

SEND Steering Board Meeting
Tuesday 18 September 2018, 12 - 2 pm
Desborough 2/3, Ground Floor, Town Hall, Maidenhead

Present:

Sarah Bellars (Chair) – Director of Nursing and Quality, Clinical Commissioning Group
Liz Kelsall (Vice-Chair) – Chair of PaCiP
Alison Crossick – Service Leader, Inclusion and Pupil Support (AfC)
Lisa Vickers – Secretary, PaCiP
Debbie Hartrick – Designated Clinical Officer SEND, Clinical Commissioning Group
Karen Cridland – Director of Children’s Service, BHFT
Nick Stevens – Head Teacher, Riverside Primary School and Nursery
Helen Hannam - Deputy Head Teacher - Interventions, Manor Green School

Apologies:

Kevin McDaniel - Director of Children’s Services
Cllr N. Airey – Lead Member for Children’s Services RBWM
Chris Tomes – Head Teacher, Churchmead School
Janette Fullwood – Head of CYP&F Clinical Commissioning Group
Jennifer Humphreys – Communications and Marketing Officer, RBWM
Louise Kerfoot – Learning Disability Service Manager (Optalis)
Joolz Scarlett – Head Teacher, Manor Green School

Minutes:

Hannah Golec - Business Support Team Leader for CYPDS, Early Help and Education

Minutes

1. Welcome and introductions

The Steering Board welcomed Helen Hannam to the meeting, who was representing JS.

2. Minutes of last meeting, actions and matters arising

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 14 August 2018 were approved, with one correction: RBWM is particularly rich in Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) children and not in ASD schools, as reported in the minutes.

All actions from the meeting held on 14 August 2018 have been completed.

3. Green Paper Update and Local Transformation Plan Review

SB reported at the last Steering Board that East Berkshire CCG was asked to be a trailblazer site in response to the Green Paper. On balance, it had been decided that East Berkshire CCG will wait for the

second round of trailblazers. Due to the timings and the deadline of expressions of interest, schools have been unable to participate in discussions due to school holidays. AC reported that a number of Local Authorities had been working on their applications to be a trailblazer site for months, and we should use what we have already done to put into the planning for phase two.

It was reported that West Berkshire has submitted an expression of interest, so it would be useful to get that learning locally.

KC reported that West Berkshire CCG have opted for the model that aims to reduce the waiting times for their Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service.

With regards to the Local Transformation Plan, DH reported that we are looking at a multi agency angle and looking at sustainability going forward. The conversations about the trailblazer will not be wasted, as it gave us a vision on how we want to progress. SB explained it is braver for us to wait so that we can do it properly.

LK noted she was uncertain as to what tier 1 and tier 2 support looks like. SB clarified tier 1 is universal services; school nursing, general practices, internet resources; and tier 2 is a combination of some community based services and some CAMHS services. However, we need to move away from referring to the service as tiers 1-3 as it is about early intervention and being less medicalised. AC referred to a document about supporting children with their mental health and emotional wellbeing, which includes the Thrive model and details all the different Early Help Services. It is about interventions that are evidence based; having a mentor for example is still counted as early stages of intervention. AC noted that examples of what we can offer from a wellbeing service within our LA is our counselling services - Kooth, Number 22. This is what would have been considered as tier 2.

SB reported that CAMHS is so overwhelmed and it is about working together and using our resources together. AC noted that some cases are about a diagnosis that only a medical professional can give, and some cases are more complex.

SB stated the Green Paper is about early intervention at a school level, and AC noted that unfortunately there is no funding to do it. DH spoke about Future in Mind, which is about early intervention and sits under the Joint Commission Board, and connects the Directors of Children's Services in each of the areas. DH noted that lots has been achieved with minimal funds, and we need to work to reduce the stigmatisation of children with SEND. SB agreed there isn't funding not to do it, so we should bite the bullet and act.

4. West Berkshire SEND Inspection Letter

DH updated the Board that she has received one to one feedback from the DCO in West Berkshire. KC has been hugely involved in the process and it was a pleasure to receive the feedback. DH stated that the DCO in West Berkshire acknowledges that RBWM helped their inspection. The audit work and the dashboard really helped. DH reported that they received the call on the Friday before the bank holiday weekend. For the two weeks that followed the call all agencies worked really closely for that time, had to hand a master list of all documents, and were selective with the documents they sent in, making sure they are the most up to date and relevant. Conference calls were booked in the week of the inspection to update everyone and diaries were cleared for this. The Local Authority provided hot desks for Health staff which was important, and self assessments showed their journey. West Berkshire said they were over optimistic in the first year about how well they were doing.

DH reported that the Emotional Health Academy was highly praised, and an example of joint commissioning. AC noted that they sell it well, and there is funding from the LA, Schools and Health to run this service. KC stated the strengths were pushed; and AC noted it is a strength as it is funded across all three organisations.

DH stated the commissioning outcomes are important. Everything is looked at together as a partnership, there is no blaming, and a presentation delivered on the Monday before the inspection services was a joint presentation and co produced.

KC reiterated that all other LAs in Berkshire learned from the RBWM inspection and SB reported that West Berkshire were grateful we shared the learning. KC stated this this is the third SEND inspection, so they were really pleased to receive this feedback.

KC stated the East works better across the three LAs in some elements, and the West works better across their LAs in other elements. RBWM are a year on from the inspection and some LAs are still panicking about theirs. KC noted that the commissioning of Health is different in the West, and there are two Health providers - Royal Berkshire and Berkshire Health Foundation Trust. The report did not pick out those nuances. SB referred to the Dutch Admiral Story, noting that they talked about the positives of each other and always knew what each other was doing.

LK noted that the Parent Carer forum in RBWM was blocked in terms of who was invited to the Windsor and Maidenhead meetings, but they were not in West Berkshire. KC stated that the groups in West Berkshire vs. RBWM vs. Surrey were different, as it was the inspectors who dictated who they want to see. In West Berkshire, the inspectors were happy to have a broad group there and the inspection itself was conducted very differently to the way it was here.

AC was unclear as to why the West Berkshire SEND Inspection Letter was an agenda item for this meeting. SB noted anything we can learn from other inspections is useful. DH also has a responsibility in her capacity as DCO to bring it to the SEND Steering Boards. SB stated it is about taking the ethos, looking at ourselves and challenging ourselves.

KC noted that there are actions that are not included in the report and the DCO for West Berkshire is drawing up a 20 point action plan. SB asked for KC to feedback any actions for BHFT that would be useful for RBWM.

Action:

- **KC to feedback actions for BHFT, from the West Berkshire inspection, that would be useful for RBWM.**

5. Updates from the Working Group

I. WS 1 - SEND Strategy and Data

AC reported that the Strategy is published but the four priorities of the implementation plan will be worked on over the next month and pulled together. An implementation group will be the next iteration of the working group.

AC stated that the working group had a productive meeting around data. The LA, BHFT and PaCiP reviewed what data we currently hold and what data we want. The next meeting will include the data analysts from the LA and Health, to look at starting to populate this data. AC would recommend that the full data set is monitored and reviewed monthly, but published annually. KC noted that BHFT will struggle to get RBWM figures only, as they collect the data in the way in which they are commissioned. AC noted the question to the CCG is whether they are interested in the data from the separate LAs. DH stated that if we are inspected by each LA, then the data should be separated by LAs.

KC noted that what East Berkshire commission to provide to schools cover a lot of children in Buckinghamshire.

DH noted there is a Quarter 1 data meeting in one weeks time and we can discuss the local data collecting there.

KC noted we are need to collect data to improve services, and AC advised it will either be performance data or gap analysis. SB noted that all proposed data to collect is activity based. AC explained other than feedback, it is really challenging to gather outcome data, but the national average will provide a standard and make the data meaningful.

Action:

- **DH to discuss collecting local data and Q1 data meeting**

II. WS 2 – Inclusion

AC reported that the Inclusion Charter has been officially launched and it is going to the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday 25 September, where the council will be asked to adopt the Inclusion Charter. AC is putting together a paper with KMCD. There area couple of pen portraits of young people displayed, and the Charter is on the Local Offer along with the Inclusion films from Datchet St Mary's CofE Primary Academy and Churchmead School.

Helen Huntley also joins this term for two days a week as the new SEND Consultant. An advert is currently out for the Area School SENCo.

III. WS 3 - Processes

LK reported there was a productive meeting about the SEND Handbook. LK and LV expressed concerns at the August Steering Board meeting that there was a huge amount of work still to be done, but this has now moved on and huge progress has been made. LK and LV agreed the handbook should include parental responsibility; as well as about what the Children and Young People's Disability Service and other professionals will do. SB asked for this to be an agenda item at the next Steering Board meeting.

An update was provided on the questionnaires around the Education, Health and Care Plan process. Around 15 - 20 responses has been collated. The feedback was very polarised, but there was a lot of qualitative data. Low scores were generally given when parents did not get what they wanted. LV explained it is thinking around setting realistic expectations with parents around what is available and who is responsible for what.

AC noted that based on feedback the scale of responses was changed from 0-10 to 0-5. Another thing we asked to look at is whether schools have better quality of EHCP requests in, which is true. HH noted the process has changed; needs assessments come into panel. SB noted that is a good news story for schools and AC will feed this back at the first SEND Partnership meeting which is coming up.

Action:

- **HG to add SEND Handbook to agenda**

IV. WS 4 - Schools

HH reported on the banding matrix and that it is being looked at from a school support level. There needs to be some follow up on some task and finish groups, as it started off with some momentum. AC suggested we put a deadline on the matrix.

Reporting on the gaps in SEND provision, HH reported there are different Head Teachers attending cluster group meetings. The produced data identified ASD in the primary phase and mental health in the secondary phase. AC noted that there is useful data from last years EHC assessments that back up that data outcome. HH noted the working party will move forward to set up the resource hubs for these areas. NS asked how we regain the momentum, and AC asked whether it would be helpful for the new SEND consultant, Helen Huntley, to coordinate.

HH reported that the SENCo coordinator position, as reported by AC in workstream 2, is currently being advertised, but Helen Huntley is managing this in the interim.

HH also noted that higher needs funding mechanism will tie into the matrix, and has been moved into workstream 3. The funding will follow the matrix. AC noted that the funding is not our decision, it is the schools forum decision. AC queried whether the LA or schools forum makes the decision on the funding link to the matrix.

It was reported that the implementation of the SEND reforms is a shared responsibility, and this has been presented at all school forum meetings.

The Board discussed the issue around Children and Young People's Integrated Therapies (CYPIT) not going into units to assess. AC clarified that if we have a child who has an EHC Plan assessment and is not in one of our mainstream schools, we have difficulties in getting anyone to assess the child. For example, the child or young person could be in the Link, or Harmony, but is not in a school for whatever reason. KC noted that CYPIT contract ends on the 31 December, so there is an opportunity for renegotiation. SB stated we have identified a gap, so we need to determine how we will close that gap.

V. BHFT

KC reported that it has been agreed for BHFT to have a link on the local offer. Following a conversation between AC and Helen Alderman, it has been established that RBWM has never been harvesting the information from the BHFT website. RBWM has the same deal with Open Objects, but RBWM has only ever had the links uploaded for some reason.

KC reported BHFT have a new employee with responsibilities around social media and will ensure CYPIT is up to date.

With regards to the 50 additional assessments for children on the autism pathway waiting list, 6 out of 28 completed assessments were RBWM. In three cases the families did not return the screening packs and there was no communication from the families so the children were discharged, and in two cases

the parents returned the screening packs but the schools did not. SB and NS asked what the barriers to this were, and what was stopping the schools. KC assured the Board that this will be looked into, but it may be due to the referrer having a different opinion to the schools. SB asked whether we know if they had a diagnosis. KC noted that the conversion rate is around 66%, so it is a high conversion rate nationally. SB noted it would be really good to understand for those children who had a really long wait and did not get a conversion, what we could have done.

LV noted that it can be parental denial, and they become too overwhelmed with the family situation or circumstance. NS reported there are a proportion of parents who refuse to proceed because they do not want their child to be labelled.

DH noted the conversion rate is high, but questioned what happens to the 33% that do not get a conversion. AC asked of that 33% that did not meet the criteria for ASD, is there a percentage that were moved to different pathways? DH stated there are a lot of children on the waiting list for no reason. SB noted that the families have a need otherwise they would not be on the waiting list, so did we meet their needs and what happened to them? DH stated BHFT have a huge waiting list, and 33% do not get converted, so if we want to crack this nationally then we need to work this out.

NS asked whether we are getting our value for money, and questioned whether we were happy that having commissioned 50 assessments, less than 25% of the completed assessments have been for RBWM children. SB responded by saying everyone benefits, and it could be that RBWM children go through the process a lot sooner which is the other argument.

KC also reported the single point of access has been moved to April 2019.

VI. CCG

DH reported that the EHCP audit plan is in place and the next audit planned for 28 September 2018 will focus on transitioning to secondary education. There is a plan to hold a Berkshire wide workshop to focus on the learning from the audits, and this would be a three hour conference. There is a teleconference tomorrow about how to plan this and when to do this. It will likely be post Christmas, something a bit different and an opportunity for different areas to come together and learn.

LK stated when the outcome from the audit was originally discussed, LK thought it would be a small interactive discussion about the outcomes and findings from the audit. DH advised both can be done, but as there has only been one audit this is not enough to have a sit down. After the next audit has been completed, themes can be looked at in detail. LK explained that the purpose of what we are doing has been lost. In terms of this event, it is supposed to be the outcome of the audit, and the audit said there needs to be some skilling up. DH clarified that it is a training event rather than a conference. LK questioned what effective training looks like and whether it is a conference style event across 3-4 LAs, or whether it is small interactive shared learning.

DH stated it is accountability of people that sit in the EHCP audit group to bring learning to their organisations. Another audit needs to be completed first. If we have really clear themes then we may be able to see that we need to put more into direct training. SB clarified that LK is referring to training style and how the decision was reached that it would be an East Berkshire wide event. DH noted the teleconference tomorrow is to make the decision. NS explained that if the event is correctly structured, you can receive the same outcome in a big conference as you would in a small meeting.

VII. PaCiP

LK reported that looking at theme 7 on the WSoA, the date of delivery was July 2018. From conversations, LK still has concerns about being involved in all decisions. SB asked whether this may be due to the summer holidays. AC apologised for not having circulated the Early Years SEND booklet which she intended to. It is a public document that is not co produced. KC noted that BHFT have parent carer groups that they consult with, but do not always consult with PaCiP which they need to remember. SB asked what we could do differently for PaCiP.

LK referred to the mental health and wellbeing activities that we are involved in, but PaCiP as a group are not involved in, such as the Green Paper and Local Transformation. SB noted that the Green Paper and the invitation to be a trailblazer is a bit different as the bid had to be in by 16 September and the expressions of interest came out after the summer holidays had started. LV noted there are so many actions that they could help shape; they have ad hoc thoughts about learning assistants for example. LK said it is fine if there is input from other parents and carers, but PaCiP need to link in with these other groups. LK was advised to link up with JF about the Children's Local Transformation Board. LK talked about actions that have been embedded, but feel there are actions that cannot be turned blue. SB suggest LK and LV identify the actions PaCiP have and have not been involved in.

LK reported action 7.2 bii has turned blue, as the Local Offer has increased knowledge and coverage of PaCiP. Membership has increased on Facebook.

LK noted there was positive feedback received from parents and carers about the Flying High scheme which is a contrast from last year.

PaCiP also held a family event on Sunday 16 September 2018 which was a very successful event, attended by 27 families; which was 92 people in total. Cllr Airey also attended with her baby, and let a child with Downs Syndrome hold her baby. She is the first parent that has ever allowed this child to hold a baby, so it was really special. LK also reported that Lisa Hughes from the Access Advisory Forum attended and they had a discussion about what can be done locally to improve access. PaCiP sent out the same annual survey, so there is data to compare to from last year. LK noted it is reasonably expensive to run this event, although it is the only event that PaCiP invite parents, carers, children and siblings to. LV stated it is a great environment to break down barriers at all levels.

With regards to the office space, LK received confirmation on Friday that internet access is now set up, but DBS checks now need to be carried out for them to be based in that building.

LK was invited as Chair of PaCiP to an event that the Mayor was hosting on behalf of Family Action, which was about the young carers service. LK has a concern about the criteria, as it stipulates the young person needs to be doing adult duties, and LK viewed the video thinking that her daughter would qualify as a young carer, but this it not the case. LK believes the video is very misleading. AC noted historically there is a real problem in finding out who young carers are, and we would prefer for more people to come forward that none at all. LK stated it highlights a huge gap in support for children who have (a) sibling(s) with SEND that require additional care, and questioned how are we supporting these siblings. AC noted that the Early Help Services can offer this support.

Action:

- **LK to link up with JF re. the Local Transformation Board**

6. AOB

Local offer: AC reported there is a new Digital Contents Officer who is fantastic and there are noticeable changes on the current Local Offer. The Local Offer will still move over to the AfC version,

but this will not happen until January - March 2019.

Single Route of Redress: DH asked whether our Local Offer has contact details for the local route of redress. DH reported there are now 144 cases nationally up from 89 in August.

Action:

- **HG to check whether Local Offer has contact details for the local route of redress.**

7. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 16 October 12 - 2 pm, Desborough 2/3 , Ground Floor, Town Hall, Maidenhead.
