HeadStart Kent Programme Board

15th June 2015, Oakwood House, 5.30pm.


**Apologies:** Paul Haith, NHS. Alex Holmes, Hartsdown Academy. Tim O’Brien, KCC. Russell Saundry, Amelix. Louis Hurst, Amelix. Andrew Heather, KCC. Mark Janaway, KCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Introductions:</strong> Florence Kroll introduced attendees to this Programme Board meeting, explaining that we will be focussing on moving HeadStart Kent towards Phase three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Update Report:</strong> Grace Dennis to include the Report with the minutes and upload to the HeadStart Kent Kelsi pages. Angela Ford discussed the Report, which includes the activities which have been going on as part of HeadStart Kent and the headlines. In May the Big Lottery asked us to provide numbers of activity and the number of young people being impacted by HeadStart Kent; these are honest figures we have collated. Amelix have been awarded the contract to deliver the HeadStart Kent social marketing campaign; there will be a ‘Digital Detox’ no technology day in Canterbury on the 18th July, there will be a campaign for young people to take a ‘pledge’ with wristbands to support their peers, and there are activities going on in each HeadStart area. There will be an Academic Resilience workshop taking place on the 7th July; we have asked schools to undertake activities with HeadStart, but they need a process to understand where there organisation is and how they can take steps to promote resilience. This workshop will help them engage with academic resilience as a toolkit and provide an opportunity for them to reflect on their whole school approach. We need to ask the question ‘where does this toolkit fit in’? We held a Big Conversation in March which was commissioned by Public Health (who also commission the Youth Health Champions), where it was identified that Kent could find this useful. We have been working with Public Health. Angela Will be also visiting Place to Be to explore their approach to a whole school.</td>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Evaluation Findings and Progress:</strong> Ugochi Nwulu provided attendees with an update on the evaluation process. We looked at the key components of an evaluation; we need to describe the intervention and the context of the intervention. The evaluation is looking at the HeadStart programme across Kent and in the three pilot areas (Thanet, Canterbury and North West Kent). There are 21 different interventions going on in HeadStart Kent, so we need to ensure they are cohesive and each intervention’s context needs to be fully described which is a challenge. We have a high level of young people involved in the programme who are co-producing; we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
need to establish what we will be concentrating on. We therefore need feedback from young people, families and the workforce who have been trained in delivering these interventions.

A theory of change is necessary so we are clear what we are doing and why; for Phase Three this will show why, an evidence base, and how we evaluate it. This programme is complex with different aspects and providers so we need to coherently say why we are doing it and how it contributes to a theory of change. We are aiming for more of an evidence base for Phase Three compared to Phase Two. We will be going from describing causal assumptions to testing these during Phase Three.

The Big Lottery emailed the HeadStart schools in March for their students to complete surveys, we have had a good response from this according to the national evaluators. An evaluator visited Kent for a Field Visit in May, their main focus was to interview those running interventions and managers, there will be another visit in July. The next stage will be a deep dive case study. Mark Kerr asked when these surveys from the Big Lottery were put into place? Big Lottery let us know about the surveys in November 2014. Grace to recirculate the surveys and put on Kelsi. The results from these surveys will provide the baseline data, and they will be repeated the same time next year for comparison. The Resilience Mentors are using the Sterling tool.

4. Key Messages from the Knowledge Seminar: The facilitators of the HeadStart Knowledge Seminars – Alex Hassett and Mark Kerr – provided an update for attendees. The first two Knowledge Seminars focussed on defining and conceptualising resilience and asking how do we measure resilience and resilience outcomes? It was reiterated that we need to think of resilience in terms of an interaction between risk and protective factors, to look beyond just a young person to their family, their context and their community. Attendees of the Seminars have found the domains measure useful to show how their work can impact on a young person. We have looked at navigating and negotiating, how do young people access resources and what is available out there for young people, how accessible is it?

Alex and Mark emphasised that we need a county-wide holistic view on resilience, which will be challenging to evaluate, but a theory of change is needed so we can ask which levels we need to be measuring at. Are we impacting on the areas we say we are impacting on? Can practitioners see they are making a difference? A matrix for plotting what is going on in terms of service would be useful.

The next step for the third Seminar held on the 20th May was to think about what is going on in Kent and the specific HeadStart projects; how do they define resilience and what are the challenges, how do they map resilience using the domains? Most projects felt they were covering all the domains, however talents and interests was revealed to be the domain which the HeadStart projects are giving the least focus. There is a strong emphasis on education and provision at a universal level within the HeadStart projects, with targeted intervention and young people who have had to experience adversity being limited (resilience mentors and family focus). Within the projects there is a lot of positive activity going on which link to emotional wellbeing, but does it link to what HeadStart Kent intends to do? Did projects feel they had to cover all the domains? We need to be realistic and look at how our interventions impact the domains, the aspects which are missing can then be mapped, each project does not have to cover every domain.

Alex said he was not surprised at the findings from the third Seminar; The way forward is that we need to develop an overarching framework for resilience which staff and agencies can sign up to, with a clear conceptualisation of resilience, and there needs to be a coherent evidence base system. Mark said the Talents and Interests domain is very important as this can impact other domains. An evidence matrix and outcomes base is needed? Florence asked why is Kent just focussing on resilience and not emotional wellbeing too? Florence said the commissioning framework in Kent is casework focussed, we need to bring talents and interests into Kent, so this can help young people achieve and develop confidence. Angela said the HeadStart Shadow Board for young people was focussing on talents and interests which helps young people build on what they’re engaging with. The Pay
It Forward initiative also localises the Programme in the community.

Jessica Mookherjee asked about targeting young people within HeadStart? Angela said there are universal programmes in schools and targeted work ie. the Family Focus programme and the Resilience Mentors. Ruth said to look at what success looks like, an evidence matrix could be developed. David Weiss said that Alex and Mark’s critique of the HeadStart programme is very helpful, and we have a chance of being part of Phase Three which is an opportunity for huge funding. David said the other 11 localities are not doing as much as Kent, and emphasised that we need a consistent definition and framework, with more targeted interventions, to take the opportunity to look at what we’re doing to improve and make decisions now on how we approach Phase Three.

Sarah Gow said about how schools have taken a model and adapted it, this is useful for our learning, but we need service level agreements. Alex said about putting something robust in place to evaluate whether it is a success or not. Angela said the curriculum has been taken on very quickly and schools see that is some value, what are the aspects that mean schools are using this curriculum and have embraced it so quickly? How is it making a difference? Alex said he feels schools are looking for answers to young people’s wellbeing. Florence reminded attendees about the context of the HeadStart programme; Kent is going through big changes (EYPS, schools, health, commissioned providers). Alex and Mark showed a video which looks at how childhood trauma affects health across a lifetime.

Angela discussed an innovation proposal which would promote resilience in vulnerable children. Should we use domains as a framework for resilience? This would need testing before we take this through to Phase Three. Boing Boing and Young Minds have their own framework but we need to decide what we will use to develop a common language and this will inform our theory of change. The domains model would mean that young people could see where they fit onto the domains. Do we need a framework for resilience, if we do how will we test it? Jo said the domains model is commonly understood and easy to adapt, it is measured through a number pre and post intervention, with young people scoring themselves where they think they are. Florence asked how do we marry screening (‘screening’ terminology is not popular) to the domains model, we need a bigger framework for young people as a whole.

5. Proportionate Universalism, Andrew Scott-Clark:  
Andrew discussed the Marmot review on health and equalities. He showed a gradient based on deprivation, which showed health inequalities result from social inequalities. The review had 6 main policy objectives. The principal of proportionate universalism is that there is a standard intervention everyone receives and the most needy get more intervention in order to get a population outcome, so intervention is scaled to meet the need. Andrew put a Public Health lens on HeadStart and resilience, we need to measure it systematically and quantitively, we need a number, we can measure the domains but cannot measure resilience. How do we measure this, annually, 6 monthly? We need universal programmes. What extra support will be used when young people are scoring less well on the domains? We need to understand local needs and design interventions which would meet these local needs. Florence said about measuring young people in schools with the domains, we can look at life events which link in. Jess emphasised that we need to build resilience, not give resilience. Jo said about Risk It and their evaluation. Evaluation (screening) in an ‘ace’ style way? Mark said data sharing and IT systems is always a challenge.

6. Family Focus in North West Kent:  
Natalie Wilbourn (Headteacher at the Orchard’s Academy, Swanley) Natalie said we need to focus on a child as a whole and a holistic approach, not seeing young people as a number, which will aid learning. Orchard’s have been working with Family Focus since summer 2014, they liked the idea of working with families and bridging the gap as a whole family support. Family Focus has provided a framework for positive transition and appropriate communication, strategies and coping mechanisms. They have provided a network for parents and a system, parents have become ambassadors for Family Focus and are not afraid to talk to the school, and are therefore more
able to support their young people. The school and Family Focus together have kept communication going so there is sustainability, with contact and Facebook groups, and introducing new programmes. Natalie said she would like a long term impact which is built, with value for money and a quality provision, so young people and families are supported in house, which is sustained.

Paul Dyer who is leading the Family Focus project said the success of the project at Orchard’s has been due to the open mindedness and the relationship built with the school. Orchard’s understood that the project is a pilot and we are seeing how it goes, which has worked well. Paul delivered an activity, focussing on 3 main questions/challenges and to think about our own contexts. Paul said often he finds there is an issue of ‘diagnosis’ with young people and families. First question: How can we create a flexibility in pathology for example children who associate themselves so rigidly with a diagnosis or how can we create non-pathology in our programmes, interventions and systems? As is in the case of the rainbow, the point is acknowledging it in that it only exists in terms of interrelation. How can we avoid the subject/object dichotomy between and expert and subject and enhance interrelation thinking about systems and being with parents and children? Sometimes young people and families come to the groups and expect to have something done and then it is left. Families are taken out on activities at the end of each wave of Family Focus intervention. There is the challenge of the ‘lightning bolt’ moment in how people see themselves. Paul said that people get stuck in systems and we may well get stuck in systems, we have noticed that making attempts to do things differently can act as a catalyst. How can we manoeuvre or see our systems differently to create change?

Discussions from the questions Paul asked included: we need the promotion of school institution into the community. We therefore need a change of culture, to marry a consistent framework with creativity. Normalising ‘problems’ so young people and families do not feel stigmatised, it is part of life, develop their skills to navigate and negotiate. There was a discussion with coproduction, decision making and influence, within HeadStart there is a relationship between adults and young people. Authentic coproduction is young people’s communication and being listened to. HeadStart is going through assessment, prioritisation, and a robust framework.

7. **HeadStart Shadow Board and Phase Three:** The Big Lottery has given us key foundations which we need to demonstrate, in conjunction with young people and families, to apply for the £10m funding bid for Phase Three. Ali discussed the HeadStart Shadow Board meeting, which took place on the 10th June. Young people looked at what works, why it works, and what doesn’t work? We need to ensure people know what HeadStart is. Angela discussed what young people see as HeadStart strengths and areas for development. How will we know we’ve made a difference? What should we take forward? We need a framework/measure for resilience which will articulate what activities we need to do. We need participation from young people who aren’t confident enough to attend the shadow board. The Theory of Change and HeadStart evaluation needs young people embedded into them. We discussed the idea of a joint Programme Board and Shadow Board meeting. Grace to confirm. The next Programme Board will be in October, which will be when we say what we’re going to do in preparation for HeadStart Phase Three and moving the programme forward. Jo said a challenge is the Big Lottery expecting systemic change, so we need sign up and commitment before the next bid stage to ensure this. Florence said this needs to be tangible to inform evidence. Does the children’s health and wellbeing board understand what resilience is? Ruth said we need to develop theory of change to answer that question.