

By: Rosalind Turner, Managing Director, Children, Families & Education Directorate  
Sarah Hohler, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Education Directorate

To: Vulnerable Children and Partnerships Children, Families & Education Policy & Scrutiny Overview Committee

Date: 21 October 2010

Subject: Virtual Head Teacher for Looked After Children

Classification: Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** This report will identify the key roles around the Virtual School, evidence the current educational context of Kent LAC, highlight issues within the current service (ILSS) and provide an outline programme of work to develop the service into the Virtual School."

## Virtual School

### 1. (1) Role of the Virtual School Headteacher

There are three key areas of responsibility of a virtual school head should be accountable for:

- (i) To make sure that there systems to track and monitor the attainment and progress of looked after children:
  - rigorously track and monitor data on where looked after children are at school and their progress, in a similar way to a head teacher of any school.
  - ensure that schools know which children are looked after and make sure that there is a Personal Education Plan (PEP) for all looked after children and one-to-one support where appropriate.
  - maintain an accurate record of the location and educational progress of looked after children within Kent, including those whom we after but are placed in other and those who are looked after by another authority but educated in this one.
  - act where necessary and work towards improving overall attainment at the virtual school, by maximising achievement and progress of both individual and cohorts of looked after children.

- ensure that the Headteacher and the designated teacher in each school know which of the children on their roll are in care, and what can be done to support them.
- (ii) To ensure that all looked after children have a robust and effective personal education plan and access one-to-one support, including personal tuition where appropriate by:
- working with relevant professionals to ensure PEPs are of a high quality, subject to a rigorous monitoring and evaluation process, with impacts and outcomes that are followed up. In conjunction with School Improvement Partners they should challenge schools and others when appropriate to improve the quality of the PEP and promote faster progress.
  - They should also ensure that looked after children are able to access one-to-one tuition and Personal Education Allowances (PEAs) wherever appropriate. They should also explore other sources of additional funding/support e.g. disadvantaged subsidy/home access project.
- (iii) To champion the educational needs of our looked after children across the authority and those placed out-of-authority by:
- championing the needs of looked after children across the authority and spread effective practice, particularly in relation to improving behaviour and attendance, promoting stability of placement and school stability through admissions policies and use of school transport.
  - working with others in local authorities and schools to ensure that measures are taken across the authority to promote positive behaviour, good attendance, and reduce exclusions, which should in turn lead to good progress and improved attainment.
  - ensuring social workers adequately consider the educational needs of looked after children when a child/young person comes into care or when taking decisions about moving placements. Where moving placements is absolutely essential, wherever possible a new placement should be found which enables continuity of schooling but at KS4 ensures there is no change of educational placement. The virtual school head should take responsibility for making sure that admissions powers to admit looked after children to the most appropriate school are used wherever necessary, and they should ensure that school transport is provided as required to help children stay in the same school.

## Data

### 2. (1) Number of Looked after Children (LAC) – KCC & Area

Table 1

Number of LAC - KCC and Area

		Aug 09	Sep 09	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10
KCC exc Asylum	In Care	750	747	751	744	751	742	742	751	750	764	782	806	813
	Accom.	412	427	442	455	455	454	463	482	486	487	521	508	507
	Total	1,162	1,174	1,193	1,199	1,206	1,196	1,205	1,233	1,236	1,251	1,303	1,314	1,320
KCC inc Asylum	In Care	750	747	751	744	751	742	742	751	750	764	782	806	813
	Accom.	737	744	704	720	703	707	711	718	722	714	759	760	755
	Total	1,487	1,491	1,455	1,464	1,454	1,449	1,453	1,469	1,472	1,478	1,541	1,566	1,568
East Kent	In Care	262	254	257	245	245	245	244	245	247	255	259	262	268
	Accom.	151	153	144	162	165	159	165	165	164	165	169	168	167
	Total	413	407	401	407	410	404	409	410	411	420	428	430	435
Mid Kent	In Care	204	200	199	197	201	194	192	195	199	197	202	224	224
	Accom.	97	101	111	114	110	108	112	118	113	117	130	126	130
	Total	301	301	310	311	311	302	304	313	312	314	332	350	354
West Kent	In Care	158	164	161	160	164	163	163	170	166	176	189	185	186
	Accom.	65	72	78	82	81	87	82	89	87	86	96	91	90
	Total	223	236	239	242	245	250	245	259	253	262	285	276	276
Disability	In Care	21	19	21	25	24	24	24	24	24	25	24	22	24
	Accom.	37	37	44	38	38	38	37	37	38	41	42	42	43
	Total	58	56	65	63	62	62	61	61	62	66	66	64	67
16+	In Care	105	110	113	117	117	116	119	117	114	111	108	113	111
	Accom.	62	64	65	59	61	62	67	73	84	78	84	81	77
	Total	167	174	178	176	178	178	186	190	198	189	192	194	188
Asylum	In Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Accom.	325	317	262	265	248	253	248	236	236	227	238	252	248
	Total	325	317	262	265	248	253	248	236	236	227	238	252	248

Management Information Unit, CFE Commissioning and Partnerships Group, 15 September 2010

### (2) Number of LAC – District

Table 2

Number of LAC - District

		Aug 09	Sep 09	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10
Ashford	In Care	48	43	44	42	43	42	42	43	49	49	50	51	50
	Accom.	26	26	28	26	26	26	26	29	30	29	30	29	27
	Total	74	69	72	68	69	68	68	72	79	78	80	80	77
Canterbury	In Care	56	55	58	57	57	60	61	59	59	62	62	63	64
	Accom.	29	29	29	30	30	28	31	30	28	28	31	35	38
	Total	85	84	87	87	87	88	92	89	87	90	93	98	102
Dartford & Sevenoaks	In Care	53	53	55	58	58	57	56	60	55	65	69	71	68
	Accom.	29	29	27	23	22	26	24	28	28	26	30	32	33
	Total	82	82	82	81	80	83	80	88	83	91	99	103	101
Dover	In Care	47	48	49	49	49	48	50	50	52	51	53	54	57
	Accom.	31	31	30	34	33	31	32	36	33	31	33	31	34
	Total	78	79	79	83	82	79	82	86	85	82	86	85	91
Gravesham	In Care	46	48	46	44	44	43	45	43	42	42	45	44	46
	Accom.	21	23	28	28	27	27	22	24	23	22	27	26	23
	Total	67	71	74	72	71	70	67	67	65	64	72	70	69
Maidstone	In Care	44	45	46	51	54	50	49	51	49	50	50	60	58
	Accom.	15	15	20	16	13	13	17	16	17	19	21	21	24
	Total	59	60	66	67	67	63	66	67	66	69	71	81	82
Shepway	In Care	65	64	60	55	55	54	51	51	49	47	49	59	59
	Accom.	25	29	33	38	38	38	37	37	33	38	46	45	45
	Total	90	93	93	93	93	92	88	88	82	85	95	104	104
Swale	In Care	66	68	73	62	65	64	65	64	65	68	68	65	66
	Accom.	45	42	39	54	52	51	53	49	49	50	50	48	47
	Total	111	110	112	116	117	115	118	113	114	118	118	113	113
Thanet	In Care	140	131	126	126	123	121	118	122	123	125	129	134	138
	Accom.	77	82	76	78	83	80	81	86	87	87	88	85	82
	Total	217	213	202	204	206	201	199	208	210	212	217	219	220
Tonbridge & Malling	In Care	29	28	26	27	31	31	31	31	32	34	41	41	41
	Accom.	6	9	11	14	15	16	15	15	15	14	14	11	13
	Total	35	37	37	41	46	47	46	46	47	48	55	52	54
Tunbridge Wells	In Care	30	35	34	31	31	32	31	36	37	35	34	29	31
	Accom.	9	11	12	17	17	18	21	22	21	24	25	22	21
	Total	39	46	46	48	48	50	52	58	58	59	59	51	52
Disability EK	In Care	15	14	16	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	17
	Accom.	28	28	32	27	27	27	26	26	28	28	29	29	30
	Total	43	42	48	45	45	45	44	44	46	46	47	46	47
Disability WK	In Care	6	5	5	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	5	7
	Accom.	9	9	12	11	11	11	11	11	10	13	13	13	13
	Total	15	14	17	18	17	17	17	17	16	20	19	18	20

Management Information Unit, CFE Commissioning and Partnerships Group, 15 September 2010

### (3) Attainment Summary

Table 3

Indicator <i>local/national indicators as appropriate e.g. LAA2, 2010, NIs</i>	Actual performance 2007/2008	Actual performance 2008/09	Target 2009/10	Estimated 2009/10	Actual performance 2009/10	Trend ▲ improving ▶ not improving ▼ deteriorating	Target 20010/11
NI 99 Children in care reaching level 4 in English at Key Stage 2	32.6 % OC2 submission document	31.6 % OC2 submission document	43%	34% (18/52 ) Red=19 Amber=15 Green=18	42% (-1%)	↑ 33%	47%
NI 100 Children in care reaching level 4 in Maths at Key Stage 2	28.3 % OC2 submission document	31.6 % OC2 submission document	53%	33% (17/52 ) Red=20 Amber=15 Green=17	46% (-7%)	↑ 65%	54%
NI 101 Children in care achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) at Key Stage 4 (including English and Maths)	5.4 % OC2 submission Document	6.3 % OC2 submission document	19%	7% (12/168) Red=118 Amber=25 Green=12 Blank=13	9% (-10%)	↑ 44%	19.5%

Management Information Unit, CFE Commissioning and Partnerships Group, 1 October 2010

Full attainment report can be seen in appendix 1.

### (4) Persistent Absence

Table 4

<b>Kent LAC Persistent Absence Analysis 2009-2010</b>		
	<b>KCC All Pupils</b>	<b>Kent LAC Pupils</b>
<b>All Schools Primary, Secondary and Special</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>14%</b>

### (5) Other Local Authority (OLA) LAC

On commencement of the Headteacher post, an immediately request to ABS was made to complete a comparative analysis on Kent Vs OLA LAC attendance.

The report identifies that, when comparing like-for-like (LAC in Kent mainstream schools), Kent LAC appear to perform worse than OLA LAC in terms of attendance. Kent LAC have higher rates of absence in almost all categories, poorer rates of excellent (100%) attendance and higher levels of persistent absence.

The full report can be seen in Appendix 2.

### (6) Exclusions

Table 5

<b>Kent LAC Exclusion Analysis 2009-2010</b>	
<b>No. excl</b>	170
<b>No LAC school age</b>	896
<b>% Excluded</b>	19
<b>% of Boys Excluded</b>	73

<b>% of Girls Excluded</b>	27
<b>2+ Exclusions</b>	88
<b>% of 2+ Exclusions</b>	56
<b>Total No of Sessions Lost from education</b>	2340
<b>Av. No. of sessions lost per LAC (who experienced exclusion)</b>	14 (7 days)
<b>Pex</b>	9
<b>Pex trend(09/10 vs 08/09)</b>	↑29%

Welfare Call Exclusion Report 29 September 2010

Currently unable to gain any OLA comparative data

### Areas for development

3. (1)

- Multi professional team that have been on a journey towards cohesion as a team. A unified team with a shared vision has not yet been achieved
- Communication between services especially Health complicated by different information sharing protocols
- Visibility and profile of the service is a real issue. Not a single Headteacher within the last 8 District Headteacher Meetings had heard of the ILSS
- Data tracking and monitoring systems are not fit for purpose
- Analysis of key data sets are not currently established, therefore do not inform intervention and strategic deployment of resources to maximise impact for LAC.

(2) Progress in all area identified above has been made since the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2010. Extremely positive partnerships have been fostered between ABS and MIU.

### Proposed Programme of Work to develop The Virtual School Kent

4. Ambitious programme to develop three foundation stone on which to build the Virtual School:

- Develop the Virtual School Governing Body – This will need clear scoping in terms of its remit. It may potentially raise the question of the remit that KCPB has and whether there needs to be a review to avoid potential overlaps with the governing body. Key responsibilities of the governing body is to support, challenge and hold the Headteacher to account, as well as being in a position to make decisions quickly to unblock systemic barriers for LAC.
- Development of the Virtual School's Management Information System. An integrated data set which is responsive to needs, accessible, functional, fit for purpose and informs strategic planning and deployment. A data set that can be used far beyond the Virtual School.
- Development of the Virtual School Identity/Brand. Key to the development of the united community of professionals around the looked after children. Fundamental in developing the community of looked after children. Intrinsic in the services capacity to grow and develop and potentially develop income generating streams.

Outline programme can be seen in Appendix 3.

**Recommendations**

5. Members of the Vulnerable Children and Partnerships Children, Families and Education Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the in Kent variation of Kent LAC and OLA LAC and to consider and support the proposed programme of work in response to this issue

## Appendix 1

### 2010 Kent LA FSP, KS1, KS2, KS3, KS4 Attainment for pupils recorded as Looked After Children in January 2010 School Census

#### FSP

	Number of LAC Pupils	Number of Pupils Achieving 6+ in PSE	% Pupils Achieving 6+ in PSE	Number of Pupils Achieving 6+ in CLL	% Pupils Achieving 6+ in CLL	Number of Pupils Achieving 6+ in PSE and CLL	% Pupils Achieving 6+ in PSE and CLL	Number of Pupils Achieving 78+ Points Including+ in PSE and CLL	% Pupils Achieving 78+ Points Including+ in PSE and CLL
Kent LAC	36	21	58.3	13	36.1	11	30.6	11	30.6
OLA LAC	15	11	73.3	5	33.3	5	33.3	5	33.3
Total LAC	51	32	62.7	18	35.3	16	31.4	16	31.4

#### KS1

	LAC Yes	Number Achieving Below L2 in Reading	% Achieving Below L2 in Reading	Number Achieving L2+ in Reading	% Achieving L2+ in Reading	Number Achieving Below L2 in Writing	% Achieving Below L2 in Writing	Number Achieving L2+ in Writing	% Achieving L2+ in Writing	Number Achieving Below L2 in Maths	% Achieving Below L2 in Maths	Number Achieving L2+ in Maths	% Achieving L2+ in Maths	Number Achieving Below L2 in Science	% Achieving Below L2 in Science	Number Achieving L2+ in Science	% Achieving L2+ in Science
Kent LAC	32	15	46.9	17	53.1	20	62.5	12	37.5	14	43.8	18	56.3	11	34.4	21	65.6
OLA LAC	8	1	12.5	7	87.5	3	37.5	5	62.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	87.5
Total LAC	40	16	40.0	24	60.0	23	57.5	17	42.5	15	37.5	25	62.5	12	30.0	28	70.0

#### KS2

	Number of LAC Pupils	Number Achieving Below L4 in English	% Achieving Below L4 in English	Number Achieving L4+ in English	% Achieving L4+ in English	Number Achieving Below L4 in Maths	% Achieving Below L4 in Maths	Number Achieving L4+ in Maths	% Achieving L4+ in Maths	Number Achieving Below L4 in Science	% Achieving Below L4 in Science	Number Achieving L4+ in Science	% Achieving L4+ in Science	Number Achieving Below L4 in English and Maths	% Achieving Below L4 in English and Maths	Number Achieving L4+ in English and Maths	% Achieving L4+ in English and Maths
Kent LAC	55	32	58.2	23	41.8	30	54.5	25	45.5	26	47.3	29	52.7	37	67.3	18	32.7
OLA LAC	35	17	48.6	17	48.6	20	57.1	15	42.9	15	42.9	20	57.1	22	62.9	13	37.1
All LAC	90	49	54.4	40	44.4	50	55.6	40	44.4	41	45.6	49	54.4	59	65.6	31	34.4

#### KS3

	Total Pupils	% English 5+	% Maths 5+	% Science 5+
Kent	71	19.7	18.3	22.5
OLA	47	40.4	48.9	46.8

#### KS4

	Total Pupils	% 5+A*-C	% 5+ A*-C ESM	% 5+ A*-G	No Passes
Kent	110	29.1	9.1	60.0	16.4
OLA	60	45.0	23.3	80.0	11.7

## Appendix 2

# Kent and Other Local Authority (OLA) LAC Attendance Analysis

## Context

The attendance of Looked After Children (LAC) nationally has historically been poorer than the general school population, and for children who are not looked after. In Kent, there are high levels of both Kent and OLA LAC and there has been recent debate around the impact of OLA LAC – and possible poor attendance / attainment – on Kent resources and schools. This piece of research, undertaken by the Attendance and Behaviour Service, aims to compare the attendance rates of Kent and OLA LAC in Kent maintained schools to provide accurate, up-to-date information around attendance and absence rates, and to support decision making around LAC in Kent schools.

## Research

### Sources and Rationale

The LAC EWO team analysed and compared attendance rates in Kent Maintained schools for the 2009-2010 academic year<sup>1</sup> for Kent and OLA LAC, across six Kent partnerships; two in East, Mid and West Kent. These partnerships were selected as they had the highest numbers of OLA LAC in each area and would therefore yield the most comparative data (see data below). By choosing two partnerships in East, Mid and West Kent, comparisons could also be made between county areas to identify any area-specific attendance trends or issues.

Partnership	Area	OLA LAC in Kent Schools	Kent LAC in Kent Schools
Thanet 2	East Kent	57	117
Canterbury Coast.	East Kent	46	48
Ashford 1	Mid Kent	38	45
Shepway Rural	Mid Kent	21	19
Gravesham	West Kent	39	38
Malling	West Kent	18	18
TOTAL	Data available	205	284
TOTAL	Data unavailable	14	1
TOTAL	ALL AREAS	219	285

Table 1. Number of LAC in Areas and Partnerships used for Attendance Analysis

<sup>1</sup> LAC entering care after end April 2010 (out of data analysis window) were not included in our data analysis.

## Initial Results and Analysis

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Kent LAC</b>	<b>Kent LAC %</b>	<b>OLA LAC</b>	<b>OLA LAC %</b>
100%	13	4.6%	14	6.8%
>95%	172	60.6%	124	60.5%
>90%	205	72.2%	166	81%
>85%	224	78.9%	182	88.8%
<85%	60	21.1%	23	11.2%
<50%	24	8.4%	5	3.9%

Table 2. Absence Rates of Kent and OLA LAC – Total by Attendance Range

On initial analysis, when comparing like-for-like (LAC in Kent mainstream schools), Kent LAC appear to perform worse than OLA LAC in terms of attendance. Kent LAC have higher rates of absence in almost all categories, poorer rates of excellent (100%) attendance and higher levels of persistent absence. It is worth noting that OLA LAC placed in Kent may have a different profile to Kent LAC i.e. more OLA LAC with behavioural issues may be placed in independent provision as opposed to Kent-maintained mainstream schools. Further analysis around teen pregnancy, disability, offending status and SSEN status may help further disaggregate the data. However, on this profile, OLA LAC would appear to present less of an attendance challenge to Kent schools than Kent LAC.

<b>Absence rate</b>	<b>Kent LAC</b>	<b>Kent LAC %</b>	<b>OLA LAC</b>	<b>OLA LAC %</b>
Any UA absence	99	34.9%	50	24.4%
>5% UA absence	34	12%	8	3.9%
Total number of LAC	284	100%	205	100%

Table 3. Absence Rates of Kent and OLA LAC – Total by Unauthorised Absence

The data collected around unauthorised absence shows that Kent LAC have considerably higher levels of unauthorised absence than OLA LAC, both for overall levels of unauthorised absence, and for pupils with high (5%+) levels of unauthorised absence. Unauthorised absence consists of sessions where the school deem absence to be without good reason (i.e. through truanting, absconding, internal truanting or being allowed to miss school for birthdays, shopping trips or non-essential appointments) and with both Kent and OLA LAC, the majority of this unauthorised absence was due to refusing to attend, truancy or the child having absconded from placement and being missing.

Key Stage	Attendance	Kent LAC		OLA LAC	
		Number	%	Number	%
4	Total	96	100%	66	100%
	100%	3	3.5%	2	3%
	>95%	34	35.4%	28	42.4%
	>90%	47	49%	46	69.7%
	>85%	54	56.3%	53	80.3%
	<85%	42	43.7%	13	19.7%
	<50%	19	29.8%	4	6.1%
3	Total	88	100%	83	100%
	100%	4	4.5%	6	7.2%
	>95%	61	69.3%	51	61.4%
	>90%	70	79.5%	69	83.1%
	>85%	76	86.4%	78	94%
	<85%	12	13.6%	5	6%
	<50%	3	3.4%	1	1.2%
2	Total	61	100%	47	100%
	100%	5	8.2%	4	8.5%
	>95%	50	82%	38	80.9%
	>90%	55	90.2%	43	91.5%
	>85%	57	93.4%	43	91.5%
	<85%	4	6.6%	4	8.5%
	<50%	1	1.6%	0	0%
1	Total	39	100%	9	100%
	100%	1	2.6%	2	22.2%
	>95%	27	69.2%	7	77.8%
	>90%	33	84.6%	8	88.9%
	>85%	37	94.9%	9	100%
	<85%	2	5.1%	0	0%
	<50%	2	5.1%	0	0%

Table 4. Absence rates of Kent and OLA LAC – Attendance by Key Stage and Attendance Range

The analysis of Kent and OLA LAC attendance data by Key Stage shows that for both Kent and OLA LAC, attendance rates are best in Key Stages 1 and 2 (primary-age children) and worsen as children progress through Key Stage 3 to Key Stage 4. For Key Stage 1, 69.2% of Kent LAC and 77.8% of OLA LAC have attendance of 95% or above, and for Key Stage 2 the rates were even higher, at 82% for Kent LAC and 80.9% for OLA LAC. However, when children moved to secondary school these rates began to fall considerably to 69.3% for Kent LAC and 61.3% for OLA LAC in Key Stage 3, and to 35.4% for Kent LAC and 42.4% for OLA LAC in Key Stage 4. Given that children take important examinations and qualifications in Key Stage 4, this drop-off in attendance is concerning and may have a considerable impact on potential engagement and achievement. Further analysis in Key Stages 3 and 4, to look at unauthorised absence and possible links between poor absence and placement moves / moving children to 16+ Teams would be very helpful.

Appendix 3

**Virtual School for Looked After Children**  
**Short Term Programme of Work**

<b>Key Issue For Action</b>					<b>Create Virtual School Governing Body</b>				
<b>Action Point</b>	<b>Activity</b>			<b>Resp.</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Exp. Outcome</b>			
<b>Identify structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research VS Toolkit</li> <li>• Research KCC Restructure Organisational Charts</li> </ul>			HT	Sept'10	Fully operational Governing Body in place to commence role by the end of Term 2			
<b>Identify Key Officers / Members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Star Gaze through structure</li> <li>• Identify Primary and Secondary candidates with VS Leadership Team</li> </ul>			VS LT 13.09					
<b>Develop outline specification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research VS Toolkit to identify effective practice case study and contact relevant VS Headteacher.</li> <li>• Scope out level of commitment required</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities</li> <li>• Meeting schedule</li> </ul>			HT					
<b>Secure commitment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule meetings with key officers / members</li> </ul>			HT					

**Key Issue For**

**Data Audit**

<b>Action</b>				
<b>Action Point</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Resp.</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Exp. Outcome</b>
<b>Identify current systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify LAC data sources</li> <li>Audit data sources in terms of delivery profile (what/when/ how often)</li> </ul>	HT / VSLT	Sept'10	Fully operational IDS by the beginning of Term 3. This is dependent on the reliability of current systems being improved
<b>Audit functionality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWW</li> <li>EBI</li> <li>Identify gaps</li> </ul>	VS LT		
<b>Meet operational data officers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Functionality Audit identify what is needed</li> </ul>	HT 14.09		
<b>Develop Draft IDS feasibility Proposal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research effective practice</li> <li>Utilise evidence from operational team and functionality audit</li> </ul>	HT 14.09	Sept '10	
<b>Meet with MIU Strategic Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss Draft proposal</li> <li>Investigate all implications for VS</li> </ul>	HT	Sept '10	
<b>Produce IDS specifications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce detailed specification document outlining:-               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data sources</li> <li>Gate-keeping</li> <li>Functionality for different users</li> <li>Development potential</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	HT	Oct '10	

**Key Issue For Action**

**Development of the VS Identity / Brand**

Action Point	Activity	Resp.	Deadline	Exp. Outcome
<b>Clarity of Brand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop VS Vision / Mission Statement</li> <li>• Develop and build Leadership Team</li> <li>• Develop VS Service Specification</li> <li>• Develop VS Policies and operating procedures</li> </ul>	HT / VSLT	Oct'10	The Brand will impact on all VS Stakeholders. Professionals from all connected services/agencies will have clarity of our role and expectations. LAC, carers and schools will have a hub for quick IAG designed in consultation with them
<b>Team Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and celebrate the ILSS Journey</li> <li>• Share VS Vision and empower whole team through ownership of the vision and direction</li> <li>• Bespoke CPD whilst fostering and celebrating their own professional backgrounds (ongoing)</li> </ul>	VS LT	29 <sup>th</sup> Sept & 19 <sup>th</sup> Oct '10	
<b>Communications Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marketing Plan (EH)</li> <li>• Development of VS Website</li> <li>• Newsletters</li> <li>• CPD Events</li> <li>• Network Meetings</li> <li>• Conferences</li> <li>• Word of mouth via               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Directors</li> <li>2. Principle Advisers / HOCS</li> <li>3. District Heads / Managers / PSM's</li> <li>4. SIP's</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Team visibility modelled HT down</li> </ul>	HT / VSLT	Dec '10	