

## **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 adaption 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

Page15:

- 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'

Page37:

- 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.