

**LRLSCB**

**1<sup>st</sup> DRAFT**

**BUSINESS PLAN 2016/17**

# Appendix A

## Notes: Please read!

- 1 The first section of this draft business plan is configured in a conventional way – it is aimed at the Board and the Executive group.
- 2 Between the two sections are some notes suggesting how subgroups / task and finish groups should use the second section
- 3 It is a first draft and therefore not complete.
- 4 It will require significant input from subgroups.

The consultation plan for the business plan will include:

### Subgroups

The executive and Board membership

Childrens Scrutiny meetings in Leicestershire and Rutland LAs

Adults and communities scrutiny meetings in Leicestershire and Rutland

Cabinet in Leicestershire and in Rutland

# Appendix A

## LSCB Priority 1 Owner – TBC

### Secure robust and effective arrangements to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation, Missing and Trafficking

PRIORITY	What are we going to do?	How are we going to do it?	Who is responsible?	When is it going to be done by?	Impact / what difference has it made?	Progress made
To broaden awareness raising activity in relation to CSE, trafficking and missing whilst targeting identified underrepresented groups	<p>Implement the CSE, Trafficking and Missing Sub Group communications strategy</p> <p>Revise, update and deliver the training strategy</p>	Develop a programme of communication activity and training initiatives appropriate and relevant to a wide range of individuals and groups	<p>CSE, Trafficking and Missing Sub Group</p> <p>CSE Communications Coordination Group</p> <p>Training Sub Group</p> <p>CSE Coordinator</p> <p>SEG</p>	September 2016	<p>Improved levels of awareness</p> <p>Increased referrals from a wider range of agencies</p> <p>Increased levels of participation in training</p> <p>Increased reporting of concerns by underrepresented groups</p> <p>Improved public trust and confidence</p>	

# Appendix A

<p>To reduce the number and frequency of missing episodes for children deemed to be at highest risk of harm</p>	<p>Partners meet their statutory duties in relation to children returning from missing episodes including where CSE is a potential or known risk factor</p>	<p>Develop and implement a specialist response to those children at the highest risk</p> <p>Ensure learning from return interviews is collated and acted upon</p>	<p>CSE Sub Group SEG</p>	<p>December 2016</p>	<p>Improve the response to children and young people by understanding causes of missing episodes</p> <p>Reduce the number of repeat missing episodes</p> <p>Reduce impact of risky behaviours associated with missing episodes such as CSE, criminality and substance misuse</p>	
<p>To seek assurance that the implementation of the Strategic partnership Development Fund (SPDF) CSE programme leads to enhanced safeguarding outcomes for children</p>	<p>Implement the 13 projects linked to the programme arising from the SPDF</p> <p>Ensure linkage between implementation of the SPDF programme and the LSCB CSE, Trafficking and Missing Strategy</p>	<p>Identify audit opportunities to test improved safeguarding outcomes</p> <p>Monitor and review progress of programme implementation</p>	<p>CSE, Trafficking and Missing Sub Group</p> <p>CSE Executive Group</p> <p>SPDF Programme Board</p> <p>SEG</p>	<p>September 2016</p>	<p>Improved professional and public confidence.</p>	

# Appendix A

<p>To provide effective support and recovery services for victims of CSE and their families that meet the spectrum of their needs</p>	<p>Post abuse services are sufficient and effective</p>	<p>Review current commissioning arrangements to determine whether they are well planned, informed and effective</p> <p>Assess and evaluate the sufficiency of current services to offer specialist interventions specifically post abuse</p> <p>Ensure the needs of children and young people are represented in the Health and Well-Being Strategy use support</p>	<p>CSE Executive Group</p>	<p>December 2016</p>	<p>Local services match local need</p>	
---	---	---	----------------------------	----------------------	--	--

**LSCB Priority 2 Owner – TBC**

**To maximise the impact of learning from SCRs and other reviews**

# Appendix A

PRIORITY	What are we going to do?	How are we going to do it?	Who is responsible?	When is it going to be done by?	Impact / what difference has it made?	Progress made
<p>To ensure that recommendations from SCR and other reviews locally and nationally are disseminated, acted upon and positively impact on the quality of safeguarding services and their outcomes for children, young people and families.</p> <p>These would include issues identified from both National and Local SCR's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people 'Suicide and Self Harm</li> <li>• Bruising to non – mobile babies</li> <li>• Effective Information Sharing</li> <li>• Case Supervision</li> </ul>	<p>Identify the key learning and action points arising from local and national SCR's</p> <p>Disseminate relevant recommendations and learning points to those that need to implement and secure improvement.</p> <p>Ensure that appropriate workforce development takes place to ensure staff can implement required change.</p> <p>Agree a quality assurance and performance management framework to test impact on service quality and outcomes for children, young people and families.</p>	<p>Agree plan of action for improvement.</p> <p>Devise and implement communications and engagement activity to secure staff awareness.</p> <p>Trigger appropriate workforce development activity.</p> <p>Audit to test outcomes following implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>Hold Review learning events.</p>	<p>SCR Subgroup</p> <p>Communications and Engagement Subgroup</p> <p>Training and Development Subgroup</p> <p>Safeguarding Effectiveness Group</p>	<p>April/May 2016</p> <p>June 2016</p> <p>July 2016</p> <p>Spring 2017</p>		

# Appendix A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerable Looked after children</li> <li>• Transient families</li> <li>• Domestic Abuse in families with children</li> </ul>						
<p><b>LSCB Priority 3 Owner - TBC</b></p> <p><b>To champion and support the extension of Signs of Safety (SoS) across the Partnership and secure assurance of the effectiveness of multi-agency processes/working and evidence of positive impact for service users.</b></p>						
PRIORITY	What are we going to do?	How are we going to do it?	Who is responsible?	When is it going to be done by?	Impact / what difference has it made?	Progress made
Through Signs of Safety to secure improvement in multi-agency practice across the child's journey through early help, child protection and care to attain improved outcomes for the children and families supported	Quantify the means by which SoS can support improved safeguarding practice in areas previously identified as requiring improvement. Formulate a multi-agency programme of action to embed SoS across the partnership in both Leicestershire	Undertake a deliberative enquiry session at Board to confirm key practice improvement priorities and multi-agency framework for collective	Board	April 2016		

# Appendix A

	<p>and Rutland possibly through a Multi-Agency Task and Finish Group</p> <p>Monitor and evaluate the impact of the Innovation Programme in Leicestershire and enable learning to be disseminated in support of the roll out of SoS in Rutland.</p> <p>Quality assure and performance manage SoS in both authorities to test the impact on key areas of targeted improvement</p>	<p>delivery of SoS.</p> <p>Agree strategy and action plan for implementation of multi-agency delivery of SoS.</p> <p>Ensure the delivery and evaluation of a workforce development programme to support effective implementation and improvement thought SoS.</p> <p>Design and agree quality assurance and performance management framework to test impact.</p>	<p>Development and Procedures Subgroup/Multi-agency Task and Finish Group</p> <p>Training and Development Group</p> <p>Safeguarding and Effectiveness Group</p>	<p>July 2016</p> <p>September 2016 – March 2017</p> <p>July 2016</p>		
--	---	--	---	--	--	--



# Appendix A

## LSCB Priority 4 – Owner: TBC

**Be assured that thresholds for services are understood across the partnership and applied consistently.**

<p>Be assured that multi agency understanding of LA thresholds (Leicestershire and Rutland) is robust and that implementation is consistent across all agencies. These would include the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCC – Early Help occasionally not escalating cases soon enough</li> <li>• LCC – Child Protection Conference repeats.</li> <li>• LCC – CSE. Higher level of consciousness required across service including First Response Children’s Duty.</li> <li>• Rutland – Joint working in respect of S. 47</li> </ul>	<p>Test multi-agency understanding and application of safeguarding thresholds (Leicestershire and Rutland) through the four quadrant QAPM framework.</p>	<p>Audit referrals to First Response in Leicestershire and Childrens Duty and assessment Team in Rutland</p>	<p>Safeguarding Effectiveness Group</p>	<p>March 2017</p>		
--	--	--	---	-------------------	--	--

# Appendix A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LCC/Rutland – Shared language and decision making regarding the use of 'No Further Action' to referrals</li> </ul>						
<p><b>LSCB Priority 5 – Owner:TBC</b></p> <p><b>Be assured that Early Help Service are effectively coordinated across the LSCB partnership and secure outcomes that reduce pressure on child protection and care services</b></p>						
<p>Be assured that Early Help services are coordinated effectively across the LSCB partnership in Leicestershire and Rutland to maximise impact on service quality and outcomes for children and families.</p>	<p>Review the map of service provision across early help in both local authorities and ensure there is coherence and co-ordination of provision.</p> <p>Test the impact of early help in terms of safeguarding service quality and outcomes for children and families through an agreed multi-agency QAPM framework .</p> <p>Identify any areas for improvement and secure assurance these are acted on.</p>	<p>Regular partnership reporting to the Executive on multi-agency performance in early help.</p> <p>Regular analysis of QAPM outcomes.</p>	<p>Safeguarding Effectiveness Group</p>	<p>March 2017</p>		

# Appendix A

## LSCB Priority 6 – LLR lead is Rama Ramakrishnan (NSPCC)

To be assured that the LLR Neglect strategy increases understanding, identification, risk assessment and management of Neglect and reduces prevalence in Leicestershire & Rutland

(Identifying neglect earlier within families, supporting parents to enable change through partnership working, in order to reduce the impact of neglect on the emotional and physical wellbeing of children).

PRIORITY	What are we going to do ?	How are we going to do it?	Who is responsible ?	When is it going to be done by?	Impact / what difference will it make?	Progress made
Be assured that the LLR Neglect Strategy is effective in safeguarding children in Leics & Rutland	Develop and publish Neglect Strategy	Consultation with LLR Neglect Reference group members and national resources	LLR Neglect Reference Group Chair Rama Ramakrishnan (NSPCC)	March 2017	Create a standard to identify, risk assess and manage Child Neglect	Current draft completed 10/12/15
Seek assurance that the LLR Neglect Toolkit is effective in safeguarding children	Development and Launch Neglect Toolkit	LLR-wide Frontline Practitioner Survey to gather evidence on existing ways in which neglect is	LLR Neglect Reference Group, Task & Finish Group Chair Julie Quincy (CCG)	Toolkit launch (early 2016)	Improved and consistent identification, risk assessment and management of	

# Appendix A

in Leics & Rutland		identified, risk assessed and managed.	Hosted Safeguarding Team)		Child Neglect across LLR partnership agencies	
Seek assurance that LLR neglect procedures are effectively safeguarding children in Leics & Rutland	Procedures – promote LLR Practice Guidance to ensure buy-in of frontline practitioners  Review and update LLR procedures	Promote LLR Practice Guidance  Promote local dispute resolution process to consider neglect cases where appropriate protection is not achieved	LLR Neglect Reference Group Chair Rama Ramakrishnan (NSPCC)	March 2017		