavy burden. Additionally the Chair reflected that regularly challenging professionals in steering board environment would require significant energy and that the steering board could review how the actions are monitored and agreed to reduce the energy required.

Recommendations:

1. Steering board process for agreeing actions to be explicit and documented and agreed.
2. Steering Board to review the content of this paper and discuss the actions identified as not having an aligned view and agree the status of the WOSA as a Board.

Conclusion

Whilst some of the changes proposed may seem minor when taken as an individual comment, as a totality if unchanged could undermine the integrity of the process and the relatively fragile trust both between partners and parents in the local area, therefore in order to move forwards in partnership this discussion and alignment is required.