

By: Mr L Ridings, Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Educational Achievement
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership

To: Children, Families and Education Policy Overview Committee
16 January 2008

Subject: Local Children's Services Partnerships (LCSPs) Sub-Committee – Update

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report updates the Committee on the establishment of the LCSP Sub-Committee.

1. (1) At the meeting on 19 September 2008 the Committee considered a report which proposed the establishment of a Sub-Committee to have an overview of the Local Children's Services Partnerships.

(2) The County Council at its meeting on 11 December 2008 agreed to the establishment of the LCSP Sub-Committee on a permanent basis and to include in its membership a Church and Teacher Advisory representative. A copy of the terms of reference of the Sub Committee are attached at Appendix 1

(3) The inaugural meeting of the Sub-Committee is due to be held on 20 February 2009. Meetings will be programmed so that the Minutes can be submitted to each meeting of the POC. The County Council Membership of the LCSP will be Mrs A Allen, Mr J Curwood, Mr G Horne, Mr M Northey, Mr I Jones , Mr M Vye (plus 1 Labour Member).

(4) Prior to the formal establishment of the Sub-Committee the Members who will sit on it have met on an informal basis on 14 October 2008 and copies of the notes of the meeting are attached at Appendix 2 for Member information.

Recommendation

2. That the establishment of the LCSP Sub-Committee and the feedback from the informal meeting be noted.

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
01622 694002
peter.sass@kent.gov.uk

Background Documents: None

Local Children's Services Partnerships

Terms of Reference:-

(1) To oversee the operation of the Local Children's Services Partnerships (LCSPs) and make recommendations to the Children, Families and Education Policy Overview Committee

Work Programme

(2) Meeting would provide an opportunity to review 3 - 4 LCSPs at a time making recommendations to the next meeting of the POC. There would be 2/3 study days a year spread around the county, which would consist of visiting localities in the morning and a meeting of the Sub-Committee in the afternoon.

Size of Sub-Committee

(3) The Membership of the Committee is based on the proportion 4:2:1 – which is the same size as Select Committees – with the Membership drawn from across the county. In addition there will be one Church and one Teacher Advisory representative

Meetings

(4) The Sub-Committee would meet 6 – 8 times a year. The meetings will be programmed so that there is timely reporting of the outcomes to the five meetings of POC in the year.

CFE POC Informal Members Group - LCSPs

14 October 2009, 10:00 - 13:00, Medway Suite, Sessions House

Present:	From 10am - Ann Allen (Chair), Jeffery Curwood, Godfrey Horne, Martin Vye, Joy Ackroyd, Sally Morris, Chris Cummins, Karen Darwell From 11am - Beth Macildowie, Jane Grogan , Fiona Mumford, Hilary Macdonald, Ian Park , Maxine Havis, Val Walton	
Apologies:	Ivor Jones, Micahel Northey, Dr Ian Craig, Stephen Smith	
In Attendance:	Matthew Redmond (Note Taker) Samantha Hardie (Observer)	
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	Action
	<p>AA introduced the group explaining that it would report to the Children Families and Education Policy Overview Committee (CFE POC) providing an opportunity for evaluation and feedback to CFE POC on Local Children’s Services Partnerships. The group would have a limited life and it was intended it would last for one year.</p> <p>(Post Meeting note - it was subsequently agreed by the County Council on 11 December 2008 that this Sub-Committee would not be time limited.)</p> <p>It was noted that formal approval of the group’s status would be carried out at a future County Council meeting. Members were in agreement that it would be of benefit for the meeting to be a formal Sub-Committee of CFE POC.</p>	
2	OVERVIEW OF KENT CHILDREN’S TRUST ARRANGEMENTS & TERMS OF REFERENCE	
	<p>JA provided a presentation on the development of children’s trust arrangements both nationally and in Kent explaining the status in terms of national requirements on local authorities, and how Kent is in line already with a number of national initiatives.</p> <p>It was explained that the Kent Children’s Trust Board and sub-group structure was central to the children’s trust arrangements in Kent and that the latest and previous papers/minutes of the Trust Board are available publicly through: http://www.kenttrustweb.org.uk/Children/kct_latestmeeting.cfm http://www.kenttrustweb.org.uk/Children/kct_meetings.cfm</p> <p>The introduction of Local Children’s services Partnerships was detailed explaining how these built on the previous school Clusters, bringing together all children’s services to help support children in local areas. It was recommended that attendees read the LCSP Partnership Agreement (included in Member packs and at http://www.kenttrustweb.org.uk/Children/lcsp_partnership_agreement.cfm) to give them a broad understanding of the role of the partnerships and links with the Kent Children’s Trust Board.</p> <p>It was agreed that the structure and members of a LCSP team should be considered at a future meeting.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>MR</p>

3.	<p>HEADLINES FROM THE PATHFINDER EXPERINECE</p>	
	<p><u>TUNBRIDGE WELLS</u></p> <p>An overview of the experience of Tunbridge Wells as Local Children’s Services Partnership pathfinder was presented by BM, the Tunbridge Wells Local Children’s Services Partnership Manager (LCSPM). The 5 priorities of the Tunbridge Wells Local Children and Young People’s Plan (LCYPP), and their background, was explained to the group.</p> <p>An explanation was given of the Acorn Project, which formed part of the Pathfinder work carried out by Tunbridge Wells LCSP. It was noted that the detail of the Acorn Project and case study was available in the Pathfinder Final Evaluation Report. This was circulated to members and is available on Trustweb at http://www.kenttrustweb.org.uk//UserFiles/CW/File/Childrens_Services/Kent_Childrens_Trust/pathfinder_evaluation_report_0608.pdf</p> <p>A key challenge that faced the LCSP in their Pathfinder experience was noted as being sustainability and funding - with enough funding having only been available to run the Acorn Project for a year. It was noted that national pathfinders for children’s trust arrangements had also found sustainability to be a key issue.</p> <p><u>SHEPWAY</u></p> <p>VW, Shepway 1 LCSPM presented an overview of the experience of Shepway as a Pathfinder. Work with the Roma community was identified as a specific example of integrated work from the Pathfinder experience. A full explanation was given on the work with the Folkestone Migrant Support Group (FMSG) and Roma children and families; further detail of which can be found in the Pathfinder Final Evaluation Report.</p> <p>Another success identified was the Single Point of Access, which had been operating for nearly a year, this had seen a group of partners bring together 15 separate referral points under a single point of access for children with multiple needs.</p> <p>The main challenge that had been faced by Shepway in their work was the issue of sustainability. Despite a sense that the programmes were wanted in the community, it had been difficult to confidently plan ahead without knowing if funding would be in place.</p> <p>A summary of the priorities from the Shepway LCYPP was circulated to the group.</p> <p><u>MAIDSTONE 2</u></p> <p>Key priorities of the Maidstone LCYPP were circulated to the group.</p> <p>One of the challenges identified in the pathfinder experience was finding a balance between setting a vision and managing expectation. To help manage this there was an evaluation of gaps and duplication in services carried out in order to identify potential resources to support new work. Another identified challenge was the move from the independence of partners to interdependence through the LCSP.</p> <p>Maidstone 2 identified a success of the move to an LCSP as being the production of a single overarching plan for Maidstone, this had enabled partners to maintain their plans, but within the framework of a single multi-agency plan, the LCYPP.</p>	

	<p>(Maidstone 2) Another success had been engaging partners, not through requesting funding from them, but through requesting time from their staff to contribute to projects.</p> <p>Other successes identified by the LCSP were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Student Voice • Families First <p>A full explanation was provided on the Families First programme. detail of which is available in the Pathfinder Final Evaluation Report.</p>	
4.	<p>REPORT TO CFE POC - 13/11/08</p>	
	<p>A number of issues were identified to be discussed at future meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Processes • CAF • Integrated Commissioning • Detailed look at integrated teams and services • Providing and acting on data and outcomes • Finance in terms of sustainability of funding and funding for work. <p>Sustainability was identified as the key issue that the LCSPs would like Members to consider throughout the life of the group.</p>	
5.	<p>AOB</p>	
	<p>Evaluation forms were circulated to both Members and LCSP Representatives. Overall feedback on the meeting was positive including the following comments:</p> <p>What aspect or part of today’s meeting did you find most helpful? “Meeting members and others from LCSPs. How we fitted into the whole picture.”</p> <p>“Hearing a broader perspective on LCSPs.”</p> <p>“The very genuine level of interest demonstrated.”</p> <p>What else would you like to be discussed at future meetings in relation to LCSPs? “Finance, Sustainability, Ways and Means.”</p> <p>“Perhaps, all agencies involved and how to suggest information, without being asked.”</p> <p><i>Any Further Comments?</i> “Would be good as a practitioner on the ground to attend more of the meetings.”</p>	