Children and Young People Committee Inquiry into the provision of safe places to play and hang out

Additional Information

5th May 2010

WLGA · CLILC

INTRODUCTION

1. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) represents the 22 local authorities in Wales, and the three national park authorities, the three fire and rescue authorities, and four police authorities are associate members.

2. It seeks to provide representation to local authorities within an emerging policy framework that satisfies the key priorities of our members and delivers a broad range of services that add value to Welsh Local Government and the communities they serve.

3. The WLGA submitted written evidence to the Inquiry in February 2010 and attended an oral evidence session on 23rd February 2010 at which additional information was requested. This briefing contains additional information on the areas requested as outlined below:

    -   The WLGA to provide a note on whether there is sufficient read across between planning and public health guidance and if there is any evidence as to whether such guidance is being adhered to by local authorities.
    -   The WLGA agreed to provide more detail on Section 106 agreements.
    -   The WLGA agreed to provide Committee Members with the Partnership Support Unit review. This has been forwarded to the Committee Clerk.

4. The WLGA will be attending a second oral evidence session on 15th June 2010 to discuss these issues further.

Planning and Public Health Guidance

5. The links between the environment and health are well known and with increasing public health concerns such as obesity and mental health there is need to ensure collaborative working between planning and health. The Wales Centre for Health has been commissioned by the Welsh Assembly Government to develop an online Planning and Health Toolkit with the aim of developing and supporting the delivery of sustainable development and the health agenda through planning and the built environment in Wales. The WLGA has been involved in the development of this toolkit and is represented on the steering group.

6.   A 'Planning and Health Toolkit Consultation Report' was published by the Wales Centre for Health in July 2009. This document sets out the link between planning and health and the development of a toolkit aimed at local authority planners, developers, designers and public health professionals. The toolkit will provide advice on issues such as Health Impact Assessments, Ministerial Planning Policy Statements and the Public Health Strategy Framework. This work is still ongoing but will provide local authority planners with further details on links with health and ensure that thorough consideration is made of health issues. Further details on the toolkit are available from the Welsh Centre for Health.

7.   Local Planning authorities place a high emphasis upon national policy as a key material consideration in development control and in the development of Local Development Plans. This is set out in Planning Policy Wales, Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statements (MIPPs), circulars and the associated Technical Advice Notes, in particular TAN 16 on open space recreation and sport. TAN 16 provides advice on preparing Open Space Assessments; keeping existing facilities; the provision of new facilities; and topics related to water based recreation, off road recreational vehicles, allotments and spaces for children and young people's play.

8.   As Local Development Plans go through the public inquiry process and are adopted this should provide further protection for open spaces and recreation facilities. An example from a current Unitary Development Plan is provided at the end of this document. At the time that the Playing Field Measure was considered by the relevant Assembly Committee, WLGA contacted all authorities currently developing LDP's and sought information on their policy on playing fields. At that time the general response was that a similar policy to that set out below was being considered (17 responses were received as some LPA's were still working on their UDP's at that point in time).

Section 106 agreements

9.   Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority to enter legally binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner. These agreements are a way of addressing matters that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms and are increasingly used to support the provision of services and infrastructure, such as highways, recreational facilities, education, health and affordable housing.

10. It should be recognised that there are often a number of competing priorities that a local planning authority must consider and developments become a careful balancing act. Playing fields and other recreational grounds must be looked at as a 'flow' rather than a 'stock' and often through S.106 agreements there can be an increase in provision on the wider scale than just playing fields; i.e. parks, open spaces, libraries and other facilities. The One Wales document sets out a commitment to meeting housing needs; improving access to housing; increasing the supply of affordable housing and ensuring 21st Century housing. This commitment places additional expectations on planning authorities to carry out developments.

11. There has recently been a substantial fall in new major planning applications and subsequently S.106 agreements. Often there are several competing pressures on the planning gain and the development becomes unviable. In the current climate with drop in values this point is reached far sooner.

12. With the advent of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), S.106 agreements will be increasingly limited in scope so that they can only cover affordable housing (by 2014). This means that S.106 agreements will not be able to be used for infrastructure such as play area and open spaces. This is a UK wide issue because CIL is effectively considered a tax. CIL is also discretionary so it will be up to each individual local authority to decide if they want to implement a CIL charging schedule. The development of a schedule to allow CIL to be charged is subject to a public inquiry similar to the process for local development plans and therefore will take time and resource to prepare. This means that in some areas a CIL won't be pursued because of local market conditions and elsewhere there will be a potential gap between the limitations on the use of S.106 agreements and the ability to use CIL.

13. Please see below an example on a Unitary Development Plan from the City and County of Swansea which sets out the conditions upon which the loss of recreational land will be considered:

City and County of Swansea Unitary Development Plan:

> **Policy HC23**
> **Development proposals that involve the loss of *land for community recreation purposes*, whether in public or private ownership, will only be considered favourably where:**

> **(i)** Facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the development of a small part of the site, or
>
> **(ii)** Alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is made available, or
>
> **(iii)** There is an excess of provision in the area, or
>
> **(iv)** A wider community benefit arises, or
>
> **(v)** The existing and potential recreational or amenity or natural heritage or historic environment value of the land is maintained.
>
> **New park/recreational open spaces will be developed at Weig Fawr Farm, Cockett and Heol Las, Birchgrove.**

Amplification

It is important to retain and improve community recreation land to maintain access to open spaces, promote healthier lifestyles and tackle health inequalities. Some of this land is protected by Policies EV22-24 on the basis of its contribution to the natural environment and, whilst not shown on the Proposals Map, Policy HC23 applies to land within the open countryside and greenspace system which has a specific recreational function. Elsewhere within the defined urban area community recreation land is identified on the Proposals Map. However the precise boundaries of each location will not be known until a full open space audit is completed. In the case of school playing fields, TAN16 states that schools should be seeking to preserve the optimum area of playing fields available rather than looking to secure a minimum provision. Any excess in provision will be assessed by individual cases as and when appropriate. The assessment will be based on the standards of the National Playing Fields Association. In addition to the tests imposed by this policy, TAN16 requires that the disposal of school playing fields will also depend on whether the site will be required in the longer term for school or community use. Planning obligations may be sought to ensure proper maintenance.

For further information please contact:

Dr Chris Llewellyn, Director of Lifelong Learning, Leisure and Information
Chris.llewelyn@wlga.gov.uk

Naomi Alleyne, Director of Equalities and Social Justice
Naomi.alleyne@wlga.gov.uk

Welsh Local Government Association
Local Government House
Drake walk
Cardiff
CF10 4LG

Tel: 029 2046 8600

6

Children and Young People's Plans 2008 - 2011

Partnership Support Unit Review to inform the
2009/2010 PSU Forward Work Programme

INTRODUCTION

1. Background

1.1 The Partnership Support Unit (PSU) has undertaken a review of the 22 Children and Young People's Plans (CYP Plans) across Wales. Final versions of the plans were used in all but one case, where the final version was not available at the time of this review. The primary purpose of this review was to inform the future work programme of the PSU. However, the review will also provide some feedback to the Welsh Assembly Government on the statutory guidance in relation to the CYP Plans

1.2 This review complements the content analysis of the plans, and detailed feedback has been received from the Assembly Government by each CYP Partnership on their draft plans. This review is intended to address some general observations, highlight key themes and common priorities, and note particular vulnerabilities and strengths. It does not comment on any individual CYP Plan, nor does it offer a comparative analysis of the CYP Plans.

1.3 The guidance, Shared Planning for Better Outcomes (WAG 2007), states that the CYP Plan is the defining statement of strategic planning intent and priorities for all children and young people's services and it is important to recognise that this is the first attempt to produce a high level strategic plan that will enable the planning and development of effective, integrated services for children and young people. It represents a significant departure from the planning environment key decision makers have operated within previously. It must be expected then that these first CYP Plans will be living documents; all will have strengths and weaknesses and will take time to evolve into truly strategic and effective planning tools.

Structure of the Report

1.4 The information here is organised into two parts. The first part details areas of specific focus selected for attention due to their being issues of specific interest for a number of partnerships. For example, in the case of workforce development this is an emerging area that many partnerships are only now

beginning to address with any rigour and therefore a number of partnerships have expressed an interest in understanding the position across Wales. Specific areas covered in this section are:

- outcome measures framework
- commissioning and joint commissioning
- workforce development
- involvement of children, young people and families in the planning process
- rural issues

1.5 Summaries of notable practice have been highlighted at the end of each section to offer examples of where partnerships are using models that are innovative, effective or particularly notable in their CYP Planning. Partnerships are identified by the region from which they come and not individually referenced.

1.6 The second part reports on the CYP Plan priorities and attempts to map these across the 22 CYP Plans. Issues relating to the planning guidance are noted where they arise.

Overview

1.7 The development of these first CYP Plans has involved a considerable amount of time and effort on the part of a huge number of partner agencies and there is some anecdotal evidence to suggest that the processes to develop CYP Plans have significantly aided the development of the CYP Partnerships across Wales. It is important to remember when reading this review, that these CYP Plans are partnerships' first attempts to draw together overarching strategic documents fit for purpose at a local level. Some variation in format, content and language is therefore, to be expected. It must also be recognised that although the CYP Partnerships are building on the previous Children and Young People's Frameworks for Partnership (including Children's Partnerships

and Young People's Partnerships), the guidance '*Stronger Partnerships for Better Outcomes*' prompted many areas to revise their planning architecture and so partnership arrangements and associated governance are, in many cases, very new. Even where previous arrangements have been retained the changing policy context provided by the guidance, '*Shared Planning for Better Outcomes*' means that partnerships have revised membership and will have had to work differently to develop the CYP Plan.

1.8 Progress has undoubtedly been made, however given the formative stage that CYP Partnerships are in, they are still in the process of working towards producing plans that are the defining statement of strategic planning intent and priorities for all children and young people's services that they are intended to be. This is to be expected given that these are the first CYP Plans. It is worth noting that progress in England was recently reported in the Local Government National Report, 'Are We There Yet?' (Audit Commission, 2008) to be slow with little evidence that children's trust boards are yet making a substantial difference to outcomes.

General Comments

1.9 The interpretation of the guidance varied across the 22 CYP Plans and as a consequence the overall format of the plans was very different. Most, but not all plans were structured around the 7 Core Aims. Whilst most used priorities for the basis of future work, some used agreed partnership themes which were then broken down into actions relating back to the themes.

1.10 Partnerships varied in their definition of what constituted a priority. In some CYP Plans priorities were strategic and overarching, often encompassing a number of sub-priorities or actions, in others priorities were more similar to the Core Aims in being broad aspirational statements. In yet other cases, priorities were outcomes and others used the term priority to refer to specific operational actions. This lack of consistency regarding what constitutes a priority, an outcome, an action or a theme is an area that the Assembly Government may wish to consider in the review of the planning guidance.

1.11   The level of detail contained in the CYP Plans differed and the plans varied in length from 36 to 211 pages. In many cases where priorities were specific actions it appeared that they had been lifted from pre-existing operational plans and had been cut and pasted into the CYP Plans. This was particularly noticeable in priorities under Core Aims 2, 3 and 6.

1.12   The guidance states that the CYP Plans are the defining statement of strategic planning intent and priorities for all children and young people's services. In reality however, the level of prescription and detail in the guidance encourages a level of specificity and detail which would sit more appropriately in operational or implementation action plans. The feedback received from the Assembly Government by CYP Partnerships in some cases also reflects an expectation that the CYP Plan should contain a high level of specificity inconsistent with a high level strategic plan. The challenge for the Assembly Government therefore is for future guidance to set out consistent principles informing all CYP Plans, for example based around the Core Aims, engagement of children and young people, shared outcomes and accountability and so on, without prescribing in too much detail how these principles are enacted in local plans.

PART 1 – KEY THEMES

2.   Outcome Measures Framework

2.1   Most, although not all CYP Plans used the Outcome Measures Framework (OMF) templates provided in the guidance. Where these were not used the PSU has used a degree of interpretation as to where some information fits in order to match to the CYP Plan template. The analysis here concentrates on the content of each OMF. A number of plans include a completed OMF as well as listing what are variously termed 'Outcomes', 'Targets', and 'Priorities' in the main text or in separate templates. The link between these different sets is not always clear, which should be a matter for further analysis.

2.2　The guidance includes the requirement that CYP Partnerships "set out agreed joint targets to enable progress in improving outcomes to be measured over the planning timescale"[1] and that these targets "should be set out (for the 3 year plan cycle in most instances) using the template within the sections on each Core Aim in this guidance".[2] The guidance identifies three main purposes:

- to demonstrate improving outcomes for children and young people and provide basic data for inspection and regulation of services delivered in partnership

- to show progress being made in implementing the rights of children and young people, thereby meeting reporting requirements under the UNCRC

- to provide a framework for moving from a service-based focus to a focus based on the needs of children and young people in accordance with the 7 Core Aims

2.3　Comparison between CYP Partnerships is one possible use of the information within the OMF, however concerns about the consistency of data and definitions used across the plans will limit the usefulness of such comparison.

2.4　The guidance requires targets to be set for the end of the three year CYP Plan cycle except in "some instances" which require annual targets. However, the guidance does not specify which Core Aims/priority outcomes this means, neither has the template attached to each Core Aim been amended to show this. Perhaps partly as a result, there is inconsistency in the approach in some CYP Plans. The guidance also asks for current performance (most recent complete annual data) for each outcome measure to be recorded as a basis for comparison. It is unclear whether such comparison is really effective as a means of identifying and demonstrating improvement since it does not take account of previous trends or variations in the year-on-year data. However, it is also important that any framework minimises the

---

[1] *Shared Planning for Better Outcomes*, 2007. p. 13.
[2] *Shared Planning for Better Outcomes,* 2007. p. 24.

bureaucratic burden on CYP Partnerships and so this may be an appropriate compromise.

2.5   The OMF is organised according to the 7 Core Aims and while these clearly sit within the principles of the UNCRC it is not explicit in the guidance how priority outcomes or outcome measures relate back to specific rights. This may, therefore, present difficulties in using the information in the OMF to show progress against the UNCRC. It merits consideration as to whether a plan can be driven simultaneously by both a set of *rights* and a set of *outcomes*, however this is beyond the scope of this review.

2.6   The OMF seems a constructive step towards moving from a service-based focus to a more needs-based focus. However, progress will be dependent on the extent to which a needs-based focus is embedded consistently across all levels of planning. In addition, the support available to local CYP Partnerships will also have an impact. It will be important for the Assembly Government to review the purpose of the OMF in line with the normal review of guidance for the next planning cycle. It is suggested that it may be helpful to review how outcome measures are baselined with a preference for enabling comparison of performance against trends rather than against a single year. It may be helpful to consider whether incremental target setting, no targets, or the current three year targets are a better means of encouraging improvement and it would be helpful for the guidance to clarify requirements for some annual targets.

2.7   Almost all the CYP Partnerships have so far adopted an OMF within or as an appendix to the CYP Plan. Of the remainder, all are intending to do so. OMFs were included with the CYP Plans in two broad types: were integrated into the plan; or appended to the plan. There was some initial confusion among CYP Partnerships about the purpose and status of the OMF although ultimately all will include a completed OMF. The lack of a common mechanism for collecting and submitting performance data and the consequent lack of consistency in presentation may undermine the Assembly Government's

ability to draw conclusions about target setting and performance across the plans. One partnership used an Excel spreadsheet to present the OMF. This might provide an example of notable practice of a tool for collating and managing this data. At least one other CYP Partnership has developed a similar tool.

2.8 It is suggested that the Assembly Government may need to reinforce the purpose and status of the OMF with clear and consistent messages. It is further suggested that the adoption of a common system such as Ffynnon to manage the information gathering and exchange might be helpful in ensuring consistency of how information is presented which will in turn aid analysis. The question of local tools or systems for collating and managing performance data should be a matter for further investigation and support.

2.9 **Priority Outcomes**

Priority outcomes sit within and at a level below each of the 7 Core Aims.[3] Priority outcomes are more specific, plain language expressions of the ambitions for children and young people encompassed by each Core Aim. For example, priority outcome 6.3 "Every child and young person . . . is safe from the effects of environmental pollution." They are not in themselves intended to be measurable. The OMF includes over 26 national priority outcomes specified by the Assembly Government (the precise number depends on how they are counted). In a number of CYP Plans these have been supplemented by, or substituted with, locally identified priority outcomes.

2.10 Most plans used the priority outcomes specified in Shared Planning for Better Outcomes either exclusively, or with only minor changes or additions. In some cases the plans included both the OMF and an alternative set of priorities which were not always mapped across. Some of the plans which included this detail used significantly different priority outcomes in the OMF.

---

[3] One of the plans was not organised according to the Seven Core Aims.

2.12   There was inconsistency in both the Assembly Government priority outcomes and some of the locally identified priority outcomes in defining what constituted an outcome. All of the OMFs which included locally agreed priority outcomes were inconsistent to a degree. For example, what are sometimes described as *entitlements* or *rights to access* were used as outcomes. Unsurprisingly there was some tension between the national priority outcomes and locally identified priority outcomes. In some cases this was resolved by substituting the Assembly Government priority outcomes with local ones. However, this will have implications for the Assembly Government if it intends to use the information on the OMFs to gain a consistent national picture or achieve comparable data sets across all plans.

2.13   It is beyond the scope of this analysis to settle the question of whether entitlements like *participation* or *access* are equivalent to outcomes or can stand in as such effectively. However, it is likely that using these as outcomes will have an impact on how some elements of the plans are delivered (and reported against). The main risk of taking a starting point which is not an outcome, being that a certain type of service provision is taken to be the goal of the work undertaken. This question of definitions relates both to the question of achieving consistency across all levels of planning, raised above, and to the question of working towards common understanding of key ideas. Adopting a common technique for embedding outcomes based thinking into planning, such as Results Based Accountability, may help to address both questions. Expectations regarding the use of Assembly Government priority outcomes may need to be clarified and communicated to CYP Partnerships. It will be very difficult or impossible to consider the 22 CYP Plan OMFs in the whole without consistency. It is suggested that it might also be helpful for there to be common understanding of key ideas (and a common language to describe them).

2.14   **Outcome Measures**

Outcome measures are the measurable data or information which helps to quantify whether the ambition expressed by the priority outcome (and in turn

the Core Aim) is being achieved. These measures can be tracked and used to set targets and record performance. The OMF includes approximately 40 outcome measures set by the Assembly Government. The guidance also allows for local outcome measures to be incorporated, although clarification may be needed regarding whether local outcome measures can be used in place of as well as in addition to, the Assembly Government outcome measures.

2.15   All plans which had an OMF used some of the outcome measures specified in the guidance ranging from 11[4] to the full set as well as additional local outcome measures. Only one did not include any local outcome measures in the OMF. There was widespread inconsistency in both national and local outcome measures as to what constituted a measure; some of those included being more accurately described as actions, aims or descriptions of relevant strategies. There was only one CYP Plan which includes only true measures. There was also inconsistency in both national and local outcome measures as to the level to which outcome measures refer. Some measures referred to whole populations, others to the users of specific services. All OMFs so far available, demonstrated this second type of inconsistency to a greater or lesser extent. The number of local outcome measures specified in the plans varied greatly. Most included between 20 and 100 local outcome measures but one included none and one almost 500. It is difficult to be precise on the number of outcome measure because some were made up of multiple parts.

2.16   As with the priority outcomes, consistency is a key factor both for accountability at a local level and if outcome measures are to be used to gain a national picture. The inconsistency around what the outcome measures are for and the population/service level to which they refer, are likely to lead to confusion about what is being evidenced. There was some evidence of notable practice in attempting to agree and stick to definitions of what constituted an outcome measure. However, as with previous attempts to measure the effectiveness of the Assembly Government policy (e.g. Cymorth

Target Template) this process is likely to suffer because of a perceived lack of consistency in the guidance.

2.17 It is questionable whether, beyond a certain point, a large number outcome measures is better for reflecting performance, particularly for high level strategic plans such as these. The logistical challenges of collating and presenting large amounts of data for local decision making are significant. But the biggest potential problem is simply that beyond a certain point a mass of data becomes unintelligible and/or open to too many interpretations to be of practical use. It is suggested that it may be more helpful for OMFs to contain some headline indicators appropriate for a high level strategic document rather than a mass of operational data more appropriate to delivery plans.

2.18 **Current Performance and Targets**

Current performance is the quantity of the outcome measure which has been achieved in the last full reporting year to be used as a "baseline" against which to assess future performance. Targets are the quantity of the outcome measure which is expected to be achieved at the end of the three year CYP Plan cycle, except in some instances which require annual targets. The majority of OMFs had missing Current Performance or Local Target data (or both). The majority of OMFs used a mix of targets for the end of the three year plan cycle and annual targets, however one CYP Plan set out a framework for annual targets for all outcome measures as well as three years of baseline data (although in fact the majority of data is missing). This might suggest a useful model for future guidance.

2.19 Overall, there was evidence that most CYP Partnerships have been conscientious in setting targets for outcome measures. As might be expected of multi-agency plans containing so many targets there are instances of missing data. This should not be considered a problem as long as the

---

[4] It is difficult to identify a precise figure because (a) WAG specified outcome measures have in some instances been re-worded and (b) a "true" outcome measure may have been specified where WAG has

commitment and mechanisms exist to fill in the gaps. There is a range of ongoing work intended to support CYP Partnerships to identify data (such as the Child Well-Being Monitor as well as individual support offered by the PSU) which should continue into the next planning cycle.

2.20 As noted previously there are risks in comparing performance against a single point (rather than a trend). Largely this is because there is no way of knowing if the particular year is atypical in any way. It is also inconclusive as to whether end of three -year cycle or incremental targets are the best way of driving improvement. An additional consideration is that fuller baselining of data would allow future performance to be assessed against a projection based on the trend rather than a target which, it is suggested would provide a more useful picture regarding progress and achievement.

2.21 Given the review above it is suggested that it may be helpful for the purpose of the OMF to be reviewed in line with the normal review of guidance for the next planning cycle and consideration given to baselining outcome measures to enable comparison against trends. There is a need to clarify the requirement for some annual targets as well as the use of nationally and locally specified priority outcomes. Without such consistency it will be very difficult to consider the 22 CYP Plan OMFs in the whole. Consideration may need to be given to the questions around how the information contained within the OMF relates to the UNCRC.

2.22 Adopting a common system such as Ffynnon to manage the information gathering and exchange might be helpful in ensuring consistency of how information is presented which will in turn aid analysis. Development of common understanding of key ideas and a common language needs further development. It is also suggested that it might be helpful for CYP Partnerships to use the OMFs to monitor strategic headline indicators appropriate for the high level strategic document that the CYP Plan is intended to be.

---

specified a proxy.

Notable Practice Box

Since publishing the CYP Plan one CYP Partnership has adopted Ffynnon as a mechanism performance against the outcome measures in the CYP Plan.

Each outcome measure is recorded on Ffynnon with information on targets, trends against previous performance and a Red, Amber, Green rating for actual performance data. Anecdotal data on performance can also recorded so as to provide a fuller picture than might be provided by the data alone. Information can then be reported to decision makers in an accessible form clearly identifying which outcome measures require closer consideration or intervention.
North Wales Partnership

2.23 Further Work and Forward Work Programme

Further work relating to outcome measurement of the CYP Plans and related support should include the following areas, (these cut across two types of work: supporting individual CYP Partnerships and informing the future direction of the OMF):

- Further analysis is required of the CYP Plan needs assessments, both with regard to the methods by which the individual assessments took place and also the form in which needs assessment has informed prioritisation. It is also anticipated that some of this work will inform future guidance. Further analysis of the link between priorities within the main text of the individual plans and Outcome Measures Framework, where these are separate, should also refer back to link with the needs assessment.

- There is a need for any review of the guidance to clarify various issues (such as where year-by-year targets are required) as well as being part of a process of working towards common and agreed definitions and consistent understanding and use of key concepts such as Outcome. The PSU will aim to continue to inform and support this work through input to officials and support of CYP Partnerships such as the ongoing work on Results Based Accountability.

- Further consideration and support is required to identify and develop the tools or techniques by which data can be collated and communicated so as to effectively inform ongoing planning and conclusions about achievement. There are some examples of notable local practice

emerging but consideration might also be given to whether adoption of a single tool, such as Ffynnnon, might be the best way forward. The PSU will continue to support and inform this work.

- It is arguable that there is scope for improvement in the use of certain performance management techniques, particularly targeting and baselining. This will be a question for both future guidance and for local support which the PSU will continue to offer.

- An important consideration for both Local CYP Partnerships and the Assembly Government is the role which the OMF will play in future inspection. The PSU will continue to work to support CYP Partnerships to meet the expectations of the inspectorates as well as contributing where appropriate to the wider question of what those expectations should be in the context of the CYP Plans.

2.24 *Forward Work Programme*

The PSU will:

- Continue to provide individual CYP Partnership support with performance management queries
- Follow up analysis of links between CYP Plan priorities and Outcome Measures Framework Priority Outcomes (where these are separate)
- Review of CYP Plan Needs Assessment (this is dependant on availability of Needs Assessments, not all of which have been published at this time). This will include a review of how Needs Assessments have been conducted as well as the links between Needs Assessment and priorities
- Organise and facilitate an Outcome Measurement national learning event. This event will link with the WAG review of the Outcome Measures Framework

3. Commissioning and Joint Commissioning

3.1 Almost all CYP Plans made reference to commissioning. A small number of CYP Partnership areas already had commissioning strategies in place, and one referred to commissioning as one of two key tools required to achieve

the aims of the CYP Plan. Most CYP Plans included a statement of intent to develop a commissioning strategy, but did not provide further information as to the characteristics of any proposed strategy, for example, whether it would be an overarching strategy or for a service specific, although some CYP Plans did attempt to detail what this would involve. A number of plans referred to the CYP Plan as a 'basis for joint commissioning' and the pooling of budgets, but none provided any detail as to what this might involve or how they intended to go about this. Joint commissioning did not appear to be aligned with a commissioning process, i.e. it was seen merely as the act of pooling budgets. There was still some confusion in a few plans between commissioning and procurement.

3.2   Those CYP Partnership areas which took part in the Social Services Improvement Agency (SSIA) Better Outcomes for Children in Need (BOCIN) work made reference to a commissioning strategy for children in need and it may be that this can be a basis for further work on a CYP Partnership commissioning strategy.

3.3   A few CYP Plans mentioned the possibility of exploring the potential for regional collaboration. Some made reference to adult services as an area of good practice from which the CYP Partnerships could learn. One CYP Partnership noted areas of priorities for further integration, and another expressed an intention to explore opportunities to work with neighbouring CYP Partnerships to jointly commission and deliver regional commissioning of integrated advocacy. Advocacy was mentioned in a number of CYP Plans as an area where there is potential for joint commissioning on a regional basis.

3.4   There was no real mention of stakeholder participation in the CYP Plans with one notable exception. This plan refers to children and young people and parent participation within the commissioning process. As CYP Partnerships develop their commissioning strategies, it will be vital that the lessons on

stakeholder involvement are taken forward from the BOCIN work.

3.5 CYP Partnerships are in varying degrees of development in terms of their commissioning strategies. The CYP Plans fell generally into three categories with most plans falling into the second category:

- CYP Plans with a commissioning strategy in place and being implemented

- CYP Plans containing statements of intent, which have identified and recognised commissioning issues throughout and which have made links with other commissioning groups or bodies and are clear about the development of this work

- CYP Plans where commissioning as a process does not feature very highly within the priorities and content of their plan.

Notable Practice Box

As well as stating that a Commissioning Strategy will be developed and that the CYP Plan is a basis for the joint commissioning of services, the CYP Plan refers to children and young people and parental participation as well as the voluntary sector as part of its commissioning process.
South West and Mid Wales Partnership

The CYP Plan contains a specific section on Joint Commissioning Arrangements and refers to a proposed dedicated Commissioning Officer. This partnership has a Joint Commissioning Group answerable to the Partnership Board and is using the development of its strategy for Disabled Children and Young People as a pathfinder for joint commissioning work. Joint commissioning is well integrated in the plan and within the work of the partnership support team and makes clear links with workforce development.
South East Wales Partnership

Notable Practice Box

The CYP Plan contains a specific section on Joint Commissioning Arrangements and refers to a proposed dedicated Commissioning Officer. This partnership has a Joint Commissioning Group answerable to the Partnership Board and is using the development of its strategy for Disabled Children and Young People as a pathfinder for joint commissioning work. Joint commissioning is well integrated in the plan and within the work of the partnership support team and makes clear links with workforce development.
South East Wales Partnership

Plans are in place to explore opportunities to work with neighbouring Partnerships to jointly commission and deliver regional commissioning of integrated advocacy.
Central South Wales Partnership

A statement on joint commissioning in the CYP Plan highlights the potential for commissioning advocacy services across networks and counties.
North Wales Partnership

3.6   **Further work and Forward Work Programme**

The PSU has been working with the Institute of Public Care to develop a commissioning support tool for partnerships, (funded by the SSIA). It comprises of materials which can be used with partnership stakeholders in a workshop environment to self-assess their current position, as well as to develop a commissioning strategy for the partnership. The self assessment component will allow partnerships to establish their baseline for this work. The tool takes into account the different starting points for partnerships, and partnerships will be able to make use of elements of the toolkit according to their needs.

3.7   One important factor is that CYP Partnerships need to learn from each other. The PSU will be working with partnerships to implement the commissioning support toolkit, and will be working with those partnerships that have developed further in this field, in order to ensure that the lessons that they have learnt are able to transfer to those partnerships that are in the early stages of development. The commissioning expertise of social services commissioning officers will also be sought by joint working with the SSIA. The roll-out of the commissioning toolkit will be in accordance with partnerships' agreed timetables for action.

3.8   *Forward Work Programme*

The PSU will:

- In collaboration with SSIA, develop and support the use of a commissioning support tool for CYP Partnerships which will support the development of commissioning strategies for vulnerable children. This will include:
  o Provision of general information on the purpose and content of the support tool to the Social Services Commissioning Group and Assembly Government officials
  o Provision of ongoing support to individual CYP Partnerships and their partner agencies in the implementation of the support tool
  o Delivery of a series of regional workshops on the commissioning support tool for partnerships
- Provide support to the Children and Young People's Partnership Involvement Network in Cymru (CYPPINC) to address the commissioning support needs of the voluntary sector. This will include:
  o Production of a pack for voluntary sector stakeholders to provide support in developing relationships with commissioners and developing as providers of services for children and young people and their families
- Provide support to CYP Partnerships in North Wales to develop a regional collaborative approach to commissioning an integrated and universal advocacy service in the North.
- In collaboration with key stakeholders, scope an event to share learning around joint commissioning and delivery of integrated advocacy services

4. Workforce Development

4.1 The guidance[5] states that a well trained, professional workforce is fundamental to the delivery of quality services and that the workforce section of the plan should not be confined to the statutory sector but should span the voluntary and private sectors including the large numbers of self-employed providers, carers and volunteers amongst the children and young people's workforce. This represents a significant and complex piece of work

and it was recognised that CYP Partnerships would be at an early stage with workforce development. The workforce elements of most CYP Plans were at a formative stage of development. The review here therefore reflects what is known about the current stage of development within partnerships relating to workforce development rather than any analysis of the CYP Plan content.

4.2   The guidance links to the methodology adopted by the Social Care Workforce Development Partnerships (SCWDP) as exemplars of good practice. However, whilst multi-agency training has been provided by the SCWDP, limited progress has been made in relation to workforce planning. The guidance suggests that partnerships should determine a small number of priorities for their first CYP Plan and directs partnerships to the needs and service provision analyses to provide the basis for identifying how these priorities will be achieved. It is further suggested that partnerships will need to make contact with higher and further education institutes as well as training providers, indicating that partnerships should be identifying areas for regional collaboration.

4.3   Elements of workforce planning are in hand in some aspects and will be more focussed and straightforward under some Core Aims than others. Separating out the workforce development aspect into a separate strategy rather than seeing it as a framework integrated across the plan lent a scale and complexity to the task that meant that in most cases this became a secondary priority to completing and finalising the CYP Plan as a whole. The acceptance by the Assembly Government that the scale and complexity of the task meant it would take time to develop, and the lack of timescales for completion has, in some cases, lead to a few CYP Partnerships delaying in progressing this work.

4.4   The suggestion in the guidance that CYP Partnerships can meet the costs involved in the development of a workforce development plan from the funding provided for partnership work through Cymorth is in many cases

---

[5] *Shared Planning for Better Outcomes,* 2007. p. 62.

unrealistic given the calls already made on this funding stream and its reduction as it enters the Revenue Support Grant.

4.5   There appeared to be confusion across some CYP Partnerships in relation to whether this section of the plan was a framework, a strategy or an action plan. This lack of clarity has implications for the content and shape of the final document.

4.6   CYP Partnerships are currently in the process of developing a process for the creation of local and regional workforce planning. Partnerships are considering the type of approach needed to resolve workforce issues at a local level and there are suggestions ranging from appointing a Workforce Development Officer through to setting up workforce development steering groups and partnerships. Regional meetings have discussed how partnerships will develop regional working processes to address 'shared' priorities and outcomes. Some CYP Partnerships have been explicit in the approach they intend to take e.g. linking with the Social Care Partnerships and the Economic Partnership to ensure that training and the economic needs of the area are met. The PSU, assisted by the WLGA, is working with CYP Partnerships locally as well as on a regional basis to identify and meet the individual needs of partnerships as they take forward this work.

4.7   The apparent lack of detail at this stage has allowed a process to evolve and enabled learning to be shared. The fact that the CYP Plan has become, in many areas, the business planning mechanism for workforce development it has avoided duplication of effort and confusion amongst partners pursuing their own workforce development agendas in silos.

Notable Practice Box

All CYP Partnerships in the South West and Mid Wales Area Consortia (swamwac) have been developing a shared process for collect and collating data and strategic documentation for CYP Partnerships outlining what is expected from partners in relation to workforce development on a regional basis.
South West and Mid Wales Partnerships

4.8 **Further work and Forward Work Programme**

The PSU has been asked to produce a proposal for the development of a regional collaborative approach to workforce development by the Central and South East Region CYP Partnership co-ordinators. This paper is attached as Annex 1. The PSU has also assisted with the development of a toolkit commissioned by the Children and Young People's Workforce Development Network (CYPWDN) to support CYP Partnerships in progressing their workforce development plans.

4.9 *Forward Work Programme*

The PSU will:

- Pool workforce data on a regional basis in order to identify opportunities for regional working

- Undertake local and regional workforce development workshops tailored to meet the individual needs of CYP Partnerships as requested.

5. **Participation and Involvement of Children and Young People in the Development of the CYP Plans**

5.1 The guidance emphasises that the CYP Plans must be based on the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), and that the participation of children, young people and their families is of key importance in contributing to needs assessment and later to strategy development and delivery. This rights based approach is different to the needs based approach adopted in England and involvement of children and young people is notably less evident in CYP Plans in England, with the Local Government National Report, 'Are We There Yet?' (Audit Commission, 2008) noting that mechanisms for involving children, young people and parents in children's trusts need to be improved.

5.2   In analysing the CYP Plans, the PSU considered the following:

- Whether data was collected solely for the purposes of the CYP Plan, or for other, earlier planning processes

- What evidence there was of CYP Partnerships engaging children, young people and families in the development of their CYP Plans

- How and with whom the engagement took place

- How engagement impacted on final CYP Plans

- Key learning points regarding engagement and suggestions for any revised guidance for the development of CYP Plans for 2011 onwards

5.3   A number of CYP Plans made reference to information gathered for other purposes, such as the development of Health Social Care and Wellbeing Strategies or information collected for Communities that Care. Most plans made reference to the views of users of specific services, or target groups (e.g. disabled children and young people, young carers etc) being used as part of the needs assessment process. Most plans also referred to schools councils and youth fora, in existence prior to the requirement for CYP Plans. Some CYP Plans detailed specific activities which elicited views on particular topics, whilst others refer to a more general use of structures (usually youth fora).

5.4   Although useful for developing multi-agency delivery plans, engagement exercises around single subject areas e.g. sexual health, or specific geographical areas e.g. Communities that Care surveys, whilst having value, are likely to contain higher levels of detail than can be usefully integrated into a county wide strategic plan.

5.5   The guidance states that the needs assessment, strategy development and consultation should be 'overlapping phases' in the plan development. All CYP Plans made reference to the importance of engaging children, young people and families. The level of detail around their involvement in planning process varied considerably across the plans, and it was not always clear at what stage, and to what extent, children, young people and their families were

involved. However, there was apparent a general pattern for the process of plan development across the plans as follows:

- *Needs assessment* - CYP Plans used views previously collected and/or undertook specific activity with children, young people and families to identify their key issues, broadly around the 7 Core Aims

- *Initial draft Plan* - In many areas the initial draft CYP Plan contained a 'long list' of priorities. Most partnerships undertook workshops with existing groups of children, young people and families to prioritise these to develop the final list of priorities

- *Formal Consultation* - Most CYP Plans stated explicitly that children, young people and families were involved in the formal 12 week consultation process. The remainder referred to the ongoing engagement in the whole process, including the consultation. Some areas included all the consultation responses (including those from children and young people) as appendices

5.6   Although all CYP Plans referred to the involvement of children, young people and their families, and most to the groups involved, in many cases it was not possible to identify the methodology used in any detail. Some plans referred to the resources used, or the organisation commissioned to take forward the engagement.

5.7   Where plans referred to the groups involved, these included:
- Primary and secondary schools and college councils
- Youth fora
- Specific events
- Service user fora (these often included vulnerable and harder to reach groups)
- Parent networks and parent/carer fora
- Detached youth work.

5.8   The level of evidence contained in the CYP Plans regarding the participation of children, young people and their families was variable. This is unsurprising

since the guidance did not specify what evidence was required. All CYP Plans made some reference to engagement of children and young people. It was not possible to draw conclusions that a lack of detail of processes in a plan relates in any way to what actually happened on the ground.

5.9 Many CYP Partnerships noted the groups they engaged with, and in most cases these demonstrated a range in terms of age group, interests and vulnerability, with a clear commitment shown in some CYP Plans to secure the views of vulnerable children and young people. A variety of methods were used (questionnaires, storybooks, interactive sessions, workshops, etc.), and a range of agencies were used. CYP Partnerships' own participation staff, Youth Service, voluntary sector partners and service providers were frequently heavily involved. However, the quality of the participation (i.e. how closely it met with the Participation Standards) cannot be ascertained from a review of the plans. PSU contact with participation workers during the production of the plans identified concerns around some of this engagement and also scope to share learning across regions about attempting to engage children and young people in planning at a high strategic level.

5.10 All CYP Plans referred at some level to using feedback from the engagement process to amend the draft into the final version. In many cases this was referred to in the narrative text in a statement indicating that 'the views of children, young people (and) families…were gathered and taken into account before making changes'. Some CYP Plans do contain more detailed information demonstrating how responses during the engagement (some of which came from children, young people and families) have been used to amend the final version of the plan. Some contain links to feedback received, and how this was used. Others have similar evidence on their websites, but it was not mentioned in their plans.

5.11 There was evidence that the engagement of children, young people and families was taken into consideration during the development of the CYP Plans. However, the degree of influence that these views exerted on the final priorities was impossible to ascertain. It was difficult to assess whether

priorities additional to those identified by the Assembly Government in the Outcomes Template were developed by children, young people and families or were developed by CYP Partnerships, and then approved by children, young people and families.

5.12 On reviewing the CYP Plans it would appear that there has been a range of levels of engagement of children, young people and families in developing the final plans. In some cases it appears that comments received have been included in the final version, and issues raised have been reflected in the priorities. It was not possible to tell if these priorities would have been included if they had not been raised by children and young people. It was also not possible to tell if other priorities have been excluded due to the input from children, young people and families. It was also neither possible nor appropriate to comment on the quality of the engagement process from the content of the plans. Concerns have been raised about the appropriateness of attempting to elicit truly informed views on a high level strategic plan from children and young people, as this requires them to comment on a range of services with which they have had no contact. There have also been concerns raised about the capacity of relatively limited numbers of staff to facilitate the engagement, given the timescales available for the first CYP Plan. It was also important to remember that the lack of a direct reference to engagement processes in a final CYP Plan does not necessarily mean the activity did not occur. A number of CYP Partnerships have evidence of engagement processes on their websites which are not noted in their plans.

5.13 Although the guidance was specific about requiring a list of issues raised by children and young people, and families and how these have been addressed to be published separately but simultaneously with the CYP Plan on websites and as hard copy, it was not specific as to what evidence of the engagement of children, young people and families should be reported in the final CYP Plan. Indeed, being too specific could well have resulted in even longer documents in some cases and unmanageable detail which would not

necessarily add value. There was therefore wide variation in the quantity and detail in the plans. CYP Plans are high level strategic documents intended to drive the operational delivery plans that sit beneath them, as such detailed reporting of engagement processes is probably unhelpful. Similarly, a 'tick box' approach would also undermine the primary function of the plan at the local level.

5.14 It may be that the Assembly Government should include stronger reference to the Participation Standards and locally developed participation strategies in the planning guidance. The majority of references to participation of children and young people in the Assembly Government documentation contain the caveat of being specifically 'about services that affect them'. Clearly, for any given group of children and young people, many aspects of a CYP Plan do not describe services that affect them. Although many plans refer to participation strategies, and also to the implementation of the National Participation Standards, there was no explicit evidence that these standards were used to shape the engagement process used in developing the plans.

5.15 The National Participation Standards provide a benchmark by which all service providers can assess their own participatory practices, by which they can ensure that their service users can effectively engage and affect the services that they use. They will also allow services to report on the National Service Framework for Children, Young People's and Maternity Services (Children's NSF) Universal Key Actions 2.1 – 2.3. If services were to ensure they were meeting the standards, and record and report their findings, CYP Partnerships would have access to an ongoing source of information directly from children and young people. This information 'patchwork' may be more relevant than attempting to elicit views from disparate groups of children, young people and families on a single high level strategic document, especially when some of the priorities are externally set, and cannot be altered by local feedback. As noted above, the current approach may seek to encourage comments from children, young people and families on services

with which they have no contact.

Notable Practice Box

1,355 children and young people aged between 7 and 25 years old were consulted with, including 91 vulnerable children and young people (such as young carers and young offenders) as well as 282 parents
North Wales Partnership

The CYP Partnership produced a storybook of the consultation version of the Plan for very young children, and a DVD version for young people
Central South Wales Partnership

The Youth Service, on behalf of the CYP partnership, co-ordinated a consultation with young people to gather their views and ideas to help inform the development of this Plan. 219 young people participated through a total of 27 groups and service providers
Central South Wales Partnership

The Young People's Reference Group held a consultation conference on the initial draft. The report produced was presented to the CYP Partnership and informed the amended CYP Plan
South West and Mid Wales Partnership

Children, young people and families' views were sought on the initial vision, priorities and planned actions developed following the needs assessment, and used the results to re-shape the CYP Plan accordingly
South East Wales Partnership

5.16 **Further work and Forward Work Programme**

Save the Children is working with CYP Partnerships and the Assembly Government to develop a national kitemark for participation. The PSU is working with partners to ensure that this work dovetails with existing arrangements and supports the priorities in the CYP Partnership participation strategies. The PSU is also working with partners to share notable practice on the involvement of children and young people in the CYP Plans to enable this to be further developed in the next planning round.

5.17 *Forward Work Programme*

The PSU will:

- Work with stakeholders to deliver a Participation Learning Event to share practice on involving children and young people in developing the CYP Plan

- Work to ensure that the development of a participation kitemark fits with existing arrangements and facilitate an event in collaboration with the CYP Partnership Co-ordinators and the Participation Unit, looking at developments around participation kitemarks.

6. Rural issues

6.1 Rural issues were identified in a number of CYP Plans from partnerships with a mainly rural geography and those where there was a mix of rural and urban. The three key themes that appeared in plans that identified rurality as an issue were:

- Transport
- Affordable childcare
- Access to services

6.2 While common issues were identified, there were few references to specific actions on how CYP Plans were going to address identified problems. One CYP Plan identified rural issues as a priority and integrated the issue into its priority areas, (e.g. considering the use of mobile services in rural areas). CYP Plans that identified rural issues did not always stream these through consistently and most plans which highlighted rural issues rarely identified solutions. For example, when mentioning access to services, no references were made to developing e-learning, web based technology and broadband access. This may be because they are not perceived as identified needs or because there is little awareness of developments in this area, e.g. the review recently announced by the European Commission to make broadband a common universal service and in particular the additional €1 billion that could be invested in digital rural economies across European regions, including Wales.

6.3   Interestingly, some of the partnership areas that are more urban in nature identified rurality as an issue whilst some mainly rural partnership areas did not and nor do they necessarily place significant emphasis on the three key themes referred to above. Clearly, these themes are not exclusive to rural areas however, most of the CYP Plans in rural partnership areas that mentioned these elements also made the link with Core Aim 7. However, this link was also made in those plans from more urban areas which identified these as issues, e.g. transport and its connection with access to services (service poverty) was an issue for children and young people in all 22 partnership areas. Areas with low car ownership are likely to encounter the same issues in relation to the ability of children and young people to access services as living in a rural environment would have. Different barriers in different areas might ultimately benefit from similar solutions. Many plans identified the need to ensure that local strategic plans recognise the transport needs of children, young people and their families, and will work with the Local Service Board (LSB) and other planning groups to ensure this.

6.4   A small number of plans identified the need to maximise the potential of community transport, and identified that increased co-ordination between organisations would fill gaps and avoid duplication. Other proposed actions included identifying and removing barriers to participation such as cost of transport, timing of activities and so on. Sharing learning from this might inform other partnerships prioritising work in this field.

6.5   Although access to childcare and sustainable childcare was a theme for the areas which identified rurality as an issue, affordable childcare was the theme which appeared in most of the CYP Plans across Wales. A significant number of partnerships identified a deficiency in out-of-school hours and holiday childcare provision and many identified Community Focussed School initiatives as an important element in driving this forward. There may be opportunities for sharing learning here also.

6.6 The issue of reduced access to services owing to geographical isolation exacerbating other forms of deprivation was identified in one plan as needing to be addressed by a multi-agency co-ordinated approach. It also emphasised the need to identify children, young people and families with similar characteristics elsewhere where the need was not so concentrated and to develop service models to meet those needs. Although it does not offer immediate solutions, this might be an area for collaboration with other rural partnership areas.

Notable Practice Box

The importance of Community Focussed Schools is emphasised within rural areas. The CYP Partnership is seeking to improve links with its Rural Development Partnership and participate in the delivery of the Rural Development Plan.
South East Wales Partnership

Notable Practice Box

Rurality and Access to Services is a priority theme in one plan, which states that: Children, young people and their parents should not be denied access to any statutory service, support system, educational experiences (including after school curricular activities) or leisure facility, due to living in rural environments and/or by not having their own transport. Cross agency cooperation should be sought to ensure parents are not denied services due to child care problems.
Projects should:
· Target vulnerable children and young people living in rural communities.
· Enhance facilities in rural areas.
· Ensure that access to services is planned into all projects.
· Ensure language and cultural issues are addressed.
· Ensure promotion of the Children's Information Exchange.
North Wales Partnership

6.7 **Further work and Forward Work Programme**

There are opportunities for joint working between CYP Partnerships in order to move forward from the identified issues and problems to solutions. There may also be opportunities to learn from examples of good practice in England e.g. from the transport co-ordinators which have been funded in rural local authorities. There is also potential to build stronger links between partnerships and the WLGA Rural Forum, with the support of the PSU. This

would enable partnerships to become more aware of developments on a national level and to be in a stronger position to influence the national agenda. There are themes in the priorities identified by CYP Partnerships which are common with aspects raised in the report of the National Assembly for Wales' Rural Development Sub-Committee, 'Poverty and Deprivation in Rural Wales', July 2008. Improved joint working could provide opportunities to share good practice and to work together to seek solutions to common issues.

6.8 *Forward Work Programme*
The PSU will:

- Facilitate and encourage strengthening engagement of CYP Partnerships with the WLGA Rural Forum:

- Scope a possible event to enable partnership representatives and WLGA Rural Forum members to share notable practice and develop solutions to some of the common issues identified

PART 2 - PRIORITIES

7. Introduction

7.1 The PSU did a mapping exercise of the priorities in CYP Plans to identify which were common across a number of plans. For the purposes of this exercise the PSU mapped only statements defined by the partnerships themselves as priorities, therefore these were sometimes described as specific actions and sometimes as broad aspirational statements of intent. Given this variation, priorities have been grouped into similar clusters within Core Aims. Not all CYP Plans were organised around the 7 Core Aims, where plans were not organised in this way this review has grouped the priorities with the majority of similar priorities.

8. Core Aim 1 Priorities

8.1 The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 1 (A flying start in life and best possible basis for future growth and development). In many cases the priority headings encompassed a number of individual priorities. For example one partnership listed the following under sufficient childcare:

- To establish and support the child element of the Genesis II project and to ensure that the childcare needs that arise from the project are reflected in the county's annual childcare sufficiency assessment.

- To further develop the county's childcare strategy so that affordable, quality childcare is available to those affected by income poverty thus allowing them to return to the workplace.

8.2 Priorities varied from the general, (securing sufficient quality childcare), to the specific, (increasing services of care and protection provided for any part of the day less than 24 hours to a child or children under 13 years of age, whose parents work outside the home, attend an educational programme or are otherwise unable to care for their children). This represents a challenge for the Assembly Government in relation to any re-drafting of the guidance. Whilst childcare was a priority in some way in all plans, the nature of the priority varied considerably from partnership to partnership. It is also

important to note that just because only 10 partnerships listed Foundation Phase here as a specific priority, this does not necessarily indicate that it is not present in other plans (it is listed under Core Aim 2 in one plan), nor that this sphere of activity is deemed as unimportant by other CYP Partnerships. The priorities within the Foundation Phase could be seen to fit within a number of other priorities under other Core Aims. In other plans Foundation Phase may be listed as an action rather than as a priority.

Table 1

Priorities listed under Core Aim 1 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Sufficient Childcare that is high quality, affordable and accessible and based on the sufficiency audit	12						1	12
Foundation Phase	10	2						11
Family Information Services	6							6
Flying Start	10							10
Strengthening Early Years provision	5							5
Language and Play	4							4
Common Assessment Framework	4	4	2					6
Develop Outcome Indicators	2							2
Information Sharing	3		1			2		3
Ensure national priorities fit local need	1							1
Improve baseline information for early identification of need	1							1
Using population information for planning	1							1

8.3   In addition to these mostly childcare related priorities, there were a number of health activities to promote pre-and antenatal health of mothers and infants. These are shown below in table 2, cross referenced with similar priorities in other Core Aims.

Table 2

Health Priorities from Core Aim 1 cross referenced across all Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Promote breastfeeding	6							6
Improve dental health	1		2					3
Immunisations	5							5
Improved diet and nutrition	4		8					9
Reduce n° of low birth weight babies	3							3
Promote maternal mental health/wellbeing	1							1
Service specification for home visiting health professionals	1							1
Improved access to services/advice	1		5					5
Improved health status of mothers and children	6		1					7
Accident prevention	2		2			12		12

8.4 Family support and parenting were strong themes across the CYP Plans. The detail of the priorities included a very wide range of proposed activity from the general, developing a parenting strategy and improving access to services and information, to the specific, development of an integrated model of service delivery such as Team Around the Child. Emotional health and secure attachment is identified here in a number of CYP Plans as is additional support for particular groups (BME parents, teen parents, disabled children and parents of children with challenging behaviour).

Table 3

Family Support Priorities from Core Aim 1 cross referenced across all Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Family support and parenting	1							1
Promote early development through support to the family	2							2
Parenting strategy	5		1					6
Parenting skills and family support services including improved support for vulnerable parents	5		1					6
Support for teen parents	3	1	1					4
Development of community	3							3

based services									
Development of integrated models of service delivery for Family Support, Multi Agency Teams to support families with young children including parenting, TAC, multi agency working	6	6	10	1					14
Development of ICCs	6								6
Improved access to advice and services	6		1						7
Encouraging parents and young children to participate in decisions that effect them	1								1
Promote positive emotional health and secure attachment	4		11						11
Support parents to understand their role as early educators	1								1
Nurture babies and young children before and after birth at home and elsewhere	2								2
Parenting skills for parents of children with challenging behaviour	2						1		2

8.5 The confusion about what constitutes a priority and a general lack of common language across the plans means that it is very hard to identify at times whether specific activities are covered or not. This is a recurring issue and is likely to cause problems for the Assembly Government in its analysis of the plans since it makes it very hard to determine on reading the plans alone whether issues such as participation, Extending Entitlement and so on, are being given due consideration. It would require some detailed follow-up to discover the extent to which some areas have been addressed. There is a risk that some partnerships may be unfairly criticised for omitting areas when in fact they are adequately addressed but are not expressed clearly within CYP Plans.

9. Core Aim 2 Priorities

9.1 The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 2 (access to a comprehensive range of educational and learning opportunities,

including the acquisition of essential personal and social skills). Core Aim 2 provided the most detailed and complex range of priorities across the plans although again there was little consistency with regard to the priorities they listed. The priorities relating to disabled children and young people are shown separately below in Table 5. Other priorities under Core Aim 2 are listed in Table 4 below. Most plans included a generic statement that they would improve the learning experiences of all children and young people in order to improve their outcomes. The needs of those with additional learning needs and autistic spectrum disorders featured heavily in most plans and disability generally was the strongest equalities theme addressed within the CYP Plans as a whole, featuring strongly both in education, family support, health and play as well as being noted by a few also in poverty, early years and participation.

9.2 Most although not all CYP Plans contained reference to youth support services and non formal and informal learning within their Core Aim 2 priorities, suggesting a recognition of the holistic nature of education and the important link between such support and opportunities and more formal learning. It should again be noted however, that an absence of reference to this at the priority level does not necessarily indicate an absence in the CYP Plan itself. Some plans have quite general strategic priorities but more detail within the plans and further detail will undoubtedly be contained in operational action plans. The strategic nature of the CYP Plans means they cannot contain any significant detail in terms of implementation. To understand how the plans will be implemented would require analysis of implementation and action plans not necessarily in existence.

Table 4

Priorities listed under Core Aim 2 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Community focussed schools		8		1				9
Extended provision - 14-19 learning pathways		7						7
Schools fit for purpose		4						4
Schools as early years settings and childcare		1						1
Support for Transitions including vulnerable groups		9	2			1	1	10
Leaving school with work/life skills		3						3
Additional Learning needs including ASD and LAC		16	6					17
Support education of those not educated in school		3						3
Education support for vulnerable groups		8						8
Early identification of need and prevention	2	5	7			11	2	16
Establish complex needs panel		1						1
Able and talented		2						2
Behaviour and attendance		6				1		7
Outdoor learning		1						1
Programmes to promote inclusion/engagement in learning, especially post 16 and reduce those NEET		9					7	12
Partnership Agreements		1						1
Global citizenship, volunteering etc		4		1	1			6
Skills based curriculum		5						5
Improved learning experiences to improve outcomes		16						16
Healthy schools		2	3	1				5
Transport		2		4			4	6

	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total
Target underperforming schools /implement Estyn recommendations		6						6
Sharing good practice		1						1
Youth Support Services		7		1				8
Informal and non-formal learning		10						10
Basic skills strategy		4					2	4
Ensure education promotes equality and respects diversity					1			1
Address Gender equality	1	3						4
Ensure access to education for gypsy traveller children		2						2
Respite care		1						1

9.3   Issues of behaviour and attendance are noted as specific priorities in 6 plans, although more plans refer to these issues within the detail of the CYP Plan. The National Behaviour and Attendance Review (NBAR) is currently compiling an action plan. The action plan at its draft stage made only brief reference to the role of the CYP Plan in terms of achieving NBAR recommendations and it is not known how familiar most CYP Partnerships are with the work of this group. This highlights the importance of such initiatives being developed with an awareness of the context within which they now operate (within a three year planning cycle driven by local partnerships and based on local priorities).

Table 5

Priorities relating to disability cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Targeted family support for families challenged by poverty, disability or child's challenging behaviour	3							3
Transition for children with disabilities		4	1					5
Education support for children with disabilities		13						13
Disability equality scheme		1						1
Promote equality for disabled children in		1						1

education								
Promote equality for disability children and young people		1						1
Ensure disabled children have access to play/leisure activities with support if needed and barriers to access removed				5				5
Improved services for disabled children/young people, especially those with severe/complex needs			7					7
Ensure mechanisms for children and young people who may not have a voice due to disability, sexuality, gender etc					1			1
Provision of respite care		2						2

9.4   Within Core Aim 2 most plans note additional support for children with additional learning needs. Such support ranges from general statements, 'Supporting the full inclusion of learners with additional learning needs and children and young people in special circumstances' to the specific, 'Develop a protocol to enhance early notification of disabled children requiring access to mainstream school services'. Transition for disabled children is noted as a priority in 5 plans, (4 in relation to Core Aim 2). A very small number of plans state the achievement of equality for disabled children in education as a priority although many more refer to equality for disability in other parts of the plan.

10.   Core Aim 3 Priorities

10.1   The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 3, (Enjoy the best possible physical and mental, social and emotional health, including freedom from abuse, victimisation and exploitation), see Tables 6 and 7 below. Many of these priorities are also listed in other tables where a similar priority was listed under a different Core Aim heading, this is especially the case for priorities around parenting which appear in Cores Aims 1, 2, 3 and 6 and those around prevention which appear in Cores Aims

1, 2, 3, 6 and 7. Safeguarding priorities are listed separately below in Table 7, and are split between Core Aims 3 and 6, although the majority appear under Core Aim 3.

Table 6

Priorities listed under Core Aim 3 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Improve dental health	1		2					3
Improved diet and nutrition	4		8					9
Improved access to services	1		5					5
Improved health status of mothers, children and young people	6		1					7
Accident prevention	2		2			12		12
Parenting strategy	5		1					6
Parenting skills/family support services	5		1					6
Support for teen parents	3	1	1					4
Development of integrated models of service delivery for family support	6	6	10	1				14
Improved access to advice	6		1					7
Promote positive emotional health and secure attachment	4		11					11
Support for Transitions		9	2			1	1	10
Transition for disabled children		4	1					4
Additional Learning needs inc. ASD / LAC		16	6					17
Early identification / prevention	2	5	7			11	2	16
Healthy schools		2	3	1				5
Improve services inc health/social care for vulnerable young people/complex needs			7			1		8

	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total
Reduced health inequalities			1					1
Reduce smoking			4					4
Increase physical fitness			6	7				11
Provision of appropriate CAMHS			21					21
School based counselling			5			1		5
Reduce substance misuse			10			8		14
Promote sexual health			14					14
Promotion of healthy lifestyles			11					11
Reduce severe self-harm / suicide			2					2
Care and referral pathway for children with behavioural problems			2					2
Ensure health reorganisation meets needs			2					2
Embedding children's NSF			2					2

10.2 Most CYP Plans contained reference to development of integrated models of service delivery for family support such as Multi Agency Teams, Team Around the Child (TAC) models and other multi agency working models although not always listed under Core Aim 3. Health promotion features strongly in the priorities under Core Aim 3 including issues diet and nutrition, smoking and physical fitness. Promotion of sexual health and reduction of substance misuse appear in most CYP Plans under Core Aims 3 (although substance misuse also features in Core Aim 6). Many plans contain a generic statement relating to promoting healthy lifestyles among children and young people. Ensuring health reorganisation meets children's needs was mentioned as a priority in two plans. Health reorganisation is likely to impact significantly on planning and delivery of health services for children and young people.

Table 7

Safeguarding Priorities listed under Core Aim 3 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Improved assessment			2					2
Instituting proceedings for children and young people			1					1

that need it								
Good quality substitute care to children that need it/improve corporate parenting			2					2
Maintaining a register of children at risk and ensure referring agencies are kept informed			1					1
Ensure that children's needs are assessed and safeguarded, supported and accommodated and this is taken account of in planning, providing and commissioning services			1					1
Safeguard and promote wellbeing of those at risk of offending			1					1
Involve parents/carers in assessments and in keeping children safe			1					1
Improving arrangements for safeguarding and protecting vulnerable children		2	18			4		22
Domestic abuse		1	1			10		14
Reduction in bullying			9			4	1	14
Quality assurance to ensure most vulnerable are identified and safeguarded			1					1

10.3 Promotion of emotional health and well-being including CAMHS services feature in all CYP Plans and this was the most consistent priority area within Core Aim 3. Self-harm and suicide is a priority in two CYP Plans. It is very possible that these issues will feature in implementation and action plans within priorities on emotional well-being, mental health and CAMHS, a priority in all CYP Plans. Many plans mention the Children's NSF as the point of reference for many of the actions underneath these, and indeed other related priorities.

10.4 All CYP Partnerships made reference to safeguarding and child protection in their CYP Plans. Most were listed under Core Aim 3, however safeguarding priorities were also contained within Core Aim 6 and occasionally elsewhere (Core Aims 2 and 7). Priorities relating to bullying are contained in over half the CYP Plans (14) with the priorities being spread across Core Aims 3, 6 and

7. Priorities around domestic abuse are also contained in over half of the CYP Plans. The level of priorities differs from general themes around ensuring that all children and young people are safeguarded to specific, detailing the development of strategies and actions.

11. Core Aim 4 Priorities

11.1 The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 4, (Access to safe play, leisure, sporting and cultural activities) see Table 8 below.

Table 8

Priorities listed under Core Aim 4 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Language and Play	4							4
Implement a Play Strategy				9				9
Ensuring quality play opportunities				14				14
Access to sporting opportunities including those disadvantaged by poverty or other circumstances				11				11
Improved access to arts, culture, leisure, including transport and out of hours				12				12
Invest in libraries				1				1
Ensure disabled children have access to play/leisure activities with appropriate support and barriers to access removed				5				5
Promote role of voluntary sector in delivering services				3	1			4

11.2 Priorities relating to play, leisure sporting and cultural activities were listed almost entirely under Core Aim 4, with only a few partnerships listing play and leisure anywhere else (e.g. language and play is listed under Core Aim 1 priority in a few plans). Priorities were broadly distributed across play,

opportunities to engage in sport and physical activity and opportunities to engage in other leisure and cultural activities. Transport and cost of entry into leisure centres were highlighted as a barrier to engagement in some plans, where the priorities encompassed reducing barriers to access. Possibly given the more specific remit of Core Aim 4, this section of the plan was comparatively brief, compared for example to Core Aim 2.   The   plans generally distinguished between play activities (opportunities to engage in self-directed informal activity) and more organised and formal sporting and cultural activities. A number of plans recognised that some children need additional support to access their right to play. The role of the third sector in delivering play was recognised within Core Aim 4 priorities in a small number of plans.

12.   Core Aim 5 Priorities

Table 9

Priorities listed under Core Aim 5 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Participation in decision making in early years	1							1
In planning/delivery of play strategy				1				1
Kite marking scheme					1			1
Adopt/Promote National Standards					5			5
Promote 10 Entitlements					3			3
Annual event for children/young people informing them of services					1			1
Robust mechanisms and meaningful opportunities to be heard in decisions that affect them					10		1	10
Children, young people, families understand own/others rights/responsibilities					5			5
Implement/promote Participation Strategy					10			10
Involvement in planning, setting targets and evaluating services					4			4

Ensure feedback					1			1
Engage hard to reach groups					5			5
Ensure parental participation					2			2
Support schools councils to be effective					4			4
Engage in participation opportunities					1			1
Develop effective dissemination so young people know what is happening in Youth Forums etc					1			1
Specific initiatives eg youth parliament/health panels/ Young Inspectors Scheme					5			5
Co-ordinate participation activity					1			1
Take Children's Rights seriously. Children/young people are valued members of society					6			6
Involvement in staff recruitment					1			1
Children/young people contribute positively to their community					1			1
Parental choice in services including education					2			2
Evaluate youth forum and make more effective					2			2
Advocacy / complaints support					16	1		16
Access to information and advice	6	5	5	2	6	5	1	14

12.1 The list above were given as priorities within Core Aim 5, (Be listened to, treated with respect, and have their faith and cultural identity recognised) see Table 9 above. A diverse range of activity was listed from broad statements of intent around ensuring the voices of children and young people are heard and have impact in decisions that affect them, to commitment to specific activities such as holding an annual event where children can be made aware of the range of services available to them.

12.2 Most plans contained reference to a participation strategy, or robust mechanisms and meaningful opportunities to be heard in decisions that affect them. Some plans made reference to the Participation Standards and

the 10 Entitlements. Advocacy was referenced in all plans and mentioned as a priority in most, although in some cases it was evident that there was no specific intention to change existing arrangements and move to a more integrated or universal approach.

13.   Core Aim 6 Priorities

13.1   The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 6, (Enjoy the benefit of a safe home and a community that supports physical and emotional well-being), see Tables 10, 11 and 12 below. Table 10 deals with the range of issues relating to safeguarding well-being and many of these appear mapped against priorities under other Core Aims. Domestic abuse and accident prevention feature in most of the CYP Plans usually, but not exclusively, under Core Aim 6. Prevention and early identification of need is a priority in well over half of the CYP Plans, usually, but not exclusively, listed under Core Aim 6.

13.2   Table 11 sets out a range of priorities related to housing and are split between priorities that relate to general reductions in homelessness and more specific actions around updating the housing audit of need to take account of the needs of children and young people. Meeting the needs of vulnerable groups features strongly in a number of plans.

13.3   Tables 12 and 13 set out the priorities that refer to community safety issues as well as other issues such as prevention, collaborative planning and use of technology. These include a wide range of priorities across the CYP Plans with little uniformity, however many plans included priorities around reduction of anti-social behaviour and youth offending. A number of plans highlighted the importance of working collaboratively with other partnerships such as the Local Children's Safeguarding Board and the Community Safety Partnership.

Table 10

Priorities listed under Core Aim 6 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans

Improving arrangements for safe-guarding/protecting vulnerable children		2	18			4		22
Domestic abuse		1	1			10		14
Reduction in bullying			9			4	1	14
Quality assurance to ensure most vulnerable are identified /safeguarded			1					1
School based counselling			5			1		5
Reduce substance misuse			10			8		14
Improve appropriate services including health/social care for vulnerable young people and those with complex needs			7			1		8
Early identification / prevention	2	5	7			11	2	16
Support for Transitions including vulnerable groups		9	2			1	1	10
Accident prevention	2		2			12		12
Behaviour and attendance		5				1		6
Parenting skills for parents of children with challenging behaviour	2					1		2

Table 11

Housing Priorities listed under Core Aim 6 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Reduce youth homelessness						4		4
Update of housing audit need to take account of needs of children and young people						1		1
A choice of affordable, suitable housing						4		4
Improve housing stock to meet needs of young people and support to maintain tenancies especially vulnerable groups						10		10
Access to advice and information on housing						2		2
Reduce number of families living in unsuitable accommodation						2		2
Provide adequate emergency and temporary						4		4

accommodation for young people								
Achieve Welsh Quality Standard for housing						3		3
All children and young people live in a safe home and community						4	4	6
Improved multi agency provision for vulnerable groups in relation to their accommodation needs						2		2

Table 12

Priorities listed under Core Aim 6 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Promote the development of the built environment to ensure it promotes the optimum development for children and young people						1		1
Collaborative planning to ensure relevant issues are fed across planning structures to maximise resources, joint working and avoid duplication						2		2
Make full use of young people friendly technology						1		1

Table 13

Community Safety Priorities listed under Core Aim 6 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Develop links with the Community Safety Partnership, Youth Offending Service, LSCB and other relevant partners						3		3
Make children aware of risk and how to manage it						1		1
Reduce anti-social/offending behaviour including numbers of first time offenders and numbers sent to secure accommodation /prison through range of approaches including diversion						11		11

Access to information on safety initiatives							1	1
Reduce nº of children who are victims of crime and impact on those that are							2	2
Collect and share accurate statistics on crime to reduce fear of crime							1	1
Reduce crime through multi-agency approaches							2	2
Reduce effect of hate crimes							1	1
Services meet national standards							1	1
Strategy and action plan for children at risk of offending							1	1
Review evidence for intervention and revise local programmes							1	1
Prevention strategy for 5-11 yr olds							1	1

14.   Core Aim 7 Priorities

14.1 The following were listed within CYP Plans as priorities within Core Aim 7, (intervention to ensure they are not disadvantaged by poverty), see Table 14 below. It is recognised in a number of plans that all priorities across all Core Aims should contribute to eradication of child poverty. There is little commonality across the priorities in Core Aim 7. Half the plans contain priorities relating to maximising income such as increased benefits uptake, increasing take up of free breakfasts, reducing the stigma of having free school meals and accessing allowances for school uniforms. The hidden cost of education, cost of school trips, school uniforms and equipment was noted in two CYP Plans and ensuring children are not left out of leisure activities and trips because of poverty was highlighted in another CYP Plan. A number of CYP Plans make reference to additional strategies or plans such as a Local Skills and Employment Action Plan, affordable warmth action plans, and anti-poverty strategies.

Table 14

Priorities listed under Core Aim 7 cross referenced across other Core Aims	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYP Plans
Supporting families to increase income including benefits take-up and advice							11	11
Reduce barriers to employment							7	7
Support to children in need							1	1
Reduce hidden cost of education							2	2
Raise awareness of poverty, generate commitment to eradicate including signed agreements							1	1
Ensure children from disadvantaged backgrounds are not left out of leisure/social activities							1	1
Commitment to affordable warmth							1	1
Other plans/strategies							3	3
Work with Communities First							2	2
Consider implications in WAG strategy for tackling poverty							1	1
Transport to employment and training opportunities							1	1
Sufficient Childcare that is high quality, affordable and accessible and based on the sufficiency audit	12						1	12
Support for Transitions including vulnerable groups		9	2			1	1	10
Early identification of need and prevention	2	5	7			11	2	16
Programmes to promote inclusion/engagement in learning, especially post 16 and reduce those NEET		9					7	12
Transport		2		4			4	6
Basic skills strategy		4					2	4
Reduction in bullying			9			4	1	14
Robust mechanisms and meaningful opportunities to be heard in decisions that affect them					10		1	10
Access to information and advice	6	5	5	2	6	5	1	14
All children / young people live in a safe home and						4	4	6

community							

14.2 Approximately a third of plans refer to priorities aimed at reducing the barriers to people entering employment and reducing the number on benefits and a dependency culture. Transport was listed under this Core Aim in 4 CYP Plans. Initiatives aimed at reducing disaffection and engaging young people in education, employment or training feature here as well as under Core Aim 2.

15. Equalities

15.1 All plans contained some reference to equalities issues, usually in some kind of statement of intent within the vision. Often this was a general statement of inclusion encompassing all children and young people from all backgrounds. In some cases CYP Plans made specific reference to relevant equalities legislation and equalities schemes in place locally. The needs of disabled children and young people featured strongly under Core Aims 2, 3 and 4, and were the more frequently referenced group.

Table 15

Priorities related to Equalities listed under Core Aim	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYPPs
Celebrate diversity and social inclusion		1	1	1				3
Gender equality	1	3						4
Social inclusion	1	1						2
Support pre and post natal provision ensuring access for vulnerable groups inc parents from ethnic backgrounds	1							1
Targeted family support for families challenged by poverty, disability or child's challenging behaviour	2							2
Ensure access to education for gypsy traveller children		2						2
Promote equality disability		1						1
Equality and diversity		1						1
Gender performance gap		1						1
Inclusion underpinning theme			1					1
Encourage take up by				2				2

disadvantaged groups								
Ensure mechanisms for children and young people who may not have a voice due to disability, sexuality, etc					1			1
Ensure education promotes equality and respects diversity					1			1
Reduce effect of hate crimes						1		1
Promote community cohesion						1		1
Work with BME young people in their communities						1		1
Anti discrimination work							1	1

15.2 The legal requirements to consult on issues of race and gender and involve on issues of disability were not mentioned. Although it is known that some of the CYP Plans have been equality impact assessed, this was not mentioned in the CYP Plans themselves. Tables 15 above and 16 below identify where equalities issues are listed as priorities within the CYP Plans. This is not to say that equalities issues are not being dealt with within the CYP Plans and as noted above, all plans make reference to equalities issues. Issues relating to disability are contained in Table 5 under Core Aim 2 since this is where most priorities relating to disabled children and young people were listed. Issues of religion and sexuality were least likely to be listed as specific priorities and where referenced were usually part of a general statement promoting equality for all children and young people and listing the range of equality issues (gender, race, disability, religion, sexuality, age and language) and often included other excluded or disadvantaged groups such as young offenders, young carers, looked after children and young people and so on. Gender equality was listed as a priority under Core Aim 2 in a number of plans.

16. Welsh Language

16.1 Although promotion of Welsh language and culture was not necessarily a priority in all CYP Plans, it did feature in all plans. Provision of services through the medium of Welsh was mentioned in all plans although the emphasis placed on this varied. Most plans raised the issue of bilingual or Welsh medium childcare, and provision of Welsh medium education was referred to in many plans. Provision of Welsh medium or bilingual youth support services was highlighted in many plans although it is noted that the

Welsh Language Board in its review of the plans suggests an over reliance on Menter Iaith. The Welsh Language Board offers support to CYP Partnerships to facilitate regional collaboration to improve and extend provision. The Welsh Language Board suggests that greater clarity is needed around the actions that CYP Partnerships will take to ensure progress in this area. As implementation and action plans to implement the CYP Plans are developed it is likely that these proposals will become clearer.

Table 16

Priorities relating to Welsh Language	Core Aim 1	Core Aim 2	Core Aim 3	Core Aim 4	Core Aim 5	Core Aim 6	Core Aim 7	Total CYPPs
Welsh language in child care and ICS	2							2
Welsh language education policy		2						2
Welsh medium non/informal education		1						1
Address issues in Iaith Pawb		1		1				2
Promote Welsh language and culture				7				7

17. Conclusions

17.1 It is not possible for any review or evaluation of the documents to determine the quality or otherwise of the processes that CYP Partnerships have engaged in to produce the CYP Plans. It is to be assumed that the task of identifying whether CYP Plans reflect real collaborative thinking and working at a local level or are the collected individual actions of constituent agencies will be at the heart of the joint inspection process as it emerges.

17.2 The different way in which the partnerships have responded to the Assembly Government planning guidance within their plans is both heartening and of slight concern. It is positive that the plans all carry their own style and have unique formats. However, the different levels at which the plans have pitched priorities and actions vary greatly. Any review of the guidance would need to give this thorough consideration.

17.3 If the CYP Plans are to be considered as strategic and concise, then they will not be able to contain the level of detail about the nature and context of the services they provide as well as keep the plan to 50 pages, which may itself be too long or simply arbitrary. It has been challenging to review and compare the current plans as well as identify possible areas of collaboration.

17.4 The current planning guidance has had to incorporate all relevant elements for the CYP Plans. The guidance for the next plans will be able to refer to the separate guidance which will have been published on specific areas by that time, e.g. commissioning and workforce. Ensuring that all these elements dovetail and complement each other, and reflect joined up thinking within the relevant departments of the Assembly Government will be vital for improving the planning process for the next plans.

17.5 A review of the guidance would be welcomed and needs to be completed by the time that preparations are made for the next plans. Any new guidance should be aligned with what the CYP Plans need to achieve and what is expected of a Strategic Plan and any associated action plans. Comments made here are intended to be helpful in this respect. However it should be noted that some CYP Partnerships have also expressed concern that any radical altering of the guidance has the potential to undermine local ownership for the plans in their current form.

17.6 Clearly the development of these first CYP Plans has involved a significant amount of time and effort on the part of a huge number of partner agencies and interestingly it has been suggested anecdotally that the processes to develop CYP Plans have significantly aided the development of the CYP

Partnerships across Wales. There is clearly some considerable distance left to go before the CYP Plans become the defining statement of strategic planning intent and priorities for all children and young people's services that they are intended to be. However it is important to reflect on the significant progress made and also it is worth noting that progress in England was recently reported in the Local Government National Report, 'Are We There Yet?' (Audit Commission, 2008) to be slow with little evidence that children's trust boards are yet making a substantial difference to outcomes. This is not to say that progress won't be made, nor is it to suggest that there is an excuse for limited progress; however the development of a truly collaborative planning process which is both outcomes and rights focussed, involves children, young people and families are key partners cannot be underestimated as the significant cultural change that it represents and this will take time, effort and commitment from all parties, to embed.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PE OPLE'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPING A REGIONAL AND LOCAL PROCESS

PURPOSE

1. This document has been produced at the request of the Children and Young People's Partnership Co-ordinators from the Central and South East region, to outline suggested approaches to developing and delivering workforce development strategies.

CONTEXT

2. The Welsh Assembly Government planning guidance 'Shared Planning for Better Outcomes' - Section 11 of the Welsh Assembly Government planning guidance 'Shared Planning for Better Outcomes', sets out how workforce issues will be addressed in the Children and Young People's Plans.

3. The Care Council, on behalf of Welsh Assembly Government, has convened a network of key stakeholders to develop a Workforce Development Plan for the Children and Young People's Workforce. The Children and Young People's Network and Strategy are linked and sit within chapter 12 of the guidance for the development of the Children and Young People's Plans. It is anticipated that the work of the network and resulting strategy will support the workforce aspects being undertaken within these plans.

4. Work to date has centred on reviewing some key elements produced by the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) in England to determine their applicability and as a basis for work in Wales. In all cases whilst there is a determination to ensure that any outputs are distinctly Welsh and fit within the Welsh context, the nature of qualifications and mobility of the workforce means that some synergy with England is required to ensure transferability across geographical boundaries.

DEVELOPING A PROCESS FOR LOCAL/SUB-REGIONAL/REGIONAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

5. The workforce development plan must respond to the priorities in the Children and Young People's Plan. The first step is therefore to revisit the CYP Plan and its priorities, and then via a risk assessment approach, to sort the priorities into a priority order i.e. what is achievable over the next 12/18 months.

6. The human resources and skills implications of each priority then need to be examined; this could be done by undertaking a workforce planning analysis. To assist with this process the Children and Young People's Workforce Development Network has produced a toolkit (HYPERLINK)..

7. At this stage it would prove useful to pool these findings to identify if commonalities exist across the region, which may provide opportunities for collaborative responses.

8. Once possible actions have been identified, a review of existing mechanisms should be undertaken to identify opportunities to deliver the actions required. This may require stakeholders (who have signed up to deliver the priorities in the Children and Young People's Plans) to amend and re-align their workforce development strategies in order to meet the workforce requirements of these priorities

9. Bring together relevant stakeholders for the prioritised outcomes to Identify and agree what is and what is not within the influence of the Children and Young People's Partnership. Changes that fall outside of the Children and Young People's Partnerships will need to be 'flagged' for action by the relevant agency/body e.g. Sector Skills Councils, WAG etc. It will be important to include these actions in an action plan to evidence the 'indirect' work taken by the Children and Young People's Partnerships to progress their Workforce Development Plans.

10.   All of the above points will need to be brought together to form your Workforce Development Action Plan with a review timescale of 12/18 months.

HOW CAN THE PSU ASSIST WITH THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS?

11.   The PSU is a central resource which provides advice and support to the 22 Children and Young People's Partnerships (CYP Partnerships) and their stakeholders to deliver their responsibilities under the Children Act 2004, in particular the duty to cooperate in the planning and delivery of services and the requirement to submit a Children and Young People's Plan in 2008 and again in 2011.

12.   The PSU is currently working at a local level with individual partnerships in parallel with all regional co-ordinators and has facilitated a 'first steps' workshop in North Wales, and is currently assisting in the development of a process with SWAMWAC.

METHODOLOGY

13.   Following discussions at the regional co-ordinator meetings it has been agreed that the PSU will provide support at both regional and local levels.

14.   Some suggestions for consideration are:

Regional workshops to include strategic 'drivers'
Local workshops with partners

Assistance with implementation of 'toolkit' developed by the Children and Young People's Workforce Development Network, where required.

Workshops could include the following questions:-
o How will the partnership co-ordinate the process, what is the role of the Central Planning Team?
o How will the Partnership ensure they meet the expectations of WAG Planning Guidance?
o What methodology will the partnership use to formulate the work programme over the next 12/18 months
o How will the Partnership prioritise outcomes and agree on a shortlist of actions
o How will the Partnership ensure the process is relevant stakeholders and they are clear about their responsibilities within the process
o What would be the implications of taking on new tasks or amending the way of working (e.g. costs, capacity)?
o What form of support can PSU provide to CYP Partnerships and their stakeholders?

TIMESCALES

15.   Using the Children and Young People's plans as the basis for this work, it is anticipated that by March 2010 Children and Young People's Partnerships will have developed a fully costed Draft Workforce Development Action Plan and work programme for the next 12 to 18 months.

16.   Recent discussions with WAG have endorsed the message of the PSU in relation to extending the timescale for the production of an Action Plan and recent correspondence from WAG stated:

"The draft Children and Young People's Workforce Development Strategy and the Common Core of Skills Knowledge and Understanding were received at the end of October and are now being considered in detail by officials across a number of departments. As you can appreciate, a wide range of issues of varying complexity needs to be taken into account.

We intend to issue a draft plan that sets out a phased approach to the implementation of the Strategy and hope to be able to do this in the spring. Given the number of stakeholders who will be playing a part and the nature of the proposals, it is likely that a further period of consultation will be needed, before a final implementation plan is available."

NEXT STEPS

17.   This paper will be presented for consideration by the Regional Co-ordinators meetings.

18.   If it is decided to proceed a work programme and timetable will be agreed with the Regional Co-ordinators.