Working Group 2 meeting minutes
7th May 2015, 11 am
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow

APPROVED

Members present: **John Dalziel**, Skills Development Scotland; **Amy Dixon**, Scottish Government Care, Support and Rights; **Laura Dykes**, Parent; **James Fletcher**, ARC Scotland (CHAIR); **Lynsay Haglington**, East Dunbartonshire Council/Social Work; **Kirsten Hogg**, Camphill Scotland; **Ian Hood**, Learning Disability Alliance Scotland; **Scott Richardson-Read**, ARC Scotland; **Lynsey Stewart**, Autism Network Scotland

Invited guests present: Jean MacLellan and Donald Macleod, National Autism Co-ordination Project, University of Strathclyde

Apologies: John Butcher, Directors of Education; **Leia Fitzgerald**, Higher Education/Scottish Government; **Arlene Johnstone**, Social Work Scotland / NHS Highland, **Ali Taylor,** Scottish Government Care, Support and Rights

Minutes by: Tracy Wenzl, Autism Network Scotland

I.   **Welcome and Introductions** – Introductions were made around the room.
II. **Review of action items**

a. *AT to look into the situation regarding additional funding (£1K) for transitions focused events* - AD reported for AT that the £1K funding should already be in the ANS budget. LS thought this was the money for the transitions roadshows, and IH confirmed that this is supposed to be a different pot of funding for an event to promote good outcomes from the Autism Development Fund (ADF) projects related to transitions.
    ACTION ITEM: AD will double check on £1K funding for transitions event with AT.

b. *AT to report back on findings from ADF projects* - AD circulated a document which listed funded transitions project by local authority and will send the spreadsheet via email. JD requested outcomes reports from first two years of funded projects.
    ACTION ITEM: AD to find out if outcomes reports from first two years of ADF projects are available.

c. *AT to report on which funded projects are about transitions* - Document circulated under item b covered this. JD asked about a Values into Action Scotland (VIAS) employment project; it would have application to this group also. JF noted the group is interested in learning and outcomes from transitions projects. KH noted it would be worth looking more broadly at other projects which touch on transitions. JMacL noted that Scottish Government indicated they would be commissioning some to analyse the ADF project outcomes; Working Group 3 and local authorities are also keen to see the results.

ACTION ITEM: AD to request more detailed information about funded projects
ACTION ITEM: AD to ask AP if the group can access ADF reports

d. *SR to forward the report (once complete) to see if their experiences match the findings from the Principles of Good Transitions 2 roadshows to funded transitions projects for their feedback* – covered in Agenda Item III

e. *IH to forward updated report on local autism plans and strategies' approach to transitions to NACP* – DONE

f. *SR and LS will update the report with learning from further events. Once this has been done, it will be circulated to ADF funded Transitions projects and local autism strategy leads for input and comments* – report is still in progress

g. *JF to meet with NACP and discuss how they may be able to help us check out the 'Digging Deeper' recommendations through their contacts with local autism strategy leads* – DONE

h. *SR to look at recommendations already in public domain and try to align them with the recommendations. Once this is done he will circulate them to the rest of the steering group for additions they are aware of for discussion at next meeting* – see action item j

i. *AT to confirm whether the group can respond to the CYPB consultation, given that the group is funded by the Scottish Government* – AD reported that the answer was no, but that feedback could be passed along via Scottish Government (AD/AT)

j. *If we are able to respond, SR (with LS) to draft recommendations for guidance to submit during consultation, circulate to group via email before next meeting*
ACTION ITEM: SR to circulate draft within Working Group 2; TW to collate responses from group

k. *IH to simplify E-say and Pupils in Scotland data with focus on transitions, and present at next meeting* – to be presented in Agenda Item III.

l. *SR to check Sir Harry Burns' work for relevant information, and circulate it and any other relevant papers/research data on eligibility* – **DONE**. SR circulated this to group via email prior to the meeting.

m. *AT to find out if review (of SDS eligibility criteria) occurred or if/when it will occur* – AD reported that COSLA is leading, and that a board will be convened soon to review progress against Self-Directed Support (SDS) and review priorities. SR noted that a recent Carers' Bill discussion derailed into a discussion of national eligibility standards. JMacL was interested to see how the statute could only be applied to carers, notes that it could create a two-tiered system.

ACTION ITEM: SR to submit further information and video of Carers' Bill discussion to TW for circulation in the group

III.   Analysis of learning (transitions road shows) and other evidence

    a. IH handed out new eSay and Pupils in Scotland data. The first chart indicates that lots of children are getting support in schools, but support drops off for adults (in social work.) The second chart shows the percentage of children with an autism spectrum diagnosis who have some type of support plan, by local authority. The third chart shows school leaver destinations, by local authority. Areas marked with an * indicate that the number was too low in that area to sufficiently protect privacy and could not be reported. JMacL said the numbers (vs percentages) would give a better picture. She further suggested that Tommy Mackay's microsegmentation report could be useful data (when available.) LH asked if local authority transitions teams were using the PoGT2 document; SR said that wasn't known, but it would be good to find out.

ACTION ITEM: IH to add numbers where there are percentages in data

JF suggested the Learning Disability Observatory as another potential source for useful data. The discussion turned to how these numbers could be used, in combination with other qualitative data, to help influence change.

ACTION ITEM: SR to consider how these numbers, and available qualitative data, could be used to paint a clear picture of transitions in Scotland.

    b. JMaCL reported that the Governance Group has met twice. The group is engaged, but so far meetings have been summary and review. This Group (2) may be first to test Governance Group with their recommendations. Group 2 will need to present clear proposals and action for endorsement. Autism Network Scotland is willing to help pull this together.

JMacL further reported that the National Autism Co-ordination Project just held their second meeting for local authority lead officers, and the third event is set to focus on transitions. This will be a big opportunity for Group 2. The next event is tentatively planned for late August. This next collaborative event "can be your day." DM explained that the format for these events is morning presentations/examples of good practice, and the afternoon is workshops.

ACTION ITEM: Group to discuss plans for this event at July meeting

DM furthered reported on a recent commissioning event, where there was strong interest in working together on transitions. JMacL elaborated further that Anne MacDonald of The Richmond Fellowship Scotland presented on their autism strategy, and that the top three topics of interest mentioned at the end of the event were diagnosis, transitions, and training.

IV.   LS presented a new work plan, which follows the format of the group's **priority plan**. It ties to the points raised in the draft report on the PoTG2 roadshows. LS and SR have identified action points for each item on the plan. LS reported that the plan follows major topics (key themes from the report.) SR added that coordinated support plans are required, but outside agencies are reporting that they don't have the resources to enter

schools. LS noted a need for training on how to carry out a good transition, both generally and autism-specific. SR said the lack of resources is a major problem in local authorities. IH suggests a simple plan: every local authority/area should have transition plans, and a lead officer for transitions. SR agreed in principle but again noted that the resources for this are not present.

The discussion then turned to **parents' preparedness** and how they could be better supported to know what's coming ahead of time. It was noted that self-directed support for children is not up and running in all areas yet. LS and LD noted that consultation means different things to different people, but that it is important to really talk to the young person to determine what they really want to do.

The group then decided that they would try to settle on some practical steps to take forward to the Governance Group meeting on June 16. These steps would be achievable and grounded in the reality of the current financial situation.

The discussion then turned to eligibility requirements, with agreement that eligibility criteria data for autism is a critical need. IH reported that he has a lot of data on eligibility but that it wasn't autism specific, and that he thought autism-specific data may not exist.

ACTION ITEM: IH to share eligibility criteria data with the group

Other ideas to acquire this information were to compare social work and Department of Work and Pensions data, and to survey young people in a couple key areas. Questions raised were about regional differences, the impact of not receiving services due to not meeting the criteria, and the number of referrals received that do not end up receiving services.

ACTION ITEM: SR and LS to discuss eligibility criteria, what the available data tells us – define the question the group wants to ask.

Discussion then turned to **asset mapping**. LH presented an example of asset mapping done in East Dunbartonshire. LS noted that the Menu of Interventions local resource web pages (hosted by ANS) did this in several areas across Scotland. IH noted a need for clear pathways to housing, self-directed support, etc. JF said that was bigger than asset mapping – perhaps it is pathway mapping. Then the discussion turned to how people make sense of many options – how do they choose the best option for them/their families? This references prior discussion about support for parents. Ideas included seeking funding to further the Menu of Interventions roadshows in more areas, and using ALISS (A Local Information System for Scotland), a web-based resource.

ACTION ITEM: LS and SR to figure out best way to connect parents to resources. This will include an aspirational end result and more practical, achievable first steps.

The next topic of discussion was **resources and logistics.** LS noted that they are hearing that transport and advocacy are two major needs, especially in rural areas. Travel costs are another big issue. SR noted that self-directed support can be used for travel/transportation costs, but that someone needs to predict the need and include it in the budget.

IH asked what can be learned about the One Stop Shops. SR said they are great, but they are not in rural communities. JF then asked about the evaluation report for the One Stop Shops.

ACTION ITEM: AD to check with AP on status of OSS Evaluation Report

LS and SR suggested a mobile One Stop Shop, contained in a bus or similar, that could travel and visit rural areas. KH said this could be a long term aspiration to address transportation issues. LD noted that parents are supporting each other by traveling to rural areas and offering walk-in type support throughout Dumfries and Galloway. LD noted that parents need to know expectations around transport and self-directed support. She wondered how local authorities are supporting isolated people/families. JF said this was a question to take to the local authorities. LS suggested that transport issues be a workshop topic for the next NACP event.

ACTION ITEM: SR and LS to populate "what we will do" section of proposed work plan, then circulate to group (soon.) JF will take this to Governance Group in mid-June for input.
JF noted that the priority plan should guide the work plan, and that the work plan should propose actions for the group to take.
For later discussion: SR suggested inviting young people to the NACP event, LS suggested that the group consider what to do with the transitions videos SR circulated via email before the meeting.

KEY MESSAGES:

Working Group 2 is in the process of defining a work plan, based on the group's priority plan, that will guide their actions going forward. This work plan will be finalised soon so that it can be presented at the next Governance Group meeting on June 16. The group plans to present both big picture, aspirational goals alongside specific and achievable first steps that can be taken now.

The group has been invited to participate in the National Autism Co-ordination Project's next Collaborative meeting with local leads working on autism strategies and plans. The topic for the next meeting will be transitions, and the group will further discuss the details of their involvement in their July meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION ITEM: AD will double check on £1K funding for transitions event with AT.

ACTION ITEM: AD to find out if outcomes reports from first two years of ADF projects are available.

ACTION ITEM: AD to request more detailed information about funded projects

ACTION ITEM: AD to ask AP if the group can access ADF reports

ACTION ITEM: SR to circulate draft within Working Group 2; TW to collate responses from group

ACTION ITEM: SR to submit further information and video of Carers' Bill discussion to TW for circulation in the group

ACTION ITEM: SR to consider how these numbers, and available qualitative data, could be used to paint a clear picture of transitions in Scotland.

ACTION ITEM: Group to discuss plans for this event at July meeting

ACTION ITEM: IH to share eligibility criteria data with the group

ACTION ITEM: SR and LS to discuss eligibility criteria, what the available data tells us – define the question the group wants to ask.

ACTION ITEM: LS and SR to figure out best way to connect parents to resources. This will include an aspirational end result and more practical, achievable first steps.

ACTION ITEM: SR and LS to populate "what we will do" section of proposed work plan, then circulate to group (soon.) JF will take this to Governance Group in mid-June for input.