

MINUTES

Title of Meeting:	SEND Shadow Improvement Board	
Date:	1 March 2024	
Place:	Microsoft Teams Meeting	
Times:	10:00 – 12:00	
	In attendance Y/N	
Membership:	Cllr Andrew Reid (AR), Cabinet Member for SEND & Education (Interim Chair)	Y
	Cllr Bobby Bennett (BB), Cabinet Member for Children & Young People	Y
	Cllr Debbie Richards (DR), Deputy Cabinet Member SEND	Y
	Cllr Jessica Fleming (JF), Chair of Health Scrutiny Committee	Y
	Nicola Beach (NB), Chief Executive, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Dr Ed Garratt OBE (EG), Chief Executive, Suffolk, and North-East Essex ICB	Y
	Tracey Bleakley (TB), Chief Executive, NHS Norfolk, and Waveney Integrated Care Board	N
	Tricia D'orsi (TD), Director of Nursing, NHS Norfolk, and Waveney	N
	Claire Smith (CS), Chair of Suffolk Parent Carer Forum	Y
	El Mayhew (EM) Interim Director Children Services, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Lisa Nobes (LN), Executive Chief Nurse NHS Suffolk and North-East Essex ICB	Y
	Corrina Bielby, (CB) Department for Education Case Lead	N
	Helen Chester (HC) Department for Education SEND Advisor	Y
	Louise Warren (LW) NHS England Advisor	Y

	Douglas Leckie (DL) Head of the Vulnerable Children's Unit, Department for Education	Y
	Nicola Roper (NR) Assistant Director Adult Services, Suffolk County Council	N
	Nicki Howlett (NH), Service Lead, SENDIASS	N
	Susie McIvor (SI), Engagement Hub Lead, Suffolk County Council	N
	Ros Somerville (RS), Assistant Director, Inclusion, Suffolk County Council	N
	Garry Joyce (GJ) Deputy Director CYP Suffolk and North-East Essex Integrated Care Board	N
	Rebecca Hulme (RH) Director Children, Young People and Maternity, Norfolk, and Waveney Integrated Care Board	N
	Codrutza Oros Marsh (COM) Assistant Director Social Care, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Seb Smith (SS) Assistant Director Nursing Community Health & Family Support Services, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Adrian Orr (AO) Assistant Director Education, Skills and Learning, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Harriet Wakeling (HW) Head of Intelligence Hub, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Graham Beamish (GB) Head of Programmes CYP, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Wendy Allen (WA) Programme Manager SEND, Suffolk County Council	Y
Minute Taker	Katie Farrow	
Invited to attend	Francesca Alexander on behalf of Ros Somerville	

Item No.	Item Description
1.	Apologies & Introductions

	<p>Cllr Andrew Reid introduced the session with the following opening statement:</p> <p>Welcome to all to the first SEND Improvement Board, which replaces the Accountability Board in the light of the recent OFSTED/CQC Inspection.</p> <p>I know we are all aware of the serious work we need to undertake to raise standards for children and young people of Suffolk and their families in providing for their education needs. As I have said, I am determined we do this as quickly as possible, but that we do so in a way that builds a resilient base for our Services and our Local Area Partnership in the future. Looking at the makeup of this Board I am confident we have the right people to do that. We are a partnership, and I will do everything to foster the spirit of working together for the benefit of our children and young people. This is a place to be open and candid and to be confident you will be listened to and respected for your views and shared commitment to succeed.</p> <p>Turning to practical matters, we have an Agenda which provides an update on progress with the Priority Action Plan we need to submit to Ofsted/CQC by 7th March and the refresh of the SEND Strategy. I know members have been working hard on this. We are also reviewing the governance of this Board. It is in Shadow form at this stage as its role and objectives may change including the chairmanship, in the light of DfE's determination of next steps on our improvement journey. Whatever that may entail, I welcome assistance and advice in any form provided and we will constitute ourselves accordingly.</p> <p>Today, I want to hear the views from as many of you as possible, but ask you direct these through the chair, and we take questions and points associated with each item once we have heard from those presenting. Most of us are on TEAMS, so please raise your electronic hand if you want to speak and I will endeavour to take these in order.</p> <p>Apologies received from:</p> <p>Ros Somerville</p> <p>Tracey Bleakley</p> <p>Corrina Bielby</p> <p>Tricia D'Orsi</p> <p>Garry Joyce</p>
2.	<p>Ofsted and CQC Inspection Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Independent Chair • Feedback to date on priority action plan

GB stated that the report in January had identified 2 priority actions and 3 areas for improvement. The focus rightly so, was on the outcomes and experiences of families, completion of EHCPs and timelines for delivery.

GB confirmed that Suffolk's NEET rates are currently below the National average, and that this is also an area of focus.

GB explained that the Priority Action Plan (PAP) was to be submitted on Thursday 7th March 2024. The PAP is a standalone document but also a subset of the wider Strategic Action Plan (SAP).

GB acknowledged that meeting the targets set out in the PAP would be challenging but it was important to have SMART targets; giving specific actions for direct improvements that had a designated owner and offered clear timelines for completion.

WA confirmed that 46 additional staff (FTE) are being recruited to focus on improving EHCP timelines, quality, and a change of culture in the communications with parents.

WA also acknowledged that there were additional challenges to consider including the growing need for neurodivergent provisions and general growth pressures to improve existing plans.

GB confirmed that there is to be a Senior Officials Meeting on 27th March where the PAP will be discussed. This will be followed by a Monitoring inspection usually within 18 months of the publication of the full inspection report and a full reinspection within 3 years.

WA confirmed that the proposal to recruit the additional 46 staff was agreed at Full Council in February 2024. In addition to these FTE staff SCC are also using contracted resources to bolster Educational Psychology and plan writing capacity.

GB highlighted that one of the key risks to completion of EHCPs is the shortage of Educational Psychologists (EPs) at a national level. This had been a key point of challenge.

WA confirmed that 7 EPs had been recruited over Summer 2023.

Q. AR - Is there continual recruitment for these posts?

A. Yes.

Q. NH – Is there confidence that this (the recruitment of these additional staff members) will be enough or are further changes needed?

A. GB – Confirmed there was a clear plan which is detailed in the appendix of the March Cabinet Papers showing where staff will be deployed with sustainability a key focus.

FA stated that liaison was taking place with the Intelligence Hub to develop modelling and trajectories to ensure that staff would be placed where they would be the most effective.

FA highlighted the positive impact that the Liquid Logic system which has replaced the previous one, was already having on service management.

AR stated that it was also important to note that the recruitment of a new Deputy Head of Service was planned and needed. Senior Resources would be crucial.

EM confirmed that SCC are working closely with the Intelligence Hub to monitor changes in data. This is to ensure SCC remains agile and responsive to changes in need so resources might be directed to where they are most effective.

AR stated that 311 is the FTE of the staff in the Inclusion department at the moment and with these additional 46 new FTE roles, this is approximately a 15% increase. In addition to these roles, a further 10 FTE temporary staff roles have been approved for the next financial year to address legacy and existing backlog.

Q. LN – Will there be a risk to delivery because of these new members of staff?

The risk is that the current staff will be taken away from their roles to deliver training to these new members of staff and this could therefore impact on the delivery of service by SCC.

A. FA – We are currently liaising with Quality & Performance regarding the option for a mass induction. This consideration is being planned into the trajectory to ensure that all staff joining are ready and equipped to do the job asked of them.

FA also stated it was important to acknowledge that this change would not be instant.

LW raised the impact on the service as a whole because of the changes. For example, what might be the impact on the Health Service and their timelines and responsibility.

EG echoed this asking what impact was this likely to have on bottom line timeliness.

HW stated that several scenarios were still being built with the completion of these expected by the middle of next week (week commencing 4th March.) These scenarios would clarify where to put whom and the impact on timeliness.

Q. AR - Will these be shared?

A. Yes.

Q. SPCF – What about the impact on unlawful practices and inaccuracies? These need to be stopped.

A. FA stated that Designated Clinical Officers (DCOs) and Designated Social Care Officers (DSCOs) were being consulted along with the creation of an Induction Model and cycle of continued professional development (CPD.) Attendance will be tracked, and SCC are already working with existing staff in this area.

FA stressed the focus on the importance of being consistent and compliant stating SCC has already come a long way in a short amount of time but needs to keep up with the continued development of staff.

FA highlighted this as a challenge to make space for alongside current workloads but that 2 days of refresher training was being developed with DCO/ DSCOs and SEND HCPs (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Healthy Child Practitioners)

ACTION: AR requested that an update on progress in this area be added as an agenda point to the next meeting.

SPCF stated that unlawful practices and inaccuracies needed to be stopped.

FA agreed without question and stated that where these have been reported it was important to share so that issues can be tackled, and staff held to account.

FA said that this has already been helped by the feedback received both positive and negative and that SCC remain committed to doing that.

Q. SPCF – How can we be assured that the new processes will work this time?

A. FA said that this would be done through the Assurance, Quality & Performance Boards and stated that she would be happy to pick up any specific concerns with SPCF outside of Shadow Improvement Board.

SENDIASS stated that they had received contact from families citing examples of missed deadlines, incorrect information, and concerns around general customer services.

SENDIASS confirmed that they would be happy to offer support in this area to Family Services.

SENDIASS also mentioned that IPSEA offer training for new starters and that perhaps paid training might also be considered.

FA Thanked SENDIASS for the offer of support.

FA stated that staff were keen to learn, and that training was a priority but also a challenge to balance alongside the day job.

Cllr BB added that she, Cllr Reid, and Cllr Richards are all new in role and had a very valuable meeting with SPCF on 29th February.

Cllr BB wanted it noted that they were all on 'receive mode' and their doors are open for contact from SPCF.

EM confirmed that enquiries were underway to find a 'suitably experienced and available' independent Chair. SCC has reached out to multiple potential candidates nationally and have now identified one potentially suitable individual who has availability. This individual is a current Director of Children's Services, has an education background and specialist knowledge of SEND.

An initial conversation with this potential individual is due to take place in the next two weeks. An update would be offered to the Board next month.

	<p>EM also stated that SCC was awaiting a decision from the Department of Education as to the type of post inspection intervention and whether an Independent Chair or Commissioner is needed.</p> <p>Q. Cllr BB – Can you give assurance that the current individual under consideration has performed well in their role previously?</p> <p>A. EM – Yes. They have led positive change to SEND systems. This will form part of their initial discussions over the next 2 weeks.</p> <p>SPCF stressed that it was important that they be involved in the process. They would also like to contact forums to know their experiences of the applicant.</p> <p>SPCF stated that they were balancing attending these meetings and are parent and carers first and foremost and the April meeting was when the forum is closed, therefore. Effectively their annual leave.</p> <p>LW offered assurance to the Board of a commitment to change these experiences and that it was vital that ICBs be front and centre in the decision-making process.</p> <p>EG agreed that partnership was key in everything.</p> <p>GB said there was still work to finish the plan before it was shared, likewise with the wider Strategic Action Plan but there would be a meeting with Health colleagues and quality and assurance checks to ensure the Priority Action Plan is deliverable.</p> <p>AR requested a meeting with himself and Cllr BB.</p> <p>GB confirmed this would be arranged once the PAP was completed.</p>
	<p>SEND Partnership draft Governance proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review transition from SEND Accountability Board to Improvement Board <p>AR introduced the next agenda point, reviewing the transition from SEND Accountability Board to Improvement Board</p> <p>EM stated that the new LAP SEND governance proposal had been co-produced across the partnerships. It had also been prepared with awareness of requirements laid out in DfE Improvement Notices so it would be compliant should this be needed.</p> <p>EM laid out that the draft was proposing 3 levels of governance:</p> <p>Programme Office</p> <p>Programme Committee - Operational</p> <p>SEND Improvement Board - Strategic</p> <p>Slide 3 in the meeting documents pack shows how this links to the wider governance in the ICBs and SCC.</p> <p>EM stated that also in the pack was a summary of the proposed function of each of these levels and proposed membership.</p>

EM suggested that at this point it would be helpful to hear any comments about the document as it currently stands and agree amendments with a view to agreeing this proposal today. The Programme Team would then work on incorporating the amendments and then share the final version.

AR stated that it would be very important to have Senior Members representing every level of the process and participating fully throughout.

LN stressed that it would be important to have clear links between Children and Young People Services (CYP) and Adult and Community Services (ACS). That strong representation from ACS would be vital to understanding data for accountability and to enable forward planning.

Cllr BB expressed that this was an opportunity to ensure transparency and was interested to know how this would work.

Q. Cllr BB – Are these open meetings for example?

A. EM – Although the meetings are closed, the minutes of the meetings are published on the SCC Local Offer website and are available to anyone who would like to view them.

There has historically been this level of transparency both with agenda and minutes and this will continue.

WA confirmed that the dates of the meetings will be made available in advance to ensure that parents are aware that they are taking place and can access the minutes.

SPCF raised a concern regarding representation from schools and education. SPCF stated that they were a key part of suicide prevention and access to the Child Mortality Database information.

Q. SPCF – Where is this represented in the new proposal?

A. EM –In terms of the representation in the SEND Board, it is right to have a link between SCC and the Suicide Prevention Partnership. A face-to-face meeting with SPCF on this matter might be helpful.

SPCF confirmed that they were aware of face-to-face and online meetings around this but were unaware if there had been an educational representative present and this was important to ensure children and young people felt schools were a 'safe, calm and supported environment.'

EG stated that it was regular practice at the start of ICB meetings to share a family experience to ensure that there was continuous context.

AR agreed that this was a very important point. That having personal understanding of the experiences of children and their families was vital.

AR suggested that SCC work with SPCF to discuss how this could be done as part of the SEND Partnership.

ACTION: Incorporate 'real life' experiences into these meetings

	<p>EM opened this point up to WA and GB for comment.</p> <p>WA confirmed that at the existing SEND Programme Board meetings, a case study was always shared and that the same was true for the Youth Justice team. It would be useful to look at this as a system because it can be challenging to walk in a child's shoes.</p> <p>Q. Cllr AR – Can that (inclusion of a case study) be extended to the Shadow Improvement Board meetings?</p> <p>A. EM - Yes</p> <p>AR stated that he was very keen for Cabinet to work with the SPCF.</p> <p>GB added that the new Audit Programme will audit cases for parent's part way through the process, reaching out to families and young people for their views.</p> <p>AR stressed that this is vital, and we are clearly all in agreement that it is important to know how families feel they are being treated and ensure that this is in a kind and timely manner.</p> <p>EM confirmed that a child's experience piece would be added to the meetings going forward and subject to a meeting with SPCF, the subject of Suicide Prevention will also be included. It would be helpful to sign off the document in its current form today so that these changes can go ahead.</p> <p>Cllr DR raised the point that there was a clear Parent and Carer voice now incorporated but not a school's voice.</p> <p>EM confirmed that discussions are to be had with educational representatives and that there was work to do with the wider schools across Suffolk.</p> <p>Q. HC – How will education level feed down into lower levels?</p> <p>A. EM – Confirmed that SCC would want to add that in. Those conversations will be had at meetings of the SEND Operations Programme Committee. A suitable representative from an education provider would be included.</p> <p>Q. EM – Could any multi-academy trust Chief Executives offer involvement?</p> <p>AR offered this question to AO for comment.</p> <p>A. AO - Confirmed contact with section heads and the Chief Executive Network. SCC is also in pre-discussions with Suffolk Education Partnerships. With 326 primary schools, 8 colleges and 500 early years provider this is a large task.</p> <p>AO confirmed that there is good representation from senior levels to help to identify appropriate people for the representative role to ensure that what is happening in the classroom has the most positive impact for children.</p> <p>GB reiterated that a key function will be to track and drive user experience. This will include an outcomes framework. The data collected will not just be quantitative but qualitative from shared feedback and experiences.</p>
--	---

	<p><i>ACTION: AR requested that an update on the Framework be added as an agenda point to next meeting.</i></p> <p>LW stressed how important it is for Strategy Leaders to understand the lives of CYP with SEND living in Suffolk to identify risks for escalation. It needs to be clear where the gaps and challenges are for CYP living in Suffolk.</p> <p>LW said the workstreams and health governance structure was a little unclear. It needs to be understandable to anyone who picks it up.</p> <p>LW stressed that SENCOs are vital practitioners, as were youth groups and questioned where these groups were featured.</p> <p>LW requested a glossary so that acronyms could be easily understood.</p> <p>LW would be happy to take this up with EM, LN, and RH.</p> <p>AR confirmed that a glossary would be key to understanding at wider audience level.</p> <p>EM thanked everyone for their contributions and confirmed this would be helpful.</p> <p>EM confirmed that detailed terms of reference will be brought back to the Board and asked for approval to go ahead on this understanding.</p> <p>AR reiterated that this was a starting point, but this did not mean that changes could not or would not be made.</p> <p>HC said that SEND and AP (Alternative Provision) both needed to be considered. At present there was a heavy focus on SEND but consideration needs to be given to where AP fits into this.</p> <p>EM thanked HC and noted this point.</p> <p>AR moved to sign off on this proposal as basis for development including the actions arising from this; to include a regular Lived Experience example in the monthly agenda.</p> <p>Cllr BB requested that we avoid the use of the term 'Sign Off' as whilst the direction of travel for the new Governance was good it does need to come back.</p> <p>WA stated that quarterly meetings had been arranged but that a meeting could be arranged sooner if needed?</p> <p>AR requested a meeting for early April.</p> <p>The Board agreed the Governance in this form in principle subject to the changes and additions discussed to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>SEND Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New data sets <p>HW and FA shared SLIDE SHOW</p> <p><i>Slide One: an example of how data would be presented.</i></p>

HW confirmed that it was identified that a blended style of data presentation was needed and that this example would not be sufficient.

HW explained that this data would enable SCC to see where we are and what trajectories looked like.

HW stated that the new Liquid Logic (LL) system offers more opportunities to report.

FA agreed that LL is a fantastic CMS (Case Management System). Managers can see the CYP they are supporting, see outstanding work and filter at case level.

FA explained that these tools allow for greater accountability in the team and offer greater assurance.

FA confirmed that data cleansing was ongoing following the move from the previous system to LL in April 2023.

FA stated that already the impact of the new Families EHCNA Portal (Education Health and Care Needs Assessments Portal) had been positive. SCC was receiving feedback and listening to the comments being shared by parents. The portal was produced in collaboration with the SENCos to ensure it is fit for purpose.

FA confirmed that the next phase would be the introduction of an Annual Review Portal.

Q. AR – Who can access this portal?

A. HW – Anyone can access the portal; it is open access. The portal is for parents and carers. It allows for the sharing of documents and monitoring of progress once assessments are underway.

Q. AR – How do we satisfy ourselves that Parents know where the portal is and how to access it?

Cllr BB added that there needed to be an awareness of the different levels of digital experience parents might have and alternatives to a digital option.

A. FA – Families have the option to use the portal if they would like but also can still contact SCC via email and/ or phone. Parents don't have to have an active assessment to use the portal either they are able to use this to leave feedback.

ACTION – AR requested more information about SCC direct contact with families be added to the next agenda.

NB Welcomed the portal as a systems approach. Not just for SEND but across the whole of CYP.

NB stated that she would always endorse a digital approach, but accessibility should be a key focus here. Particularly around how the portal might present on different devices; phone/ tablet. It is important that SCC are aware of the reality experience of parents who might not have access to the same levels of technology.

SPCF agreed that access and technology poverty was a reality for many parents and carers, and they were keen to have non digital access options for parents and carers.

SPCF stated that they are still often hearing of difficulties in this area e.g. codes to login via phones, encrypted emails particularly can be challenging.

SPCF stressed that all information needed to be accessible to all parents and carers regardless of the technology they may have.

Slide 2

HW acknowledged that there was no Health data in the example today and this would be included.

HW explained that the target was for all data to stay within the two red lines (that indicate the control areas) If this was not the case the department needed to understand why this was happening and take appropriate action.

Slide 3 shared.

HW confirmed that SCC is mirroring the National picture in terms of EHCNA with approximately 80% becoming full assessment requests.

Q. HC – How do we access those numbers? Can this be an interactive document so we can access live data?

A. HW – In real experience this is the case but the transfer to a PowerPoint presentation removed this as an option.

HW confirmed that SCC can add these numbers to the presentation for sharing.

HC stated it was great to be able to see the fluctuations but what this available to external organisations?

HW confirmed that at present this could not be interpreted by externals.

ACTION – AR requested that this be taken as a point for consideration. How this data could be shared with external organisations.

SPCF suggested that the rise was due to plans not being met. That if the week 16 deadline is missed that these automatically become full assessment requests.

SPCF stated that it would be good to have the decision data of where the 16 Week deadline has been met and likewise with the EHCNA. If the impact of demand is a direct failing of meeting deadlines this needs to be considered.

FA explained that from the point of moving across to the Liquid Logic system in April 2023, this data would be available. SCC now can break down draft issues by week 16.

FA added that prior to this under the previous Capita system it would have been a challenge.

HW confirmed with confidence that from April 2023 onwards this data could be shared.

Q. SPCF – Can we have a video/ webinar to explain this to families?

A. HW – Yes

HC stated that the data sets were not offering the option to see cumulative data. It would be helpful to see the bigger picture i.e. where SCC sits in terms of the National average.

HW confirmed that currently data is shared monthly, but that SCC was looking to develop this once the regional share measures have been agreed.

HC stressed that it was important to see the data from January onwards to see if the progress target of 50% was being met.

HW agreed.

SPCF stated that there was a high number of complaints where parents had not seen draft plans before these have been finalised.

FA requested that SPCF share the names of these families so this could be investigated.

FA confirmed that it was also important to SCC that timelines do not come over quality and sought to assure the Board that this remained the priority in all cases.

SPCF also raised an issue of authorisation. That lower-level managers were signing off plans.

FA confirmed that Leads had authorisation to sign off plans.

FA stated that she had met with SB on 29/02 to approach this matter and would welcome a discussion with SPCF on this.

Slide 5 shared.

FA confirmed that SCC was already seeing the benefits of the new staff that had been appointed.

FA also stated that for context, SCC had dealt with 109 plans in February 2024 in comparison to 40 at the same time in previous years so volume was a factor.

FA was pleased to report a positive shift and that 99% of families had been informed within the given 6-week time frame since the introduction of the EHCNA Support Team.

Slide 6 shared.

FA assured the Board that SCC are looking to finalise all those outstanding.

HW stated that at present there were 450 outstanding/ overdue cases in relation to Clinical Psychologist provision.

Slide 7 shared.

FA confirmed that they had a duty to finalise by 15th February. That now there were only 3 cases outstanding. 308 cases now had a named setting. 29% of those were a specialist setting and 46% mainstream education settings.

Slide 8 shared.

FA confirmed that the slide shows volume and completion. SCC are looking at how to improve the current figure of 666 per month.

Slide 9 shared.

FA explained that this slide showed the changes to the Specialist Education Services (SES). Most of the work now is done via a new 'whole school' approach and only some individual work.

Slide 10 shared.

FA stated that this slide showed the positive impact of the changes made since September 2023.

FA highlighted that a remaining challenge was that SCC had not felt it appropriate to place children in Pupil Referral Units if these were not suitable for their needs. SCC needs to be clear on the provision that is needed for CYP in Suffolk.

Slide 11 shared.

HW explained that due to an issue in the system that the planned roll-out date of April for the Annual Review Portal could not be met. The revised date had been proposed for May/June.

HW confirmed that instead, a form was to be created in Liquid Logic.

Cllr BB shared some questions for consideration that she confirmed did not require an answer in today's meeting:

- How satisfaction/ dissatisfaction of customers is reported
- How we can use the data as an early-warning system, and this will be dependent upon who monitors this data and how it is shared.
- AP (Alternative Provision) needs assurance that the story of these changes is also impacting them.
- A comparator to National Data will be a useful and important inclusion.

ACTION – These questions to be answered at the next meeting in April.

SPCF raised a concern that families were being told that places were not available 'due to workload' and this was unlawful.

FA echoed this concern and confirmed that this was not accurate.

FA requested that SPCF shared the number of families and names wherever possible of those who have experienced these types of responses.

FA explained that finding suitable educational settings for all CYP was key. Also, that a 'type' of setting might be offered before a specific location is determined to offer parents the right to appeal this placement as soon as possible.

SPCF confirmed that an email would be shared with FA on this matter.

ACTION - AR confirmed that a deep dive investigation was required in this instance.

5. **SEND Strategy**

- Update on consultation.
- Timeline

Slide show shared

WA shared the challenges being faced by the new Inclusion Support Line.

WA confirmed that 8000 calls had been received by 2 people and that as a result SCC were looking at managing these calls from the main Corporate Contacts call centre.

WA explained that callbacks were being arranged with varying degrees of success and as a result the service was not having the impact that had been desired.

WA confirmed that since the consultation had started on the Strategy in 2023 SCC had received 900 responses which had identified 4 key areas of focus.

WA confirmed that the draft consultation was due to end of Sunday 3rd March 2024.

Slide 8 shared.

WA confirmed that this slide highlighted the new Vision for SCC which had been co-produced with CYP Engagement Hub.

WA stated that the vision included words where children felt 'Included, Fulfilled and Supported.' These words had been suggested through consultation with CYP.

Slide 9 shared.

WA explained that the next step was how best to present this and that feedback on the proposed logos was already coming in from CYP.

WA confirmed that whilst there had been some recommendations of objectives, there have been no disagreement to the new approach.

Q. AR – How does this feed into our next piece of work?

A. WA – Priority action sits within part of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The PAP (Priority Action Plan) needs to be completed by 7th March and SAP progress will also be submitted on that date.

Q. Cllr BB – Are we picking up posts on social media?

A. No, we do not normally.

SPCF requested that puzzle pieces not be used in any of the logo or accompanying documentation. That this imagery had been reported as offensive to CYP.

WA acknowledged this request.

LW stated that it would be important to include key milestones.

WA acknowledged this.

	AR stated that he was mindful of time remaining. EM suggested that if there were any further points that these be directed to WA and GB.			
6.	Review of last meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notes of last meeting (Feb-24) agree accuracy.• Actions arising from notes. EM suggested that anyone with points to raise on the above should do so directly to WA. CS stated the job descriptions of herself, and SW had been incorrect in the previous minutes and that she had raised this with WA. AR confirmed as there were no objections or further edits raised to the Notes from February’s meeting that all were happy to accept.			
7.	Forward Plan EM suggested that the length of the Shadow Improvement Board meetings should be extended to give adequate time to all topics being discussed. This was agreed. AR requested that if anyone has any comments or thoughts to share between now and the next meeting that these be directed to WA. WA confirmed that the intended date for the next meeting was 5 th April but that this was to be rescheduled as it falls in the Easter Holidays.			
8.	AOB AR called for any other business. None raised. AR stated that the meeting had been fulfilling and offered a good basis to move forward. Meeting was closed at 12:09pm			
Update on SEND Strategy workstreams paper for information only.				
		Dates of Future meetings Friday 5 April 2024 10am – 12:00pm (Needs to be changed Easter) Friday 3 May 2024 10am – 12:00pm Friday 7 June 2024 10am – 12:00pm		

		Friday 5 July 2024 10am – 12:00pm		
--	--	--	--	--