

MINUTES

Title of Meeting:	SEND Improvement Board	
Date:	5 July 2024	
Place:	Hybrid Meeting Teams and Endeavour House, Benjamin Britten	
Times:	10:00 – 12:00	
		Y/N
Attendees:	Kathryn Boulton (KB), Independent Chair	Y
	Cllr Andrew Reid (AR), Cabinet Member for SEND & Education	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	N
	Tracey Bleakley (TB), Chief Executive, NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Board	N
	Claire Smith (CS), Chair of Suffolk Parent Carer Forum	Y
	EI Mayhew (EM) Interim Director Children Services, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Lisa Nobes (LN), Director 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	N
	Emily Williams (EW) Deputy Director of East of England DfE Team	N
	Nicola Roper (NR) Assistant Director Adult Services, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Nicki Howlett (NH), Service Lead, SENDIASS	Y
	Susie McIvor (SM), Engagement Hub Lead, Suffolk County Council	
	Ros Somerville (RS), Assistant Director, Inclusion, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Garry Joyce (GJ) Assistant Director CYP Suffolk and North-East Essex Integrated Care Board	Y

	Rebecca Hulme (RH) Director Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Board	Y
	Codrutza Oros Marsh (COM) Assistant Director Social Care, Suffolk County Council	N
	Seb Smith (SS) Assistant Director Nursing Community Health & Family Support Services, Suffolk County Council	N
	Adrian Orr (AO) Assistant Director Education, Skills and Learning, Suffolk County Council	N
	Harriet Wakeling (HW) Head of Intelligence Hub, Suffolk County Council	N
	Graham Beamish (GB) Head of Programmes CYP, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Wendy Allen (WA) Programme Manager SEND, Suffolk County Council	Y
	Hayley Cullimore (HC) Trust SEND Lead, (Primary Education rep)	Y
	Anna Mears (AM) Headteacher, Castle East School (Special School rep)	Y
	Nicola Jervis (NJ) Lead Practitioner for SEND (Secondary School rep)	Y
	Adam Tedesco (AT) Deputy Chief Executive (Alternative Provision rep)	Y
	Trudi Rose-Porter (TRP) Director- Transition, Foundation and Inclusive Learning (Post 16 rep)	Y
	Jessica Clarke - Team Leader for Suffolk, East of England, Regions Group	Y
	James Allen-Perry – SEND Improvement and intervention Regional Lead	Y
	Vulnerable Children Unit, East of England	
Minute Taker	Kate House	Y
Invited to attend	Sue Willgoss (SPCF) Lauren Day (SPCF), Graham Ling, (Intelligence Hub), Kate Dodd, Senior Communications Officer	

Item No.	Item Description
1.	<p>Apologies & Introductions</p> <p>KB Welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>KB shared that this was her second SEND Improvement Board she was Chairing, and it was good to see many of the Board members last month, and it's good to see some of those who were not there joining today.</p> <p>KB welcomed the education colleagues who were attending their first formal meeting as participants.</p> <p>KB stated that whilst there are 32 people in meeting, it is only fair for everyone to introduce themselves.</p>

	<p><i>Introductions from all around the room.</i></p> <p>KB stated it is important for everyone to know who is in meeting, whilst it may take a lot of time, it is still important.</p> <p>KB explained that she did give a bit of an introduction at the last meeting, but wanted to reiterate for those not there that she is acting as an independent Chair of Board and part of role is to bring challenge, seek accountability and act as critical friend.</p> <p>KB stated that she will do so with respect, empathy and compassion whilst keeping families and young people heart of that.</p> <p>KB said that so far, she is enjoying the role and enjoying the commitment of everyone and the involvement of education partners.</p> <p><i>Housekeeping</i></p> <p>KB confirmed that the chat function was working and reminded everyone it is for the use of sharing links etc and anything anyone wants minuting should be brought into the meeting as the chat is not minuted.</p> <p>KB checked that everyone had received the papers.</p> <p>KB asked if there were any matters of AOB?</p> <p>None raised.</p>
2.	<p>Review Minutes and Action</p> <p>KB stated she wanted to check any matters of accuracy and went through each page.</p> <p>CS stated on page three of the minutes that she would like the poem she included in the SPCF update was written by Lucy Jacobs and she is a published poet, should be credited appropriately.</p> <p>RS confirmed that Terms of Reference had been reviewed and would be reviewed again in 6 months.</p> <p>KB asked the Board if everyone was happy to accept the minutes as accurate record of the previous meeting?</p> <p>Board confirmed accuracy of minutes subject to agreed changes.</p> <p>KB asked WA to take the Board through the Action Log</p> <p>Action Log</p> <p>WA confirmed that following the March meeting it was agreed to update refresher training. She confirmed that the first 2 training days took place last week and an update will be shared shortly. The training sessions were well attended, and they had received some good feedback. There was lots of learning that came from it and there will be a further update from the Head of SEND Services at a later meeting.</p> <p>WA confirmed that the Governance arrangements had been taken to Scrutiny Committee and were accepted with a recommendation. This is on the agenda and will be covered at that point.</p>

WA confirmed that DR will be attending the SPCF event in Lowestoft next week in AR's absence but no one from West Suffolk was able to attend.

AR stated that he will be in an all-day meeting next Friday so unable to attend the event. He very much enjoyed event in Stowmarket, he found it helpful to hear first-hand accounts and have discussions with parents and children.

BB confirmed she will be attending next Friday's SPCF event.

KB confirmed she will also be there.

NH confirmed she will be there, and she always tries to prioritise these forums to reach families. It was a good event in Stowmarket.

RH confirmed colleagues from the Waveney system will be there.

WA advised that action SIB014, for NB to look into NSFT colleagues attending future improvement board.

EM confirmed that conversations around this between NB and EG and EM and LN had taken place. Their proposal suggests health providers do not become part of this board but delegate decisions to the SROs of Programme Board to work with colleagues to agree where best providers should attend.

LN stated she thought it would be helpful to go with EM's proposal as NSFT are not only health provider with SEND and would mean having to invite other providers which would mean several additions.

KB stated that the key is we ensure providers are engaged in the right meetings in the system. The Board would therefore accept the proposal from EM.

WA confirmed that following SPCF's comments around cancellations of meetings, there have been communications cascaded through Inclusion Services, from Service Leadership and direct from RS. ICB have also raised this with internal meetings and SPCF will want to talk about that later. SCC are continuously putting those messages into the system.

WA confirmed that within the RISE programme of work there will be a listening exercise taking place after the summer holidays. Further people involved across national Parent Carer Forum. This will therefore stay on as amber.

WA raised the action of SPFC requiring easy read version of the complaints process.

CS stated that SPCF have received a version, but it is not easy to read.

CS has sent some feedback back as it was not easy to follow and confirmed there was still a long way to go.

KB asked if the work was underway to amend?

WA confirmed it had gone back to IT Communication as a colleague is specifically trained on "easy read" and they are reviewing following the feedback.

WA confirmed that SENDIASS had been invited to the complaints meeting with RS, CS and Jamie Swinyard.

WA stated that the Local Offer website review was in the report.

WA confirmed that the Performance report has been updated.

WA confirmed that following the escalation to IT of GOSS, the improvements have been made. The next steps will be to input into the complaints dashboard so SCC can test that

	<p>GOSS isn't overwriting. Intelligence Hub will then review once again. This was able to be resolved quicker due to Improvement Board escalation.</p> <p>WA confirmed that the action to invite SPCF to interviews had been completed by RS.</p> <p>WA asked GJ to update the Board on the action for Right to Choose.</p> <p>GJ explained that the ICB are working to put a narrative together. There will be a final working group on 22 July to look internally then will be seeking views from stakeholders</p> <p>WA thanked SW for email response regarding examples of good EHCPs and explained they do need to be redacted. WA asked SW if she was happy for her to follow up with Fran Alexander. This remains ongoing.</p> <p>SW confirmed this was ok.</p> <p>WA confirmed update regarding change in EHC plan finalised data has been actioned.</p> <p>WA confirmed the point about language used and that it is for everyone to be considerate. This is ongoing.</p> <p>WA confirmed the health data has been provided so this action is complete.</p> <p>KB asked if anyone had anything to raise about the actions. No one did.</p>
3.	<p>SPCF Update – Parent/carers feedback (20 mins)</p> <p>KB introduced CS and SW for their update.</p> <p>CS asked WA to share the slide provided.</p> <p>CS started that regrettably SPCF lost 8.1% of their operational hours due to short notice cancellations in a 12-day period.</p> <p>CS explained that during this time two SPCF members unwell, 5 medical appointments were attended and fulfilled all caring responsibilities. They didn't cancel any meetings.</p> <p>CS said they lost a further 10% as the week progressed of operational hours. This is quite considerable.</p> <p>CS advised they have faced demands for short notice meetings, meetings outside of their operational hours and late distribution of papers. This is not a new situation.</p> <p>CS is concerned about the lack of familiarity of the MOU amongst staff.</p> <p>CS must raise a concern over the professionalism of some meetings including staff members eating entire lunches on camera.</p> <p>CS confirmed it is distracting for their team, some members have autism and ADHD, and this is distracting. For example, licking ice lollies on screen is not appropriate.</p> <p>CS is pleased to confirm they have held some focus groups recently, and more are planned before the end of term. It has been great to spend time with families. It takes a lot for them to share, they are tough meetings but so valuable.</p> <p>CS confirmed they have seen some growth this month which is encouraging.</p> <p>CB confirmed that next Tuesday (09/07) there is a focus group for families to meet KB.</p> <p>CS explained they doubled their responses in the survey this year. Families mostly of ages 5–16-year-old parents in mainstream or special education. Most of them experience bullying or being left out. Only 1/3 of those children are getting the provisions in their plans.</p>

CS reported that 1/3 had seen improvements in education. And 10% had seen improvement in Health in the last year.

CS explained the survey reported a decline in post 16 transitions. 42% had not been able to access health services they needed to. 72% found difficult to access information about services, an increase of 5%. 11% found Liquid Logic easy to use. 11% said complaints were handled well and resolved.

CS requested the Board to please take time to read survey and requested a response from leaders to those who took time to complete the survey.

CS extended her gratitude to those who attended the event in Stowmarket and was pleased that so many families came through the door.

CS confirmed the next event is in Lowestoft next Friday (12/07) and asked the Board to share the details to anyone who might be able to come.

CS reiterated what KB said at the beginning of the meeting, that children and families are at the heart of this.

CS explained that there are children and young people who fall through the cracks and that an email is going to be sent that includes a letter from a young person who finishes school this year. The parent gave CS permission to share the letter, this young person did not have good experience of inclusion at school.

CS explained that the young person is on assessment pathway, but their needs were not met. Her family had nowhere to turn until introduced to CS. Sadly that's the truth of it, families are alone and isolated until they meet CS and SW.

CS continued that the school punished the young person for their needs rather than supported. They were banned from prom. The young person attended a public area, dressed up, looking beautiful and had photos with friends for memories. Unfortunately, school staff treated them poorly and they were publicly humiliated and had a panic attack. The young person aspires for other young people to have better experience than they did.

CS requested the Board to read through the letter. It is insightful to read. We cannot be surprised that we have a mental health crisis across the country.

KB thanked CS.

KB commented that finishing with an explanation of a young person's experience is impactful. As a strategic Board, the actions Suffolk have got in the PAP, the board and local area partnerships are all collectively responsible, are capturing the key pieces of feedback. Colleagues in education sector will be thinking carefully about roles and contribution, influencing and being an agent of change in sector.

KB confirmed she looks forward to reading the letter and would be happy to have a conversation with the young person if they would like.

CS confirmed the young person would like to talk, they want to drive change.

KB commented that the first element of feedback, the loss of time due to cancellations was also a matter at the last meeting. She was keen to know how much this relates to period between last board, to this board.

CS confirmed it was the last 12-day period. Claire stated that people have been told of the impact, but it is still happening. Not one of the cancellations was for an acceptable reason.

GJ explained that he has spoken to CS the about cancellations from the ICB. A couple were health providers, not the ICB, but he still takes responsibility.

KB requested this is monitored on a week-by-week basis.

AM requested a further break down on the data, to see what comparative data is between mainstream schools and special schools particularly around the bullying and peer isolation. As school leaders it would be interesting for us to see around the bullying peer isolation if that's related to primary, secondary, mainstream. Could the data be broken down further?

CS responded she wasn't sure how far it can break down and explained that because parent carers were short on time they keep the survey small, under 35 questions. In the survey you have got, you've got all the answers to everything we have. But to break it down it would be a lot of extra work.

KB confirmed that in terms of the survey, the responses we have are those we need to be working from.

CS explained that looking at surveys from Health Watch, that go into more depth, would be useful to look at together.

RS thanked CS for sharing when meetings have been cancelled and acknowledged she was one of those cancellations. She explained that the team are trying to address this issue and ensure the meetings are prioritised and ensure reps are sent.

RS addressed the point about thinking how to take forward the SPCF survey, explained that CS and WA were in discussion about next steps that SCC can take as well as working with school leaders, there is a meeting this afternoon (05/07) with education reps to see what we can do together to take this forward.

RS acknowledge CS point around a response from leaders to those who completed the survey and commented that people in room would agree that is appropriate.

CS explained that in regard to meetings cancellations, we are parent cares and fit around these meetings, they arrange children's appointments to attend these meetings and then they're cancelled. They don't get paid a salary like working 9-5pm, SPCF staff are paid for the meetings they attend so by cancelling a meeting, you're cutting someone's pay and disrupting a family. SPCF team have autism and ADHD and short notice changes can be distressing. Please be mindful of impact.

KB confirmed this was discussed at last board. She confirmed there is an acknowledgement that it is an exception to cancel meetings.

SW wanted to go back to the point AM raised about bullying in schools. In 2022 a Board took recommendations from the child mortality report. SCC said they would take on 9 points. It was to ensure schools and colleges have clear anti bullying policies that include how to assess risks of suicide. The link between bullying and suicide is well known.

SW said she is not sure these actions were taken on. She would like to make sure schools have anti bullying policies in place. We have lost enough children in Suffolk, especially recently.

KB confirmed this speaks to the whole Inclusion agenda. We need to look at the survey and reinforces messages from Ofsted report and need to cross referencing that with Priority Action Plan and the actions the system leaders are taking forward, and nothing is being missed. This is a key issue.

SW explained she believes this is an action for the DfE. She is honoured to be asked to sit on Government advisory board as a priority group and this is one of the areas SW can inform them on so would be a shame if her own county weren't doing anything about it.

KB asked is there a follow up conversation?

RS thanked SW and confirmed we are now visiting every school. JG's team are visiting every maintained schools.

ACTION SIB028: RS, JG and SW have a meeting to discuss further and ensure school visits are checking for a copy of the bullying policy when in schools, then working with the school to ensure it is put into place.

JG suggested also linking with the Suffolk Education Partnership. Together the Suffolk Local Area Partnership can make it a priority.

KB interfaces – flow between this board and other boards is important. It needs to be worked out how it streamlines. This is a key **challenge**. Sue will keep us right in this board.

SW – I will

NH suggested that it is wider than bullying, it is inclusion. It starts with the ethos, the culture in any setting or department. It links to what we've seen in SENDIASS, providing training for school governors, it is in decline the numbers attending. NH said that they have come to an agreement with governors' services in SCC that rather than a session, they provide the information, content, messages about Inclusion and make it public, including the responsibilities of schools. Academy Trusts are providing own training. What SENDIASS does is based on the law and covers role governors play in holding to account. NH reiterated that anything they can do to support, do reach out.

KB agreed that it is a wider Inclusion piece and there are several actions in place to take that forward. It is the Board's job is to monitor whether progress is being made.

KB said it was great the education colleagues are part of the Board as great to have the education sector working in partnership. It is a big County, so no mean feat, but it is possible.

AR wanted to go back to something CS mentioned regarding the familiarity of memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He wanted the team to take that away and have a look at it as it is important to have good understanding of it.

KB suggested this should be an Action.

RS confirmed there is an action for reviewing it with GJ. The other point CS mentioned and should be an action is the sharing of the MOU.

ACTION SIB029 - Sharing and understanding of the MOU within the teams across the Local Area Partnership following review in September 24.

CS confirmed they plan to get together in September to go through it and make a couple of tweaks to reflect current climate.

AR requested to be part of that meeting.

CS confirmed this was fine.

KB confirmed RS and GJ were taking the work forward and would bring AR in when appropriate.

	<p>KB reiterated one of the key actions is the response to survey. Key aspect making sure the actions in the PAP, although doesn't pick up every action required in the SEND system, but what's happening in SEND system is responding to key messages.</p> <p>LN asked if KB wanted something to come back re survey.</p> <p>KB confirmed that there needs to be a response from key leaders.</p> <p>LN asked is it would be helpful to track individual feedback against the PAP and do that mapping exercise?</p> <p>WA confirmed that there is a meeting planned with SPCF on Monday (08/07)</p> <p>KB confirmed that what LN was saying was overlapping the feedback from the survey with actions.</p> <p>KB thanked CS and SW.</p>
4.	<p>Improvement Notice</p> <p>KB introduced a verbal item from EM with regards to the Improvement Notice.</p> <p>EM explained most Board members are aware of the contact with DfE in April 2024 to inform us that the Minister for Children and Families at the time was going to issue an Improvement Notice to SCC. Due to the Moratorium period that's been in place since end of May until yesterday (04/07) an Improvement Notice hasn't yet been published by DfE, but we understand it will be at some point soon.</p> <p>KB confirmed we know there will be an Improvement Notice, but we await the publication by the DfE.</p>
5.	<p>High Level report Strategy, Priority Action Plan, Risk Register and QA report</p> <p>KB confirmed everyone has the report and the expectation is for people to have read reports and have questions at the ready. RS and GJ will pick key headlines and then the Board can discuss.</p> <p>RS welcomes the education reps and confirms they are meeting this afternoon about how they can work together. Interface within our own governance system and the board as well as representing sector.</p> <p>RS discussed the report, referencing points from the Improvement Board report.</p> <p>Point 1.4 – shows the impact of changes to performance data with the inclusion of Health data set.</p> <p>Point 1.7 – continue to recruit to new posts with additional money. Next recruitment day will be at the end of July.</p> <p>Point 1.11 – launch of new annual review paperwork, RS extended thanks to those involved including SPCF. It has been launched as a paper-based review and will become an online form as and when it goes online. There has been a delay to going online as a consequence of the provider. The service is now on track to get it online for the autumn term for pilot schools. The form has received positive feedback from families and schools.</p>

SW explained that she did an annual review with a family, the child was in Alternative Provision with multiple provisions. She suggested the form needs tweaking a bit to make allowances for that.

RS confirmed that was helpful feedback and explained this is why we put it out in paper base before it went online as gives opportunity to make tweaks.

RS asked if SW was clear where to take this feedback outside of board?

ACTION SIB030: SW to feedback back to relevant review group on annual review form suggestions.

RS continued update referencing the Summary board report.

1.14 – It was recognised through trajectory work more capacity is required with a year-on-year increase. A paper for this will go to July cabinet.

1.15 – Health colleagues (Designated Clinical Officer (DCO)) have experienced an issue with DCO dashboard. IT confirmed that this is now resolved thanks to escalation from Board.

1.12 – There is a specific agenda item on QA within the agenda. The Quality Assurance process has been reviewed by Programme Office against the Priority Action Plan; the programme office has requested that this is escalated to committee for further discussion.

1.23 – regarding the feedback section on the local offer website. SPCF survey, stated that 73% of parents not able to navigate the system, the Local Offer has been revised and further work will be required to understand what is required. Suggested that SENDIASS could put on some sessions/drop ins with SPCF to help support families.

SPCF advised that they were surprised at that survey result as she thought the new Local Offer was easier but that doesn't mean it is for everyone. New cohort of SEND parents each year and maybe they don't know where to go.

RS said she felt SPCF summarised the benefits of the Local Offer at the Stowmarket event. SCC and SPCF should work together for drop ins and focus groups on a regular basis.

SENDIASS suggested linking up with the existing SPCF SEND advice drop ins which have been running regularly within the Family Hubs.

SPCF suggested getting together to work out how to make it easier for SEND parents to access information. Schools need to support as well; they could be sharing more info about Local Offer. Also improving information available at doctors.

KB confirmed the 2 points, one is communication on how the information gets to families and the other is making sure people can access the Local Offer and information is clear.

WA confirmed this is an action within the Priority Action Plan. Communication and widening how we communicate with more people on a wider basis.

ACTION SIB031 WA to cross reference Improvement Board discussions to SEND Strategy and PAP to ensure this is tracked and actions are in place.

RH asked CS and SW if there is a view on using QR code? Are they considered helpful? Could be useful for some people to scan through to info?

CS explained she felt QR codes are helpful to some and not others. It's not bad idea to put QR codes on posters as it will work for some.

KB confirmed that it was about having additional methods but using a blend of methods.

NH confirmed SENDIASS are gradually adding QR codes to all resource and agreed that a range of things are needed help families to access. Another thought is about social prescribers, SENDIASS have made a couple of links but don't have a complete network of doctors. Perhaps Health colleagues could help?

ACTION SIB032: LN to help NH to seek who is best for SENDIASS to link into with for links into doctors.

RS 1.29 The Delivering Better Value programme has been running and moving out in the autumn term with the Speech and Language offer and the SEMH offer. Thank you to SPCF for working with the team on this. Gathering data on first cohort on what difference made in the first round. So far, anecdotal evidence is positive. This is part of the Early Intervention graduated response, which was discussed at Scrutiny about focussing on early intervention. 1

3.4 – Training that has been coproduced across the partnership had been raised as a concern due to Health colleagues not having access due to the number of licenses that SCC workforce development hold, this has been resolved with the training to be made available of health training portal as well.

SENDIASS added context to Summary report item 3.6 to explain difficulties. SENDIASS are losing a senior member of team. SENDIASS are exploring additional investment. As a result, the team have done a reshuffle to make sure they can meet the needs of families. This has impacted the offer and the need to squeeze from other areas, reducing the helpline to 3 days.

SENDIASS wanted to reassure the Board that they will do as much as they can. SPCF will be sighted on possible changes, they are meeting with advisory group to discuss changes. Virtual communications will go out w/c 15 July. Service delivery change is from 1 August. Losing a senior member of staff has a big impact. The front-line staff are quite new and have less experience so rely on experienced members of team so it's a big impact.

SENDIASS confirmed they will focus on maintaining quality and keeping things consistent.

KB thanked SENDIASS.

RS confirmed that if the additional money is agreed, some of it will be coming to SENDIASS.

ACTION SIB033 – RS and NH to have conversation about additional resource for SENDIASS.

AR confirmed his support with the extra resource.

KB confirmed this would be discussed outside of Board and that SENDIASS is very important.

SENDIASS explains it takes a lot of time to train, could be looking at disruption for the foreseeable.

KB confirmed the need to monitor the impact.

GJ confirmed he was going to talk about Priority Action Plan with 3 key areas to focus on.

First point is performance data and the data Health collect. Both Integrated Care Boards (ICB) work together on the health data dashboard and will continue to grow the dashboard as the local area partnership progress the priority action plan.

Second area is mental health, from a Suffolk North-East Essex (SNEE) point of view have been reviewing 2 areas of mental health. The first is crisis reviewing how the provision gaps can be filled. Workshops have been happening and SNEE are close to final model which will be ready by end of summer. There is a provisional date of 23 September to go to SNEE ICB Execs with proposals. The second part of mental health relates to the wider system of mental health, the framework. SNEE ICB are creating a new name for it. There have been several workshops with over 60 people face to face, there have been 6 different work streams developed. There will be volunteers to help from September for each work stream. The focus is on building over the summer period and a lot of the focus will be on early intervention.

Final point is Neuro development pathway, SNEE ICB have put some significant funding in to reduce backlog. Important to note around Neuro pathway, SNEE ICB are committed to early support within voluntary sector. Reviewing existing services and looking at what worked. ICB SNEE will come up with a finalised proposal by the end of September and will go to the ICB Execs for approval and then will commence a procurement programme from October.

AR asked around the resource required, is that something that will require continual further resource to maintain the work?

GJ confirmed that in terms of voluntary sector areas of support that SNEE ICB are procuring, there is a committed £1million investment from the ICB. The first set of contracts that are coming to close next year were for 4 years. Future ones will likely be for 5 or 6 years to give financial stability.

AR confirmed it is crucial to be sustainable.

KB asked RH if anything further to add.

RH confirmed that the two ICBs work as closely together as possible. The ICB's need to demonstrate impact and have been working together with the Norfolk/Waveney ICB team, not just SEND teams because what we're doing with SEND should be accessible to all children and young people. A set of measures is being agreed to use across all programs. These are qualitative not just quantitative. There will be a set of solid measures across all services. This will not happen overnight but exciting to be able to demonstrate real impact. The aim is to start capturing things that currently exist and identify the source and work with those people to share the information. With increased capacity in Health, want to show what that means for children and young people.

KB confirmed that RH is right about impact and sounds exciting.

RH requested from the board to help Health keep this high on the agenda.

KB confirmed that is what the Board is here for.

LW explained that with the increased capacity and investment it has a knock-on effect to health voluntary services with increased requests. The capacity is not mirrored in other services. **Question to the Board is are we watching what's happening with that investment, looking at training and time it takes across whole system.**

KB confirmed that was very valid **challenge** to the board.

RS confirmed that the recent trajectory work had been shared across partnership which is what SCC are basing the investment on. It's on the table and needs to be looked at.

KB explained this is why we need to check we have we got the right people around the table? Seems we do, so people can take it away.

KB checked any further comments on the on high level report.

Next point to discuss is the Quality Assurance report

RS passed over to GB to provide context.

GB explained the cycle one report on new plan is in isolation so wanted to provide wider context for the huge amount of work in that space. The report shows reasonably good quality of EHC plans but that is at odds with the SPCF survey, SCC survey and the Ofsted inspection.

GB explained the service are looking operationally at plans before they are issued. From July, starting to include the progress young people are making within course of their SEND journey. What's happening between delivering the plan and the difference its making. Resourcing has been limited so far but anticipate increased resourcing will strength QA significantly. SEND needs a consistently higher QA performance board which will feed into SEND Improvement Board. To add confidence to auditing, add as much family feedback on every audit. Increasing moderation of audits so the SEND consistently knows what good looks like. Plus, a range of other things to strengthen the work.

KB asked if the work is programmed in, and will the Board have sight of this? The QA performance board sounds good, is there a plan in place to establish that?

GB confirmed it was underway, draft Terms of Reference had started to be circulated.

KB confirmed it is added to the forward plan and agree this is a standing item.

AR confirmed the Board need to see the family feedback.

KB confirmed that there is a plan to strengthen the family feedback and bring to Board. Important for both timeliness and quality. Any further comments around QA?

SW explained that outside of SPCF, SW and CS help families and provide SEND support. SW and Lucy Jacobs check EHC plans. Since October last year SW and Lucy Jacobs have checked a lot of plans. LJ is in process of writing up the themes of the findings and how they can be improved. These will be available for everyone. SW stated that it would be good to see SPCF involved in auditing. SW query how plans can score high as SW rarely see's a good quality plan.

KB asked GB to take account of SPCF in the QA?

	<p>GB agreed.</p> <p>LW explained that herself and HC are doing a deep dive of timeliness and quality, and this will be feedback.</p> <p>KB asked LW when this feedback will be available?</p> <p>LW confirmed it would be soon. There is a provisional date but waiting for people to agree.</p> <p>TRP suggested education could be involved in the feedback. Suffolk New College have 350 learners with EHC Plans so they see the quality as they come in post 16 so could feed in.</p> <p>KB confirmed the Board would note TRPs wanting to be involved.</p> <p>SW explained that with the family feedback, for families receiving first EHCP, they're not sure if it's a good plan until things go wrong or they consult SPCF.</p> <p>KB confirmed the importance of the quality of process in constructing the plan and then the delivery of that plan, which is a different matter.</p> <p>KB confirmed that there is a lot of work needed around QA plans. Plans in place, there is an action plan, and confirmed with board to move on.</p>
6.	<p>Review Terms of Reference (ToR)</p> <p>KB explained the two aspects of the review of the ToR, first is that it is brought to Board to review with school reps as they are included in the ToR.</p> <p>KB asked if the Board is happy to approve the change?</p> <p>KB explained the second aspect was to decide frequency of the Board. Currently it is quarterly. There have been discussions about keeping pace and therefore a consideration to make the Board more frequent. A proposal to shift to bi-monthly, every 2 months so 6 meetings a year.</p> <p>KB asked what people think of that change? Would then work on dates post September and align with programme committee.</p> <p>AR confirmed his support for greater frequency due to stage of development and important to maintain vigilance.</p> <p>KB confirmed it is about the key system leaders having that assurance and line of sight. The board have been meeting monthly so moving to quarterly feels a stretch so every 2 months feels like it would work.</p> <p>EM endorsed that proposal. Has a good balance between maintain pace but allowing key partners to undertake some of the work. Maintaining monthly meetings means investing more energy in preparation for board instead of actual work.</p> <p>KB asked the Board if any thoughts that bi-monthly was the right thing to do? Confirmed the ToR will be amended.</p>

	<p>***no objection***</p> <p>KB acknowledged SPCF get involved a lot so hopefully the change is helpful.</p> <p>CS confirmed it useful for SPCF and it's good to get to together. SPCF are just keen to see improvement.</p> <p>KB confirmed that as an incoming Chair, quarterly feels too long so can agree that.</p> <p>EM referred to SIB action 08 in terms of interface between ToR and wider SCC systems. EM took SEND governance to Audit Committee 11 June and they endorsed SEND governance and thought it was important to include that in the minutes. They did ask for 2 minor changes to be considered.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would the Board agree that the ToR would explicitly state that the minutes be uploaded to the Local Offer website from a transparency perspective. Did reassure they are loaded to the website, but they suggested it is included in the ToR. 2. Relates to both ToR for this board and the ToR for the Programme Committee. At section 8 of ToR, in relation to declaration of interest. The Audit Committee made a good point where we say members must declare a personal or professional interest related to any items, therefore all members will have a direct personal and professional interest as that is why they are on the Board. Therefore, wanted to amend to expressly sight around conflict of interest rather than members having a personal or professional interest. <p>KB confirmed that those points make sense and asked if anyone had an issue for the ToR to be amended to add in that minutes would be loaded on to website and change to add "conflict of interest"</p> <p>No objection</p> <p>KB confirmed the Board agree to those two changes.</p> <p>Action SIB034 WA amend TOR to change frequency and reference to conflict of interest as suggested by Audit Committee.</p>
7.	<p>Progress of Performance Data</p> <p>GJ started with Health measures on third page of report. Last Board they were still developing these, they are still being developed but some measures are here. Focussed on long delays for mental health. The BI teams for both ICBs have been working together along with other officers.</p> <p>9n (number of referrals with 1+ contacts received in 4 weeks) and 9p (percentage of referrals with 1+ contacts received in 4 weeks) relate to first contact in relation to mental health, this is national health data and covers Suffolk as a county. What it shows is the time take from referral to first contact is getting better. More work on this is needed to understand the journey, when does the actual work with the service begin. Looking to enhance that further as ICB know there are waits between first contact and interventions.</p>

Second area focussed on was first point of contact. ICB have the emotional wellbeing hub in Suffolk and Integrated front door but also mental health teams in schools. There is a gap in data around mental health in school.

Emotional Wellbeing Hub showing data in terms of average waiting times. Integrated front door but also want to develop more data around mental health support in schools. They will grow as years progress. For NDD, ICB are still developing measures. Only measure ICB have is relating to Autism under 11 for the SNEE ICB relates to lot of work around recovery plans. WST have managed to triage all the backlog of referrals and will begin assessments of those from next week. Expect to go through entirety of list by November. By November, ICB expect to see a different picture in relation to waiting times for Autism under 11.

Same reporting levels for Autism over 11 and for ADHD, unfortunately the procurement had to be delayed because of general election but has gone live today (05/07). Once procurement has happened and everyone has been triaged, ICB will report same data.

GJ asked if anyone had any questions?

KB confirmed there is work being done to enhance data.

GJ confirmed it will grow.

SW said it was amazing Health have triaged that backlog (for NDD). Mental health wait is still a concern, at one time when a young person was waiting, there should be a safety plan developed. In East West Suffolk there is an offer but there isn't a similar offer in Waveney and that should be something to work towards, so families have the same opportunities for support.

RH confirmed they do have that through the integrated front door, it's called the access to children and young people mental health support, 0-25 years. Working to get shorter title for that service. Each young person and their family will speak to an individual at point of request for support, no one should leave that route without support. Consider where can support can be provided by, is there something that can be offered in the interim. That is the route ICB are trying to go down.

SW explained some adults are sent to Live Loud for Danny for support. The safety plans SW has seen are points mentioned in a letter which is not really a safety plan.

RH confirmed it is not done as letter it is a conversation with service. Everyone will have contact and a conversation with someone. Some services do have drop ins, for example Multi-Agency Psychological Support (MAPS).

have drop ins and young people are signposted to those. There are youth workers that they will be signposted to. It is all done at first contact now.

SW asked if any of these people (providing mental health support) are attending SPCF event next week?

RH confirmed that members attending from mental health team.

KB asked if any further questions on health date? Move on to Ros.

RS confirmed that the 20-week data is now hitting the trajectory line, this is conditional on the money, sign off in July and will continue to focus on that.

Points around 4n to 7p it was requested the service provide information on what exceptions were. They are exceptions for advice, so advice can be late, the only reasons advice can be late. Not across the entire 20 weeks data. That will be there, and the service will keep that in the report as a reference point. Increased occupancy rate within alternative provision, as have removed blockages.

Meditation was raised by Ofsted as being high, the rates have gone down which is aligned to the work done around EHC plan request panel, move on average from 60% to 80 % agreed. That is not set as a limit.

8n SCC have recruited lead for Annual Review team and this will be their focus, we're seeing progress and double reds now. That is a key focus what else we need to be doing.

24p, permanent exclusions, RS has developed a working group and leading on what is already provided to support schools? Bullying, culture in schools and how are SCC and schools getting it right. What is SCC doing to support schools, how is it manifesting through every member of staff in the school, led by the Head. As things might be escalating, where can they go for support. Do schools know about it? Putting a toolkit together so schools know where to get the support and that will be launched in autumn term. Joining together what already exists and how SCC communicate that, working with CEOs of education partnerships on that. SCC and School leaders have a conference in January to reflect on that.

SW asked around the plans produced in 20 weeks, there are still families who have been waiting months. SW feel for families when they see things going up and they're still waiting. A need to prioritise those who have been waiting.

RS explained that the challenge is we can't priorities everyone.

SW explained that the impact on the families waiting have had children excluded because EHC plan isn't in place. Interested to see how many of the young people excluded are those waiting for EHC plans.

RS confirmed that they have that data and will share that. RS the service does not underestimate it. Looking across the piece and what resource is available to those who need it the most.

ACTION SIB35 – RS share the data regarding cohorts of how long CYP are waiting for a completed EHCNA or subsequent final plan

EM asked if there was value having a measure which is the percentage EHCNAs in progress that are currently in time and percentages EHCNAs in progress but will be late. Then it will be known what the 1,934 EHCNA caseload is made up of. Additionally, measure around EHCNAs in progress, what is the longest wait, likely week and days. Would that provide some sight and discussion point for Board about getting prioritisation verses wait right.

GL confirmed they can go away see what the Intelligence hub can do.

ACTION SIB036 – Intelligence Hub to review EHCNA requests on those that will be within the timescale and those over and add to performance report.

HC explained that the DfE collect two key pieces of data, children waiting 30 weeks or more and children waiting 52 weeks or more. Maybe beneficial to put those measure in but keeping track of waiting time.

	<p>EM agreed with HC point. Measures Suffolk have in 6p 7n 7p do use those 30 and 52 weeks but that is for plans issued rather than plans that haven't yet been issued.</p> <p>KB confirmed the board have sight of those completed but not got sight of those in the process. If Suffolk add EM's suggestions and brought back in next board.</p> <p>LN wanted to say thank you to Local Authority colleagues for the amazing progress made in providing EHC Plan date and the trajectory which helps us (ICB) track and keep accountability. Would like to endorse EM's suggestion about longest wait.</p> <p>KB confirmed SW is right in picking up those that are still waiting.</p> <p>KB asked any further questions around date?</p> <p>Cllr JF asked if there was any idea of the age ranges of excluded children in the data as found during Scrutiny Committee there is quite a difference.</p> <p>RS confirmed this is school age children. This year, numbers of children excluded from primary school has dropped compared to last year. The Year 9,10 and 11s make up most permanent exclusions.</p> <p>RS acknowledge and accept the long wait and whilst the capacity supporting for those children within 20 weeks. Suffolk are looking to prioritise high priority children within that cohort. The risk is Suffolk will extend waits but do prioritise those waiting. Over 20 weeks are the priority groups as well. Not diminishing the impact of the wait.</p> <p>KB asked any other questions around data?</p>
8.	<p>Forward Plan</p> <p>KB confirmed that at the next meeting there is the DfE deep dive if that is ready and appropriate to be looking at.</p> <p>KB confirmed the right to choose update from GJ.</p> <p>KB confirmed QA added.</p> <p>EM suggested the meeting should maybe be 2.5- or 3-hour meeting with comfort break.</p> <p>Cllr BB said that some people not comfortable to sit still for that long so factor in a short break.</p> <p>KB confirmed the 2 options and need to give it enough time. Any strong feeling?</p> <p>Cllr AR suggested SPCF needs to be considered how the board timetable the agenda.</p> <p>SW suggested everyone put who they are in chat to avoid long introductions.</p> <p>KB confirmed that hopefully won't need to do introductions again.</p> <p>CS suggested 2.45 hours with half hour plus 15 min break.</p> <p>KB confirmed 2 hours 45 minutes as new length of the Board meeting.</p> <p>Cllr AR endorsed that suggestion. Would be useful to have a synopsis of key points and then come to the meeting prepared.</p> <p>KB confirmed this is the use of the high-level report. Board members can raise their challenges.</p> <p>NJ raised the point that 10 April Board meeting will be in school holidays.</p>

	<p>KB confirmed the Board are looking at dates to avoid school holidays as that is also consideration for SPCF.</p> <p>KB confirmed that is the end of the agenda but wanted to recognise this is EMs final meeting of the Board and recognised her contribution including her swift action following the inspection, commitment to pace and strengthen governance.</p> <p>NB wanted to recognise EMs significant contribution across CYP.</p> <p>KB confirmed SJS will be joining the next Board.</p> <p>NB confirmed SJS is planning to attend the SPCF event in Lowestoft.</p> <p>SW wanted to thank Izzy Connell and Claire Darwin for ensuring the new annual review training was released on 17 June, was the anniversary of losing her son so meant a lot to her.</p> <p>KB confirmed everyone was happy to draw the meeting to a close.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
9.	AOB
	<p>Dates of Future meetings</p> <p>Friday 6 September 2024 10am – 12:00pm</p> <p>Wednesday 23 October 2024 10am – 12:45pm</p> <p>Wednesday 18 December 2024 10am – 12:45pm</p> <p>Thursday 13 February 2025 10am – 12:45pm</p> <p>Wednesday 2 April 2025 10am – 12:45pm</p> <p>Wednesday 21 May 2025 10am – 12:45pm</p> <p>Thursday 17 July 2025 10am – 12:45pm</p>