

**SEND Steering Board****Monday 28 January 2019, 12.00 - 2.00 pm****May Room, Town Hall****Present:**

Sarah Bellars (Chair) – Director of Nursing and Quality, Clinical Commissioning Group

Liz Kelsall (Vice-Chair) – Chair of PaCiP

Kevin McDaniel - Director of Children's Services

Debbie Hartrick – Designated Clinical Officer SEND, Clinical Commissioning Group

Chris Tomes – Head Teacher, Churchmead School

Nick Stevens – Head Teacher, Riverside Primary School and Nursery

Joolz Scarlett – Head Teacher, Manor Green School

Karen Cridland – Director of Children's Service, BHFT

**Apologies:**

Alison Crossick – Service Leader, Inclusion and Pupil Support (AfC)

Cllr N. Airey – Lead Member for Children's Services RBWM

Jennifer Humphreys – Communications and Marketing Officer, RBWM

Louise Kerfoot – Learning Disability Service Manager (Optalis)

Janette Fullwood – Head of CYP&amp;F Clinical Commissioning Group

**Minutes****1. Welcome and apologies****2. Minutes of last meeting, actions and matters arising**

The actions that were reviewed in the Steering Board meeting on 13 November 2018 were discussed:

Action 1.2a & 1.2d: The action has been completed, though we are struggling for the evidence. Reviewing the impact is a long term piece of work.

For future action plans, it was agreed that we would separate out what are *actions* (i.e. holding an Inclusion Summit) and those 'actions' that are the impact.

SEND Guidance Booklet: This has been circulated to schools; there has been some positive feedback and suggestions (as detailed in workstream 3 report). There was a note that the old version is still on the Local Offer which needs to be replaced. LK noted that the 'Operational Handbook' has not yet been completed. KMCD advised this is a working progress as all the documents available on the Local Offer will be streamlined into the Operational Handbook. The progress headlines should reflect this ongoing work.

Action 1.3c: KMCD reported that there are ongoing conversations with the Engagement Officer about how we engage children and young people in that group. It is part of the wider activity and will be included in next year's action plan. We need to ensure that

---

when the council publish the engagement strategy that this is included. Our action was to explore Kickback, which was completed, though this is too narrow so we need to go wider.

**Action: HG to document on the WSoA that this action will be carried forward to next years action plan**

6.1b i: KMcD questioned how changing a process which involves more people around the table increases transparency; this was about publishing figures. LK noted that we need to be confident that we have a process of constant review of what we are doing. The Area SENCo is going back into schools and having conversations with those where the panel have decided not to proceed with an assessment. SB started that we need to put this quality assurance process onto next years action plan so that it is continually throughout the year. KMcD notes we have actions which involve completing surveys ; 6.1a is about the process, but are we receiving a more transparent service? SB noted we will pick this up in monitoring.

8.2a: the date of delivery is to be agreed; the actions are ongoing.

The Steering Board all agreed on the current status of the WSoA following the changes agreed in November 2018.

---

### **3. Update on re-inspections (Kevin McDaniel)**

KMcD reported on the key headlines - the DfE suggested the way forward was a new action plan with a wider scope. OFSTED will revisit with as many of the original team. They will be looking at the eight identified themes and the evidence.

LK noted that OFSTED put a survey out to parents and carers of children and/or young people with a disability for Suffolk County Council. The format was "a year ago, parents/carers said ..., a year later...". There was a very clear statements to parents and carers advising that OFSTED only wanted their views on the areas they were asking about; any other concerns should be addressed via a different route.

KMcD advised we need to review the reports to see where we are. OFSTED will be concerned with the 'So What?' question which we need to address.

---

### **4. Comments on work streams and organisational reports**

#### **Workstream 1**

Members of the Steering Board requested the update on action 1.2b and 2.2b to be rephrased to reflect that Health representatives were unable to attend the Implementation Group in January 2019.

LK expressed concern that there is no parent or carer representation at the additional planned meeting to discuss the joint plans/strategies for Priority 1.

JS noted that the Implementation Plan priority document was designed as a summary, not a full implementation strategy. KMcD noted the SEND Implementation Plan is a detailed document. Producing a plan is a substantial piece of work that is challenging. The expectation to deliver this still exists; professionals are trying to balance their work

---

---

and their priorities, resources are diminishing, the government are making budget cuts, but the expectation to deliver is still there.

The Implementation Plan is aspirational and was written prior to the inspection. The Implementation Plan was the piece of work that the work streams were originally going to action. OFSTED then visited the Local Area and identified issues and processes that needed to be reviewed and amended and then the WSoA was implemented.

NS noted that the Implementation Plan Priorities should be SMART. There is an element of wanting to be aspirational but it needs to be achievable. LK agreed, noting that it is over complicated. As the implementation group were not involved in the initial planning and setting out of the priorities, there is a lot of conversation as to why these priorities were chosen. We are tied down to four priorities that we do not really own.

KMcD stated that we are able to put the strategy on pause and revisit the strategy, if we feel that is the right course of action. By the time we reach the Inclusion Summit in September 2019 we may have refreshed priorities and a refreshed strategy.

NS noted that there is a Headteacher Cluster this week; he will draw up a document to ask for the existing priorities to be reviewed with any comments, and to indicate any other priorities that should be included.

**Action: NS to create a feedback document of the four priorities. NS, CT and JS will circulate to schools; KMCD and AC will circulate to AfC, LK will circulate to PaCiP, DH will circulate to Health.**

With reference to data, KC updated the Board that BHFT know what data can be shared on a locality basis. The data collected may shift depending on the review outcome of the priorities.

## **Workstream 2**

The Steering Board agreed for action 4.1a to remain 'green' as some links are still needed for Health.

**Action: KC to request her colleague liaises with Shaheb Khan to get all Health links updated**

Action 4.1 remains green rated. LK stated she would like parents and carers to be aware of what stage we are at in developing the Inclusion Quality Mark. SB noted there was a concept of it being trialled in schools, which the progress headlines suggest. JS stated it will be trialled in the summer. NS noted it will be tricky for schools to sign up. KMCD reiterated that the action was to develop an Inclusion Quality Mark; the action does not state the number of schools that are expected to sign up.

The Quality Mark is based on the Inclusion Charter which was co produced. Schools need to trial the model first. NS questioned from a schools point of view, are they doing what we consider to be inclusive practice? Once we have a model that works, then we can invite parents to comment. KMCD noted the Inclusion Quality Mark is two fold: for schools it is to be aware of where they are on inclusion; and then its for the local

---

---

authority to relay to parents the way in which they can identify a schools character, so parents are able to consider whether that schools is right for their child.

There are three schools that the Quality Mark will be trialled with. Capacity dependent, LK will look at the Quality Mark before it is trialled.

**Action: HG to update progress headlines of action 4.1b.**

### **Workstream 3**

Action 2.3b ii: LK reported that the Annual Review paperwork was circulated in December 2018, but is not aware of how many annual reviews we have had. LK does not believe the action should be blue rated. NS noted that process is blue as it has been completed, but we now need to monitor it for effectiveness so the action should remain green.

The Steering Board agreed that actions relating to the SEND Guidance Booklet is green as the Operational Handbook has not yet been completed.

KC provided an update on 6.1a; the single point of access exists for a child that is not previously known to BHFT, but the system is not yet set up for the children already known to the service. The delay has been due to capacity issues but is planned for April 2019.

### **Workstream 4**

The Steering Board agreed that action 1.3b(iv) is amber rated and not green. KMCD advised that the teams in the Local Authority working on this action are trying to find a suitable solution for everyone and encouraging them to say what they are not doing. The team needs to come up with the information to “sell” the idea of the best route to take, even though it will not suit everyone. NS noted the idea of the matrix is to provide consistency and transparency.

To enable this action to go from amber to green, KMCD suggested the team need to drive a proposal to the the schools forum. We need to put forward a recommendation, but outline the options. The next forum meeting is in early March.

The Steering Board were informed that in relation to action 3.3 b, no hub bids were received; it is not affordable. JS reported there is no continuity and no vision for sustainability. SB noted the way for this to be resolved is service transformation and finding the budget from existing resources to maintain the resource.

### **PaCiP:**

LK updated the Steering Board of her concern about the sustainability of the Parent/Carer Forum. Two parent/carers representatives have come forward to say they would be happy to be part of an interim forum. There was a lack of response for the drop in sessions. PaCiP’s Annual General Meeting has been brought forward to March 2019. A different model may need to be considered going forward, such as a Community Interest Group (CIC) or a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO). In terms of where PaCiP are currently at as a forum is very typical.

---

---

If PaCiP decide to be a CIO then there is a board of trustees and funds need to be raised; it is more time consuming to keep the forum going. The parent/carer forum in Hampshire is a CIO, whose CEO has just resigned.

DH suggested LK links in with the parent/carer forum in Bracknell as the demographics are similar.

LK also noted that in relation to action 7.1a, PaCiP is not currently in a position to take this action forward and therefore a change in the date of delivery was requested, and agreed by the Steering Board.

### **CCG:**

The Local Transformation Plan has now been published across the three Local Authorities, with a working group across the LAs. The LTP was a refresh, so support is in place for ADHD and ASD assessments; this is ongoing.

JF had previously stated that an easy to read version would be written, which was confirmed. JF is currently leading this project at the moment, but there will be a dedicated project lead.

For action 2.3 a vi., KMCD noted that if the action plan says there will be a new service and there is not one, then the progress headlines in the WSoA need to explain why this is or what there will be instead.

### **Summary**

The Steering Board were asked whether we feel we are on track overall.

DH advised that we are on track in regards to the WSoA but is concerned for next year and the future plan. DH noted it is a good idea to refresh the strategy, however, we should be looking at other Local Authorities who appear to have a lot of innovation going on and have SENCo's involved in these discussions. However, DH is aware that they have not had an inspection.

KC agreed that the WSoA needs to be completed but we need to look beyond it. NS believes we are broadly on track with the WSoA but there is no room for anything else at the moment. LK suggested we look at the eight themes and determine whether we have achieved those outcomes. CT noted there are lots of positive things that have been achieved.

---

**5. Implementation Group TOR and Structure and Membership of Steering Board**  
Not discussed

---

**6. Implementation Plan**  
See Section 4: Comments on work streams and organisational reports (workstream 1)

---

**7. Inclusion Summit Update (Liz Kelsall)**  
Not discussed

---

---

## **8. EHCP 2nd Audit Report**

There was insufficient time for DH to provide an update on the second audit report and the Planning Together for Great Lives; effective & collaborative EHC Plans Conference scheduled for 25 February 2019.

DH asked the Steering Board to read the audit report that was circulated. DH needs to know as soon as possible the attendees for the conference who will represent RBWM. The conference is designed as a learning event from the audit that has been carried out. DH noted there will be speakers including a service user (a teenager with an Education, Health and Care Plan) and the Council for Disabled Children. The event is Berkshire wide and there are only 18 places per Local Authority. The people that attend will be the sharing their learning with their organisation.

---

## **9. AOB**

LK noted that it would be useful to know what OFSTED said and what we have achieved outcome-wise, to make sure we all have a shared understanding. We need to consider what evidence we need to provide.

---

## **10. Date of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 19 March, 12.00 pm - 2.00 pm  
Desborough Suite 2, Ground Floor, Town Hall

---