



0-25 SEND Quality Assurance Group Minutes

17 January 2018

<b>PRESENT:</b>	
Ellie Gray	Children’s Commissioning & Quality Monitoring Manager
Redacted	Redacted
Sara Fletcher	Partnership Manager, East Riding Education and Skills Partnership
John Seaman	Principal Improvement Advisor
Redacted	Redacted
Angela Potter	Interim SEN Team Leader
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	
Lesley Gilson	Interim Specialist Services & Inclusive Education Manager
Helen Higgins	Educational Psychologist
Jonathan Connell	Interim Children’s Commissioning & Quality Monitoring Team Manager
Kate Jagger	Principal Performance Officer
<b>DISCUSSION NOTES</b>	
<b>ACTIONS:</b>	
<b>1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</b>	
<b>2. Notes and matters arising from the last meeting (14.9.17)</b>	
<i>Declined statutory assessments</i> – Explore the possibility of SEN team including a list of documents/ evidence when informing parent/ carers that their request for statutory assessment has been turned down. AP confirmed that some letters had already been changed but that, until processes, roles and responsibilities of the re-structured teams were confirmed and in place, there will still be some changes required. Redacted EG also fed back that, as a result of the single route of redress to the SEND Tribunal national trial to begin in April 2018, there are additional changes required to letters.	AP
<i>QA/ Sign-off for new EHCPs</i> – Redacted had requested clarification regarding whether new EHCPs were QA’d and/or signed off at SEN Panel. AP confirmed that this does not routinely happen at SEN Panel but that this was currently being reviewed as part of the review of SEN Panel and EHCP processes. All agreed that it was important to ensure that all EHCPs are of robust quality.	AP

<p><b>3. SEND Data</b></p> <p>This was the first meeting of the combined SEND Data Group and the 0-25 SEND QA Group. JS gave outlined the background and remit of the SEND Data Group – to establish robust data gathering, monitoring and analysis to inform the SEND Inspection Self Evaluation Framework (SEF). JS confirmed that education data collection and review is now established. However, gaps remain in particular around PfA and non-education data, e.g., health and social care.</p> <p>JS has reviewed the SEND Inspection letters received by LAs who have already received their inspection, and drawn up a list of data requirements that were routinely highlighted as an issue. KJ has the latest version of this list.</p> <p>There was a general discussion regarding transfers of statements to EHCP – the first wave of transfers were those relating to PfA. JS confirmed that this has been included in the data collection but that there is a consistency issues in terms of data relating to PfA – particularly as primary needs are defined by c&amp;yp themselves and do not follow the pre-16 categorisation. It is therefore very difficult to track young people – there is little outcome or next destination data available. Providers are required to send starter lists but nothing further.</p> <p>SF confirmed that, although hwe do not have learner names, we are able to look at provider numbers of young people defined as SEN or LD. It may be possible therefore to look at emerging patterns and trends. SF also confirmed that she has a summary document covering the last 3 years which shows the levels c&amp;yp are choosing to study, and the subject areas. It was agreed that this would be a useful document to share.</p> <p><b>Action: SF to circulate the 3 year PfA data summary for the group’s info, and a briefer version that can be circulated to wider EYPCF members.</b></p> <p>Current PfA data shows that NEETs are fairly low which would suggest that, generally, the provision is available. However, there is much greater difficulty in obtaining data for Post 19. SF highlighted that the Jobcentre are willing to look at data sharing but, before we can progress this, our legal teams will need to agree a process and agreement.</p> <p><b>Action: SF to feedback on progress re data sharing with Jobcentre.</b></p> <p>Issues remain with collating health data, particularly as there needs to be agreement regarding which part of health should provide which data, i.e., CCG, Public Health, NHS England and health providers. EG agreed to liaise with KJ re this.</p> <p><b>Action: EG to liaise with KJ regarding collation of health data.</b></p>	<p>SF</p> <p>SF</p> <p>EG/KJ</p>
---	----------------------------------

<p><b>4. Quality Assurance</b></p> <p>A quality assurance exercise was undertaken on an anonymised EHCP. This was undertaken as a group exercise. The EHCP was for a child that attends a secondary school. The exercise resulted in the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was a transfer from Statement to EHCP and this shows in the lack of detail in some instances.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that a Educational Psychologist assessment was requested or submitted. This is a key report that needed to be included.</li> <li>• There was a lot of information pulled from a range of needs which was positive</li> <li>• No real sense of the young person or any background/history.</li> <li>• Clarity about what the young person likes but there is no real evidence or highlighting of aspirations. This section could have been more detailed.</li> <li>• It was clear that the young person’s views had been captured but no real detail or evidence about health, play, schooling, independence and friendships or about future plans, employment, FE etc.</li> <li>• There were some elements where the language should centre on support needs, e.g., ‘young person would benefit from...’ rather than ‘young person needs to change...’</li> <li>• There is a range of needs evidenced but these are rather broad, with no levels of functioning included.</li> <li>• Not particularly specific and a focus on what the young person can’t do rather than what they can do.</li> <li>• Use of outdated terms such as ‘general learning difficulties’.</li> <li>• Contribution from health was very light and consisted of bullet point. These were not recorded as needs and not all appeared relevant to SEND.</li> <li>• No evidence or contribution from health relating to the sensory needs highlighted in Section B.</li> <li>• Physiotherapy provision listed but no physiotherapy needs were highlighted in Section C.</li> <li>• Needed a much fuller picture of the young person’s medical needs as these were very relevant to his SEND.</li> <li>• Some evidence in Section B that there may be social care needs but no evidence that this was requested or considered.</li> <li>• Majority of outcomes are SMART, although some come be more timebound.</li> <li>• Monitoring and review arrangement included in some cases but not all.</li> <li>• Overall there is good evidence of what needs to be put in place.</li> <li>• No provisions to support social, emotional or personal safety needs highlighted in Section B.</li> <li>• Social elements outside of parental supervision needs exploring, i.e., attending activities without parents present.</li> </ul> <p>QA template to be typed and circulated to the group.  AP agreed to feedback the comments above to the relevant EHC Commissioning Officer/EHCP Transfer Officer.</p>	<p>AP</p>
<p><b>5. Quality Assurance Process reflection</b></p> <p>All agreed that the current process appeared to be working well. EG agreed to begin compiling a summary of themes and trends of both EHCPs QAd through this group,</p>	

but also those through SEN Panel and wider SEN Team activity. <b>Action: EG to collate themes and trends from all EHCP QA activity</b>		EG
<b>6. Any Other Business</b>  EG confirmed that she had previously chaired this meeting in her role as CCQMT Manager. As she has now changed roles, she would liaise with the Interim CCQMT Manager to discuss chairing arrangements as it would seem appropriate to continue with the chair sitting with the CCQM Team.		EG
<b>Future Meetings Dates</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>Time</b>
8 <sup>th</sup> February 2018	Room 4	1.30 – 3.30pm
12 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	Room 4	1.30 – 3.30pm
7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	Room 4	1.30 – 3.30pm
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2018	Room 4	1.30 – 3.30pm

DRAFT