



Targeted Short Breaks Consultation Report July 2018

Introduction

This report summarises the recent targeted short breaks engagement and consultation held in two stages between 20 April 2018 and 18 July 2018.

This Consultation is concerned with:

- Targeted Short Breaks
- Options for a Personal Assistant sourcing support service
- Widening eligibility for short breaks to include children who have ADHD with complex needs
- Reducing the short breaks transport fund to be a hardship fund for those in greatest need

Background

Short breaks are preventative, family support services that provide a disabled child or young person with a break. They can be at any time ranging from an hour to a day, evening, overnight weekend or holiday, depending on the needs of the family involved. The short break may take place in a community activity setting, a child/young person's home or other residential setting. It allows parents and carers to have a break from their caring responsibilities and gives children and young people the opportunity for a positive experience. Specialist (higher-level and residential services) are accessed following a social worker process referral, this currently includes direct payments. Targeted short breaks are open access and do not require a social worker assessment for families to access. This consultation paper is concerned with targeted Short Breaks.

Bristol City Council holds contracts until 31 March 2019 for a range of services including:

- Weekday evening and weekend daytime Short Breaks
- Overnight residential holidays
- School holiday Short Breaks in Special Schools
- Transport for Short Breaks
- Youth Service – Disabled Young people
- Short break activities for Deaf and hard of hearing children and young people and their families

Click here for Bristol's current [Short Breaks](#) Statement.

Bristol's approach to consultation

Terminology

Engagement is a more participatory approach to frame options and solutions; it includes approaches such as co-design. Duration varies and the resource should be proportionate. Engagement is an optional process which may be valuable in identifying how to deliver the agreed budget savings and/or to engender public understanding and acceptance of the proposals.

Consultation is a formal process to seek and take into consideration people's views on questions and defined options. Duration: Typically 12 weeks based on Bristol Compact (a formal agreement with VCS sector). The majority of the consultation questions were consulted on for six weeks in this tranche have been shortened to six week following agreement from our legal team.

Approval to consult on options was granted at Children's Management Team, Executive Director Meeting and Cabinet Member Briefing. In March and April 2018

Alternative Formats / Accessibility

Paper copies of consultation materials and various other alternative formats could be made available on request.

The Consultation

This total length of our engagement and consultation was of 12 weeks duration. However, this was broken down into two six-week periods consisting of six weeks of engagement and consultation on proposals to gather opinions and ideas, followed by six weeks of consultation on the proposals resulting from this engagement. This approach worked well as we were able to pause midway through the consultation to ensure that we were asking the right questions and to hone the second part of the consultation.

Consultation Activity

The approach to our engagement and consultation was to engage as many people as possible online, as that is what people expect and it keeps costs down and increases response rate.

We also arranged to visit as many services as possible seeing children, young people parents and carers in groups or one-to-one, following the advice of our external providers to ensure that our engagement methods were as accessible to as many people as possible. We paid particular attention to engaging groups who find it harder to access services.

We had in the region of 80 respondents to our online surveys mainly completed by parents and carers (the exact number is hard to ascertain as respondents were able to skip questions).

Our survey monkey questionnaire for young people was completed by 25 young people.

Face-to-face consultation events included visiting our short breaks services to observe the sessions and listen to children and young people's ideas for services thus reaching in the region of 60 young people in addition to our survey.

We also held a variety of consultation events for parents and carers including:

- telephoning parents at home
- attending "at home" events with Bristol Parent Carers resulting in the coproduction of our options paper
- attending a number of coffee mornings and parent and carers' get-togethers

- visiting drop – in play sessions
- co-producing an engagement event with Autism Independence (a Somali community led organisation for families with children with autism) and engaging with upwards of 50 Somali parents
- reaching out to specific equalities groups to understand the issues affecting communities to find it hard to reach services
- running consultation workshops at Bristol Parent Carers participation event in June 2018

As a result of our consultation outreach we estimate to have had contact with at least 60 children and in the region of 200 adults who may otherwise have not been engaged with the consultation.

A full breakdown of our consultation activity is available at appendix 1

Consultation findings

The below is a summary of the main overall themes of the consultation followed by summaries of the feedback relating to particular service areas. A full download of the online consultation is available on request.

Thematic Findings

Information

One of the strongest themes from the consultation was a lack of information and awareness about targeted short breaks. Parents and carers whose children were not currently using targeted short breaks almost universally said they did not know what they were. This lack of knowledge cut across geographical areas and socio-economic groups. For example, a parent who describes themselves as knowledgeable and well connected to services for disabled children, whose child was in receipt of a direct payment and was involved in an inclusion campaign group was not aware of Bristol's targeted short breaks offer. We also found that professionals who are often the first port of call for parents in a crisis and for their ongoing support were unaware, or had incomplete knowledge of the targeted short breaks services commissioned by Bristol City Council.

Parents and carers told us they receive their information on services through a variety of means. Many parents did online searches to find out about activities for their children, however, the majority of parents that we spoke to found Findability difficult to navigate and that "you have to know what you are looking for" and specifically search for the exact thing you want, rather than being able to do a more general search and Findability provide you with options. Many parents and carers told us they would like to be able to go to one source for information and have everything in one place.

Many parents and carers we spoke to said that they would like to get information through their Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs) at schools, but they had not had information about short breaks from their schools.

Parents and carers who are not online said they would like information on flyers and on posters at their schools about activities that their disabled child can take part in.

All of the children and young people who contributed to the consultation were already using short breaks services and told us that they got their information online, from friends or through professionals they were working with.

Geography

Another strong theme from the consultation was the feedback that services were not fairly distributed through the city. Transport is a big issue for a lot of families who struggle or find it impossible to use public transport.

Consultation questions findings

Proposed changes to the way families access Targeted Short Break services

In our early stages of engagement we had feedback from parents that while there are a wide variety of services on offer these are not always accessible to children with more complex support needs who may require more one-to-one support to access sessions. We consulted on a range of proposals to address these concerns. Each of these proposals is set out below with an analysis of the results.

For the proposal: We propose continuing to have open access to Targeted Short Breaks for children with a disability or social communication and interaction need, 54 out of 59 responses (91.5%) either agreed or strongly agreed.

We asked: Where there are more people requesting the service than we can provide for, we could decide who gets a place using waiting lists or we could prioritise places to people with the greatest needs (e.g. those whose families are at greatest risk of breakdown). We provided a range of proposed options:

- Option 1 - Waiting lists for all places Or
- Option 2 – Waiting lists for half the places and prioritising the other half to people with greatest need Or
- Option 3 - Prioritise all places to people with greatest need

The table below shows the range of answers for this question, with Option 2 being the most preferred proposal.

Where there are more people requesting the service than we can provide for, we could decide who gets a place using waiting lists or we could prioritise places to people with the greatest needs (e.g. those whose families are at greatest risk of breakdown). Please say how much you agree with each option.						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
Option 1 - Waiting lists for all places Or	11.11%	31.11%	31.11%	24.44%	2.22%	45
	5	14	14	11	1	
Option 2 – Waiting lists for half the places and prioritising the other half to people with greatest need Or	38.18%	36.36%	14.55%	10.91%	0.00%	55
	21	20	8	6	0	

Option 3 - Prioritise all places to people with greatest need	14.29%	26.19%	11.90%	35.71%	11.90%	42
	6	11	5	15	5	
					answered	61
					skipped	28

We also asked:

We want to know your views on four alternative proposals for how children with the most complex needs would be able to access short breaks.

Options 1 to 3 are ways children with complex needs can access both open access targeted short breaks as well as social worker-approved specialist breaks.

Option 4 proposes that if a child is receiving a Specialist Short Break service, they should no longer receive a Targeted Short Break service.

The table below shows the proposed options and the responses that we received.

Do you agree with the following proposals for improving access to the Targeted Short Breaks service?						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
Option 1 - Set staffing ratios to ensure a proportion of Targeted Short Break sessions are available for children with one-to-one support needs. This would result in fewer places for children with lower levels of need.	4.26%	34.04%	40.43%	14.89%	6.38%	47
	2	16	19	7	3	
Option 2 - Use BCC bridging workers to support Short Breaks services to provide more one-to-one support to enable more children with higher levels of need to access Targeted Short Breaks. (Bridging workers are staff who support children with disabilities to access mainstream Short Break provision). This could result in fewer places for children with lower levels of need.	11.11%	28.89%	35.56%	15.56%	8.89%	45
	5	13	16	7	4	

Option 3 - The disabled children's social work service directly purchase a number of Short Break places for children with a higher level of need (e.g. one to one) from the Targeted Short Breaks services which will be funded through a direct payment. This could result in fewer places for children with lower levels of need.	11.90%	23.81%	33.33%	23.81%	7.14%	42
	5	10	14	10	3	
Option 4 - If a child is receiving a Specialist Short Break service, they no longer receive a Targeted Short Break service. This would result in more places for children with lower levels of need.	17.39%	26.09%	21.74%	30.43%	4.35%	46
	8	12	10	14	2	

The spread of responses shows that this is a complex issue, with no one proposal being especially favoured. For all four options there are more “neither agree nor disagree and strongly disagree” responses than there are “strongly agree or agree”. However, we cannot conclude that none of the options are acceptable, only that people were expressing they had no preference in a particular given option.

Whilst the on line consultation has given no clear overall preference, conversations with parents and professionals working in the field have given a steer that option two is the most workable option, and will have the best results for enabling children with more complex needs to access services.

Targeted Short Breaks - Weekday evening and weekend daytime sessions and youth service provision

Currently Targeted Short Break weekday evening and weekend daytime sessions are available for children and young people up to and including the age of 18. There are also Targeted Short Break youth services for disabled young people aged 13-18 years.

We proposed that we create two separate children and youth services; one for children between the ages of 5-12 and another for children and young people aged 13-18 in order to tailor the type of services to the needs of those age groups. We asked if people agreed with the proposal.

On the whole, parents and carers were in agreement that we should have some sessions that are for younger children, and separate sessions for young people. The table below shows the responses to this proposal showing that 40/53 respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal.

Currently Targeted Short Break weekday evening and weekend daytime sessions are available for children and young people up to and including the age of 18. There are also Targeted Short Break youth services for disabled young people aged 13-18 years. We propose that we create two separate children and youth services, one for children between the ages of 5-12 and another for children and young people between 13-18 in order to tailor the type of services to the needs of those age groups. Do you agree with this proposal?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly agree	33.96%	18
Agree	41.51%	22
Neither agree nor disagree	11.32%	6
Disagree	13.21%	7
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0

However, as part of the young people’s engagement we asked whether the young people would like sessions that were just for older children, or whether they wanted younger children to be part of their sessions as well. The interviewer gave the clarification question that this would mean that everybody was “all together”. In response to this question most young people said they would like “everybody all together”. However, it is the children’s commissioning team opinion that with hindsight this question was phrased wrongly, and seemed to encourage young people to respond that they would like everybody “all together”. Part of the consultation was to go out and observe the sessions for young people and it is the view of the commissioning team that these sessions would not be appropriate for younger children, and that if younger children were there then this would limit the session for the older children. It is the commissioning team’s judgement based on our observation that we should continue to have sessions that are specifically for older children.

Young people though that you should start attending the youth service at about the age of 12-13.

In our engagement with parents and carers prior to our consultation feedback people told us that they prefer to have activities at the weekend and school holidays rather than in the evening. In the consultation we proposed to reduce the number of evening activities provided in order to increase activities at the weekends and in the school holidays and asked if people agreed.

The table below shows responses in this area shows that most people agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal.

The feedback we have received from parents, carers and young people tells us that people prefer to have activities at the weekend and school holidays rather than in the evening. We propose to reduce the number of evening activities provided in order to increase activities at the weekends and in the school holidays. Do you agree?

	Response Percent	Response Total
--	-------------------------	-----------------------

Strongly agree	26.47%	9
Agree	47.06%	16
Neither agree nor disagree	14.71%	5
Disagree	5.88%	2
Strongly disagree	5.88%	2

However, we asked a follow-up question as to which was more important increase: activities at weekends or activities in the school holidays and 71% of respondents said that both were equally important.

Personal Assistant Support Service

Parent Carers have strongly expressed that there is a need for more support with sourcing personal assistants (PAs). Parents have reported specific difficulties in recruiting PAs for young people with personal care or medical needs and have also reported they find it hard to find PAs who have specific skills such as manual handling or administering emergency medication. From gathering feedback from parents and professionals the reasons for a lack of PAs are:

- PA work can be insecure
- PAs find it difficult to secure enough hours to provide themselves a living
- Good PAs leave as they move onto more secured work
- PAs don't have the opportunity for job development/training

The consultation posed a number of proposals seeking to resolve this issue.

The table below shows that most people were in favour of the council investing in additional support to help parents find a PA.

Do you agree that we should invest in additional support with sourcing personal assistants (PAs)?		
	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly agree	44.44%	24
Agree	35.19%	19
Neither agree nor disagree	14.81%	8
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	5.56%	3

We then consulted on specific proposals for options for providing support to source a personal assistant. The table below shows the responses that we received and that option two received the most "strongly agree-agree" responses.

If you agree or strongly agree with the previous question, please say how much you support each of the following options for sourcing personal assistants. (We could adopt one or more of the options)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
Option 1 - BCC will provide a PA finders' fee when social workers complete their direct payment assessment so that parents and carers pay another organisation to source their PA.	4.44%	28.89%	37.78%	22.22%	6.67%	45
	2	13	17	10	3	
Option 2 - Establish an assured list of registered providers and agencies who can provide PAs for families to access and pay for via their Direct Payment and/or act as an employment agency managing all aspects of a family's personal budget.	27.08%	41.67%	20.83%	8.33%	2.08%	48
	13	20	10	4	1	
Option 3 - commission a two-year pilot service with an external provider to provide a PA finding/matching service.	15.91%	25.00%	38.64%	15.91%	4.55%	44
	7	11	17	7	2	

Short Breaks Transport Service

In 2018-19 Bristol's budget for short breaks transport is a maximum of £25,200. In 2016-17 the transport service provided 14,064 miles of travel at £1.99 per mile. A comparison of short breaks statements from Manchester, Leeds, South Gloucestershire, Newcastle and Gateshead show that only Manchester provides any transport for short breaks and only then 'in exceptional circumstances when it is identified as an essential part of the support package and, usually, as part of a social work assessment.' i.e. as part of an Individual Budget assessed by a social worker.

As part of the consultation we proposed reducing the short breaks transport funding from £25,200 a year to a £2,000 travel hardship fund. This will enable us to redistribute funding to other Short Break services.

At an engagement event and subsequent consultation with Parent Carers this was the area of discussion that had most difference of opinions; this difference of opinion is borne out by the responses that we have had on this proposal as shown in the table below.

We propose reducing short breaks transport funding from £25,200 a year to a £2,000 travel hardship fund. This will enable us to redistribute funding to other Short Break services. Do you agree with this proposal?		
	Response Percent	Response Total

1	Strongly agree	16.33%	8
2	Agree	18.37%	9
3	Neither agree nor disagree	24.49%	12
4	Disagree	30.61%	15
5	Strongly disagree	10.20%	5
		answered	49

Whilst the online survey generated a range of responses with a weighting towards disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, at a face-to-face participation event organised by Bristol Parent Carers in June 2018 reaction to the proposal was almost entirely negative.

The proposal had strong feedback from parents who said that without the transport scheme they would not be able to cope. Parents said that using public transport was not an option as transport in the city is so limited and the needs of their children were so complex and provided such a challenge for services that public transport was not an option for them. Parents with multiple disabled children would be particularly affected by this change. Parents were angry at the concept that they were being asked to “pit one service against another” and said “it’s such a small amount of money in the grand scheme of things, why are you bothering to take this away?”

Other parents suggested asking for a small contribution to help fund the scheme.

We also asked parents and carers what they thought the eligibility should be for receiving funds from the travel hardship fund. Again, this generated a range of responses, reflecting the division of opinions on this topic.

We propose that the travel hardship fund will be provided for people in financial hardship who are not in receipt of mobility DLA, and that the transport will be used to support an approved Short Break. Do you agree with these criteria for accessing the travel hardship fund?			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree	28.57%	14
2	Agree	4.08%	2
3	Neither agree nor disagree	18.37%	9
4	Disagree	20.41%	10
5	Strongly disagree	8.16%	4
			49

Some of the feedback from the survey is below:

“The short break transport scheme is a great service which allows families to have days out/holidays, without this scheme it could mean they won't go as it may be too stressful or not viable to use public

transport. Perhaps a donation or small charge should be proposed depending on how far they are travelling rather than taking away nearly all the budget which would then defeat the object of the scheme as families would then not go on a day trip or holiday and then being isolated.”

“Need a flexible amount because £2000 may not be enough. People should not be in receipt of higher level mobility DLA and I only agree with proposal 17 (regarding mobility DLA) provided the family has their own transport.”

“I think it should continue to be available for families who do not have access to a car or who are unable to drive. I don’t know what an approved short break is but I have used the short break transport to take my disabled children to Calvert trust. This is a journey we might not be able to manage by public transport due to my own disability needs. Myself and children on lower rate mobility but no way could we afford a taxi to Barnstable.”

“The travel hardship fund is too small - and won't cover many needs.

How are you going to measure financial hardship?

You can be in receipt of mobility DLA and still not have a vehicle.

Who decides what an “approved” short break is? If it's just Council provided activities - what if they don't suit my child?”

“Some people use the travel fund when they have transport of their own they could use.”

Widening eligibility for short breaks to include children with complex Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs

Our consultation proposed piloting a targeted befriending / one to one support service for children with complex ADHD. The service would support children and young people to build supportive and understanding relationships with a trusted adult and access a choice of activities that build confidence, self-esteem and resilience and encourage greater independence and self-management. We asked if people agreed with this proposal.

60% of people agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal and we had a number of suggestions in addition to the proposal, including:

- This would be good for other disabled children with communication difficulties who do not have ADHD, including children with social emotional or mental health problems.
- This would need to be a long term service as building confidence and resilience for children with ADHD cannot be achieved in a few weeks or months.
- This service would need to be available 24/7 as that when parents need them. A parent should be the first person to approach and given that training so that they can deal with and handle such circumstances.
- This would be too late for my child now that they are 14. He would have needed something like this when he was in primary schools but then I got turned down for services and was told ADHD was not on the register as a disability in Bristol. The older children are the harder it is for them to engage.
- A child with ASD might find it difficult interacting with a child with ADHD, and if the service is already stretched should you be considering widening eligibility?

Special School Based Holidays Short Breaks

This service provides play, leisure and sports activities during the Easter and summer school holidays for school-aged children and young people who attend the following special schools:

- Briarwood School
- Claremont School
- Kingsweston School
- New Fosseway School

We propose to continue providing this service and asked parents how they would like to use their allocated days across the holidays.

- Option 1: Days in a single week (as we do now)
- Option 2: Days spread throughout the holidays.
- Option 3: A combination of options 1 and 2 (i.e. some days in a row and some in other weeks)

The most preferred options were option 2 (47%) and option 3 (38%), with days spread throughout the holidays or a combination of having all the days in a single week or days spread throughout the holidays.

We then asked a follow-up clarification question to parents who use the scheme:

Would you like to be able to book your child into short breaks days not just at your child's school but at other schools around the city and have more choice of dates over the summer holiday? This may result in staff from other schools who don't know your child so well, looking after them?

This produced a range of responses from parents, saying they would absolutely not want their child to go to a different school staff who didn't know them, with others saying that yes, this would be suitable for their child providing the staff were appropriately trained.

Parents have also told us that they would like more notice about the days that they are receiving from the service, and also that they would like the service to be available for the whole of the working day. Some parents can only use the short break when they themselves are on annual leave.

Feedback from the current provider made the suggestion "that if we want to offer more choice to parents we would integrate the special schools work with the wider community short breaks rather than being stand alone, this would then allow assessment of young people and those who can access something more independent to be offered this which then frees up capacity for those with higher support needs (potentially including those who don't attend a SEN school.)"

Residential holiday service for disabled children and young people

The consultation proposed continuing to provide this service, with the added proposal that after every holiday there is a session where families can get together and share experiences and cement friendships for the future.

All the consultation feedback on this service has been overwhelmingly positive. People have said that the referral pathway into the service works well: some places are allocated by a panel that looks at the needs of young people and other places are directly accessed by families.

As part of the consultation the children’s commissioning team observed an afternoon/evening activity and the children were there on the whole were engaged and enjoying the session. Parents’ feedback on the holidays is that they are extremely positive for their children and young people and that some children have made friends for the first time. Parents report that their children’s confidence and self-esteem has grown as a result of the holiday, and that they only wish there could be more of them.

On the question as to whether there should be a session where families can get together and share experiences and cement friendships for the future, some respondents thought that this was a good idea, with one respondent saying: “great idea – building up your support for families is important and can build links between families to offer support and opportunities for young people to meet up outside of short breaks.” However, some people felt that it should be up to the families themselves to get together and “not prescribed by commissioners”, so it’s important to note that any get-together after a holiday should be entirely voluntary and families could attend if they wanted to.

The table below shows the range of responses for this question.

We propose that after every holiday there is a session where families can get together and share experiences and cement friendships for the future. Do you agree?			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree	7.84%	4
2	Agree	37.25%	19
3	Neither agree nor disagree	49.02%	25
4	Disagree	5.88%	3
5	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
			51

Short Break activities for Deaf and hard of hearing children and young people and their families

At present we have no specific Short Break provision for children with a multi-sensory impairment (impairments with both sight and hearing) which has been identified as a gap in our services.

In the consultation we asked the question: We propose opening up the short breaks service for deaf and hard of hearing children to children with multi-sensory impairments. We explained that this could result in more children using the service, and some activities being oversubscribed. Do you agree with this proposal?

The feedback from the survey and conversations with parents, carers and young people who use this service was overwhelmingly positive with almost 80% either agreeing or strongly agreeing.

However, there was clear feedback from parents of deaf and hard of hearing children and young people that maintaining a deaf identity and having strong deaf role models for young people in the group was extremely important.

The table below shows the range of responses to this proposal.

At present we have no specific Short Break provision for children with a multi-sensory impairment (impairments with both sight and hearing) which has been identified as a gap in our services. We propose opening up the short breaks service to children with multi-sensory impairments. This could result in more children using the service, and some activities being oversubscribed. Do you agree?			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree	10.53%	4
2	Agree	68.42%	26
3	Neither agree nor disagree	15.79%	6
4	Disagree	5.26%	2
5	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
		Answered	38

Bristol Autism Project (BAP)

The consultation proposed continuing to provide the Bristol Autism Project services and asked participants to provide comments on this proposal. This was with a view to providing continued service improvement for Bristol Autism Project and ensuring that it was continuing to meet the needs of children and families with autism and social, communication and interaction needs.

People told us that this was a very valued service and provided a lifeline for families, some of whom otherwise would be “stuck in the house all holidays”. Participants told us that their children valued the social interaction at the sessions and that as parents and carers meeting with other parents and sharing experiences was invaluable to them. Families welcomed the sole use of a variety of venues so that their children could fully express their personalities and behaviour without fear of judgement.

Having support staff at the sessions who understood the needs of their children was vital for families, especially if they had more than one disabled child.

Feedback was that whilst some families enjoyed all of the activities provided by BAP, many people said that the activities were becoming repetitive as they were the “same every year” and that families would welcome more choice. In particular they wanted more choice for their teenage children. The consultation generated a vast array of ideas for new activities which have been shared with the manager of the Bristol Autism Project.

Families also wanted to be able to attend events as a whole family. At the moment if events are strictly for under or over 11-year-olds and families had children falling into both age brackets they were excluded from the activities. Families also told us that they wanted to be able to use their Personal Assistants to enable their children who are under 11 years old to be able to attend the sessions.

Parents told us they wanted their children who did not have a diagnosis of autism who had a social communication and interaction need to use Bristol Autism Project. This has been immediately addressed for the 2018 summer BAP programme.

Appendix - 1

Timeline of fact finding, engagement and consultation activity

Date	Fact finding, engagement and consultation activity
16-Aug-17	Barnardo's special school session – visit to Briarwood School
23-Nov-17	Bristol Parent Carers at home event initial short breaks scoping
01-Dec-18	Bristol Parent Carers engagement survey
20-Dec-17	Visit to residential holiday for observation of the session and conversation with young people
17-Jan-17	Bristol Parent Carers at home event
01-Feb-18	Action for Children Residential Holiday - telephone interviews with parents
08-Mar-18	Claremont Special School Coffee Morning
08-Mar-18	Initial market engagement event with existing and potential providers
27-Mar-18	Barnardo's and Playbus session
01-Apr-18	Young People's engagement survey via out and about consortium
20-Apr-18	Engagement and consultation first stage on line survey - survey link sent to all networks as per our communications strategy and plan
23-May-18	Hareclive E-ACT Academy – coffee morning with parents in Hartcliffe
24-May-18	Coffee Morning with parents of children with Autism - Parenting Course
24-May-18	SENDaWelcome coffee morning with parents
30-May-18	Ilminster Avenue Children's Centre. Stay and Play session - visit to group to talk with parents
01-Jun-18	Young People Survey Monkey - delivered at a number of young people's sessions and on line
04-Jun-18	Councillor drop in briefing session
07-Jul-18	Councillor drop in briefing session
06-Jun-18	Consultation second stage on line survey opens - survey link sent to all networks as per our communications strategy and plan
12-Jun-18	WECIL Hillfields Youth Session - visit to listen to parents and young people
12-Jun-18	Bristol Autism Project, National Autistic Society meeting with parents over coffee.
15-Jun-18	Time2Share - visit to evening session to listen to parents and young people
16-Jun-18	Visit to deaf youth club to listen to Parents and Young People
18-Jun-18	Conversation with a Polish Parent
28-Jun-18	Gypsy, Roma, Traveller (GRT) Conversation with Service Co-ordinator
29-Jun-18	Rainbows pre-school stay and play for disabled children - visit to group to talk with parents
26-Jun-18	Bristol Parent Carers participation day - workshop
04-Jul-18	Autism Independence (Somali community group) co-produced workshop
05-Jul-18	Hartcliffe Pre-school Rainbows Group - Conversation with parent/carers
12-Jul-18	Coffee Morning with parents at Khaas Black Minority and Ethnic Short Breaks Provider

18-Jul-18	Consultation closed
19-Jul-18	Conversation with LGBT+ organisation leader from Off The Record
14-Sep-18	Follow-up market engagement event with existing and potential providers