

POST JAR ACTION PLANNING GROUP

Friday, 17 November 2006

3:00pm – 5:00pm

The Lord Haldon Hotel, Dunchideock, Exeter

Version 11 of the JAR Action Plan was circulated.

1. Actions since last meeting

The draft JAR Action Plan has been submitted this week to Corporate Management Board, Joint Corporate Management Board, Children's Trust Executive and Children's Trust Board. It has also been to Scrutiny Committee and the latest version will be circulated to Executive Committee on Monday.

2. Considerations of Actions

Language must be understandable by most professionals so that all can have ownership and confidence in the plan. It was agreed at Children's Trust Executive and Board that it is the responsibility of each agency to make sure we have the right name and title of signatories in the action plan.

Action: All Partner Agencies

It was agreed to remove the Children's Trust Parent representative as a signatory there is no representation. **Action: DS to remove**

If anything is unclear or obscure, please can all members notify DAP or DS, to ensure we all have editorial ownership of the plan. **Action: ALL**

All members of the group to ensure that all appropriate plans are listed, for example: the Raising Achievement Plan.

Action: All to consider and feedback to Dave Slocombe.

3. Performance Management

This section was discussed and adjustments agreed including bringing it to the beginning of the document. It was agreed that the summary of the timetable should be based upon the milestones in order to make it a realistic and useful document.

4. Analysis of the recommendations:

Acronyms to be removed across the recommendations. **Action: DS**

Where project plans are required this should be noted and ready by the 6th December. **Action: ALL**

Resources will be largely through disinvestment and re-investment. Where there will be any other requirement this needs to be shown in order to get sign-up.

Action: ALL

John Barnard to summarise and check all resource commitments. **Action: JPB**

LAC should be removed from all Devon language and the term 'children and young people in care' used instead.

Recommendation 7 had too much detail and was couched in very specialist terms. This level of detail was more appropriate to the project plan. **Action: DAP to discuss with KC**

It was agreed that a lay professional and a proof-reader should read the plan before it was sent off.

Action: CM to nominate a colleague to read for plain English/proof reading.
Action: Tim Todd to send to Shona the contact details for John Astley for reading across the plan, technically.

It was agreed that all future changes on the plan would be tracked. **Action: DS**

Recommendation 13 needs simplifying to aid understanding. Clarification over what is meant by the programme. **Action: DAP to LM**

Recommendation 15 focused on social care as the performance management of social care was judged inadequate, so recommendation 15 focuses on this. It was noted that the outcomes for children and young people needed to be more specific and there was a debate on outcome measures. It was noted that there were no partnership measures for this recommendation but it was a joint recommendation.

Action: DAP and CW to discuss outcome measures and DAP review content with JS

Recommendation 16 target measures:

Action: Deborah Booth to discuss with Debbie Ford.

Action: DB to forward to DS the project proposal paper.

Recommendation 18 requires some clarification:

Action: DS to clarify with Alison Morgan the outcome measures

Resources need to be clarified. Needs to be referred on to Martin.

Action: JPB with JS providing original email

Action: Tim Tod to clarify at housing meeting on Monday afternoon.

Youth Housing needs to be added as milestone 1 to establish basic funding if not a recommendation. **Action: DS**

Communications Strategy

The communications strategy has been slightly updated for the action plan. DP to work on the communications strategy with Ruth Dale, as a whole. CW raised her concerns that there was no communication strategy for partners. It could be re-inforced – the duty to co-operate responsibility of partner agencies to communicate. The JAR Newsletter has just been circulated. **Action: DAP to review content**

Resources

A summary page on resources required for the post JAR Action Plan needs to be drawn up. There is a need to flesh out 'B' quickly, for Executive.

Action: John Barnard to draw up paper and circulate on Monday. Concerns are about some require on-going resources, some are expensive, time and commitment, people's time but we can begin to categorise. The concern is that if we spend finances on this area of work, something else is not happening elsewhere. JS raised his concerns that without bridging finance, for example, for respite care, we cannot deliver without some sort of agreement.

Action: JB to clarify on Monday morning with Ingrid Fisher/Anne Whiteley e.g. costs, no costs, invest to save.

Action: JB to sketch out and circulate the draft.

Action: All members to feedback to John.

Further to the query regarding at what stage partners contributions would be identified, it was agreed that a note would be circulated to lead officers on Monday asking them to go through the process of confirming what kind of resources are required under each of the 3 categories for each recommendation.

Action: Shona to email Lead Officers on Monday.

Action: Lead Officers to consider/identify the particular risks and the mitigation plans.

Risk

The risks identified were:

- Governance and accountability
- insufficient financial resources to deliver aspects of the plan
- time of turbulence creating instability

Method of risk assessment was agreed as:

- assess impact out of 5 (5 high)
- assess probability out of 5
- multiply two figures and if over 12 needs contingency plan

Chris Roberts recommending drawing up a matrix of risk giving more detail on the impact and probability of risk.

Action: DP/DS to draft up a matrix.

Action: ALL members to feedback to DP/DS, even if to just say the matrix is fine so we know we are all in agreement.

CW confirmed that, further to DB's query that the risk of schools not engaging in relation to looked after children should be put in the project plan.

Action: DS to talk to the audit team to view the corporate risk register.

Chris Roberts suggested that small action groups should be set up to review and identify risks – a brainstorming process by technical experts.

- ① Risk Register: CR/DP and 2 or 3 volunteers
- ② Performance Management: DP and 2 or 3 volunteers
- ③ Resources: JB and 2 or 3 volunteers.

Action: DP/JB/CR to contact colleagues to set up membership on these 3 small action groups. Meetings should be short, sharp and output focussed.

Mechanism for signing off the plan

This needs to be considered. Do we need to have e-signatures ready in place?

Christa acknowledged that very good progress has been on the JAR Action Plan and there has been a complete change in the plan in a week.

Dates of Future Meetings:

Thursday, 23 November 2006 8:30am – 9:30am, Reading Room, Coaver, County Hall, Exeter

Monday, 4 December 2006 8:30am – 10:30am, Film and Demo Room, County Hall