

RICHMOND SEND PARTNERSHIP BOARD
Terrace Room, York House, Twickenham
14 May 2019 – 10.00am

Attendees:	
James Thomas (JT)	Director of Children’s Services, Richmond Council
Ian Dodds (ID)	Managing Director, AfC
Grace Over (GO)	Participation Officer for Children and Young People with SEND, AfC
Romany Wood-Robinson (RW-R)	Parent representative
Doreen Redwood (DR)	Lead Children’s Health Commissioner, Kingston & Richmond CCG
Sara Doyle (SD)	Associate Director for Identification & Assessment, AfC
Charis Penfold (CP)	Director of Education Services, AfC
Mandy Skinner (MS)	Assistant Chief Executive, Richmond Council
Ashley Whittaker (AW)	Programme Director, AfC
Tonia Michaelides (TM)	Managing Director, Kingston & Richmond CCG
Cllr Penny Frost (PF)	Cabinet member for Children’s Services and Schools, Richmond Council
Natalie Douglas (ND)	Deputy Director Clinical Services – Richmond and South West London
Anna Bryden (AB)	Consultant in Public Health, Richmond Council
Tracy Mabbs (TM)	Early Years provider representative
Heather Mathew (HM)	Children and Young Peoples Voluntary Sector Strategic Lead Manager, Richmond CVS
Hannah Gill (HG)	Senior Public Health Lead, Richmond Council
Alex Hardy (AH)	Independent Supporter, Ruils
Laura Turner (LT)	Chief Executive Officer, Richmond Mencap
Elaine Ball (EB)	Headteacher, Orleans Park School
Sharon Cousins (SC)	Assistant Principal - Student Experience, RuTC
Dave Leeman (DL)	Parent representative
Ivan Pryce (IP)	Headteacher, Strathmore Special School
Enno Kuettner (EK)	Interim DCO, Kingston & Richmond CCG
Janice Riley (JR)	PA to Ian Dodds & James Thomas, AfC, minutes

Apologies:	
Julia Travers (JTr)	Director of Commissioning, Kingston & Richmond CCG
Cllr Suzette Nicholson	
Cathy Maker (CM)	Chief Executive, Ruils
Ian Hutchings (IH)	Headteacher, Sheen Mount Primary School

1. Introductions and welcome

JT noted that it is good to see such a good turnout for the second meeting. The first meeting was formative with a refreshed start to our partnership approach and securing commitment from everyone. There will be significant discussion around the two primary agenda items.

- How well do we understand the needs of our children and young people and how well are we meeting them. On the back of that how clear are we of our top priorities for the year ahead.
- Updated version of the SEND plan has been circulated. We did some exploration around whether it would be good to have a number of top priorities to focus on. JT believes we can make most difference by prioritising.

JT also advised that he has had interesting conversations around how we communicate the work of the board and is grateful to GO for the accessible version of the agenda. JT will take some responsibility towards communicating appropriately across the borough.

2. Previous minutes

TM advised that the Richmond Health and Care Plan has now been published and one of the priorities is the SEND transformation.

Action: TM to circulate Health and Care Plan after the meeting.

Action: All to provide TM with comments on the Health and Care Plan by the end of the month.

The Terms of Reference will be updated based on comments and finalised and circulated. AW noted that he had not received any feedback on the timeline.

Action: AW to circulate finalised Terms of Reference and updated timeline.

Action: JR to note timeline to be a standing item for future agendas.

RWR noted that messages being sent out should be co-produced with members having the chance to add to the message before circulation.

DR reported a DCO has been appointed and a young person panel was part of the process. The appointed person will need to give three months' notice. Enno Kuettner is covering the role on an interim basis.

3. Children and Young People's Voice – top three priorities for improvement

GO shared a presentation which was based on experiences over the last 18 months. The top three priorities were:

- Inform
- Involve
- Prepare us for adult life

RWR pointed out that a lot of these points apply to all young people but it is important that we do not make young people feel they are a problem. RWR asked how many are in mainstream and how many in special school. GO confirmed it was a very broad audience across all areas. RWR noted homework is a problem and causes a lot of anxiety for young people and their parents often because they don't have the same level of support at home.

EB suggested that perhaps the next step would be to go out to some schools for responses to the priorities. It would be good to look at best practice in areas where things are working well. JT also noted similar conversations are taking place in parent panel.

CP advised that there is a section on the SEF for what is going well, including examples of good practice which will be used as learning exercises. Child centered reviews will be incorporated.

HM noted that it is also important to use the wider expertise. One example is a sports programme called RISE which works with young people with disabilities. We need to look at how we get staff to share expertise.

LT advised that Mencap are commissioning a programme of sport and she will share information.

CP noted that the borough sports has an inclusion section.

RWR noted that for some young people taking part in sport is not possible but they could still be given opportunities to be involved i.e. referees

JT noted inform and involve are about how all professionals should be working with young people and this might be an option to think about a pledge. All three priorities will feed into our plan.

4. How well do we understand our children and young people's needs and outcomes

AW advised that we are trying to create a dataset which will be useful and meaningful. The first issue is around the amount of data out there, this needs to be narrowed down to show what will make a difference. The second issue is that there are gaps in the information we have and we need to think about how we capture this without creating vast amounts of work for people.

AW shared the data via a PowerPoint presentation. It was noted that some of our data includes out of borough young people.

SC advised that with college applications some young people don't want to declare additional needs. There are variations in how different schools register SEN support.

AT circulated a draft document detailing what we feel should be included in the key indicators and asked all to discuss in small groups and make notes of anything they feel is missing. Discussion in twos or threes for five minutes.

JT noted that we will collect notes in but asked if anyone has substantive comments to take now.

ND – asked about headings and whether everything was in the correct place. It is essential to have ante-natal data as well as information from the 1 & 2 year reviews. Wait times are important are also an important indicator.

DR – noted that the structure of ‘Every Child Matters’ is a good background to work from and should be used to map performance. We need to think about the key processes working backwards from the outcomes we want.

DL – outcomes need to be individual and taking capabilities into account.

CP – we need to have very clear monitoring of annual reviews taking place and the impact and quality of the plan. There should be a judgement made by somebody on progress.

AH – SENCOs are feeding back on how much paperwork they are being asked to do. Outcomes being sent seem to be further and further into the future. Parents need to be given some timescales when plans are being amended.

EB – asked how this will be measured, workloads cannot be increased.

DR – we should be thinking about measuring strategically as a board. There will then need to be individual KPIs.

RWR – need to also address the young person’s own personal desired goals and outcomes.

Action: AW to convene further discussion with Public Health and CCG to bring back developed performance report to the next Board.

5. **Draft Self-Assessment**

The draft Self-Assessment was circulated with the agenda. CP talked to the document and explained what we need to think about as a board. It is important to identify and celebrate what we think is going well, as well as identifying the areas where we are aware we need to improve and what we are doing about it.

JT requested small group discussions to identify the priorities for improvement.

Headline thoughts:

DR – what processes do we have in place to identify need? We will need to identify a range of sources for the data we draw from.

RWR – noted the difficulty of transition period throughout life and the fact that often issues will sometimes only come to light at these points i.e. from primary to secondary school and again post 18.

CP – from a family’s point of view, understanding identification is quite difficult as well as how the process takes place.

EB – some smaller schools may not have very much experience in the identification process.

DL – parents often feel they are the ones having to drive things forward and this can be difficult for some parents.

JT noted it has been identified where some parents are not good at advocacy for their children and then there are others who are extremely driven.

AH – it is crucial that all staff involved with a young person must be aware of and understand their needs.

EK – from a health perspective the focus tends to be on the assessment.

AH – historically there was a suggestion of a lead professional but nothing seems to have materialised. Also noted that he is seeing more positive results in homes.

6. Setting our priorities for improvement

Final discussion back in small groups to think about our top three priorities for the year ahead.

DR – parents, carers and children and young people have already identified a range of priorities and perhaps this should be our starting point.

HM – a huge amount of work has been done with parents over the years and we need to look at that body of work. It would be good to consider a similar approach to the dementia process.

PF – three key things for consideration need to be 1. Have we achieved outcomes, 2. Measures in the local area. 3. User friendly information for parents and timetables adhered to.

AH – availability and timeliness of quality assessments including info and advice for parents. Are we able to test and measure we are doing this to enable families to engage effectively.

MS – are we making use of the microdata that we have to spot themes and patterns.

RWR – it is important we all have access to the same shared information. Training to be done in schools to raise awareness.

CP – Transition throughout life including to adulthood. Consistency throughout the borough. Information accessibility. Therapy and early intervention.

JT noted that he doesn't feel we have a clear enough understanding of provision but we do need to move forward and identify our initial priorities. Asked the group for their trust as chair to make sense of all the work done today so that we can try to identify the priorities.

Going forward we will inform our plan based on the priorities we agree and will then work with children, young people and their families to consistently have input to the board. Transition has come out as a very clear priority. Two other themes coming out are consistency and clearer information as well as support from professionals.

All to feel free to email any further thoughts that come up after the meeting. Next meeting in July would expect to be working on the priorities we have chosen.

7. AOB

EB – Noted a questionnaire on the ESFA website re SEND funding – all to please go on and complete.

AW – SEND Futures Conference is on 27 June

LT - Learning disability week – key is sport

Future meeting dates: 17 July 2019 3.00 – 5.00pm – Thames House, Teddington
19 September 2019 10.00am – 12.00 – Thames House, Teddington
26 November 2019 9.30 – 11.30am – York House, Twickenham