

GIRFEC Implementation- Reporting on Progress

Self-Assessment Questionnaires for CPPs – Summary of Returns

Key findings

This summary report aims to provide a helpful snapshot of where CPPs are in terms of the various elements of the GIRFEC implementation agenda. The very good response rate to the questionnaire and the helpful list of GIRFEC contacts in the CPPS will provide a very useful basis for us to work with CPPs. The following key findings are based on the responses received from 28 CPPs.

All 28 CPPs reported that:

- they understood and promote the vision for all children; GIRFEC principles and partnership in service delivery with almost all providing examples of local initiatives.
- policies and protocols have been developed to support the GIRFEC approach. Many areas said that they have established approaches agreed at CPP and reflected the Integrated Children's Services Plan (ICSP) and other strategic documents.
- all the GIRFEC core components are being embedded through a range of activities such as GIRFEC training both multi agency and single agency in education and health, the production of guidance and other training material and through the establishment of GIRFEC champions in service areas.
- they have local arrangements in place for monitoring impact and improving outcomes. Many areas reported that they conduct regular multi agency self-evaluations.
- Almost all CPP areas self-assessed in the 3 and 4 categories (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest score) for the five GIRFEC themes. While two areas scored 5 across most of the five themes, a few areas scored 2. However, overall this shows that progress continues to be made from the position reported last year in an exercise carried out by local authorities' chief executives. Additionally almost all CPPs reported significant progress in implementation since last year and that they expected to embed further and move up the maturity model scale in the coming months.
- The majority of CPPs report to have actively engaged with parents and families in their areas. There is an overall acknowledgement of the importance of engaging with and involving children and families in processes to take forward GIRFEC development plans.
- More than half of CPPs who responded advised that they have a change plan in place, in one area since 2011. And the plans ranged from high level to detailed implementation.
- Some CPPs acknowledged the support currently being provided by the centre to CPP groupings. Further local support was identified in areas such as information sharing, provision of training and guidance material and Scottish government run national training event/ Masterclass. This will be the subject of on-going discussions with CPPs in terms of on-going assistance from the GIRFEC National Implementation Group.

Background

1. On 14 March this year a self-assessment questionnaire was sent by the Chair of the GIRFEC National Implementation Support Group (NISG), to all CPPs and Council Chief Executives. Reporting to the Board, the main purpose of the NISG is to support the development and implementation of GIRFEC across Scotland, in particular:

To undertake an inclusive approach through consulting with community planning partnerships and individual organisations,
To identify the key areas for support over the next eighteen months.

2. To inform this work, and to provide an assessment of progress to the GIRFEC Programme Board and the Minister for Children and Young People, the Group asked CPPs to provide information in the form of a self-assessment questionnaire. This assessment builds on the information reported to Society of Local Authority Chief Executives & Senior Managers (SOLACE Scotland) by many CPPs last year in respect of the Maturity Model and on the work undertaken by Education Scotland in their report of October 2012 on the *State of readiness of the education system to fully implement GIRFEC*¹.

Responses

3. The questions were designed so that they would reflect the areas of work that the CPPs were expecting to be exploring themselves as part of implementation. We received 28 responses, and contacted those who are yet to send their returns. The 4 outstanding areas have indicated that they are still working on the return or are awaiting its sign off by their CPP Partnership Board and have indicated that they will send a return. A list of those who have returned the questionnaire is shown in Annex A.

4. Annex B sets out the detailed responses to the questions. The CPP Weblinks are shown at Annex C.

Next Steps

5. We will use the information provided in Section 8 (further assistance) to help inform the work of the Scottish Government GIRFEC Team and the National Implementation Group. In particular we will continue to support the work of CPP GIRFEC groupings; assist areas in the provision of local training and guidance material and plans are being made for a national GIRFEC training event for later this year.

6. Next steps will involve asking CPPs for an update in the autumn on the information provided in this exercise, with the expectation that all will be able to confirm on-going work on GIRFEC implementation and an expectation of a score of 5/5 on the Maturity Model in time for the commencement date of the GIRFEC elements of the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill – anticipated as summer 2016.

1

<http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/newsandevents/educationnews/2012/pressreleases/october/reviwimplementgirfec.asp>

Bill Ellis
Scottish Government
GIRFEC
7 June 2013

**ANNEX
A List of
Question
naire
returns**

Scotland's 32 CPPs	Questionnaire Received
	Received
· Aberdeen City Council	Yes
· Aberdeenshire Council	Expected
· Angus Council	Yes
· Argyll & Bute Council	Yes
· Clackmannanshire Council	Expected
· Dumfries & Galloway Council	Yes
· Dundee City Council	Yes
· East Ayrshire Council	Yes
· East Dunbartonshire Council	Yes
· East Lothian Council	Yes
· East Renfrewshire Council	Yes
· Edinburgh City Council	Yes
· Outer Hebrides	Yes
· Falkirk Council	Yes
· Fife Council	Yes
· Glasgow City Council	Yes
· Highland Council	Yes
· Inverclyde Council	Yes
· Midlothian Council	Yes
· Moray Council	Yes
· North Ayrshire Council	Yes
· North Lanarkshire Council	Yes
· Orkney Islands Council	Yes
· Perth & Kinross Council	Yes
· Renfrewshire Council	Yes
· Scottish Borders Council	Yes
· Shetland Islands Council	Yes
· South Ayrshire Council	Yes
· South Lanarkshire Council	Yes
· Stirling Council	Expected
· West Dunbartonshire Council	Expected
· West Lothian Council	Yes

Q1 How far do members of the CPP understand and promote:

- **A vision for all children**
 - **The underpinning principles and values of Getting it right for every child**
 - **Effective partnership approach to the delivery of services?**
1. All CPPs reported that they understood and promote the vision for all children; GIRFEC principles and partnership in service delivery with almost all providing examples of local initiatives.
 2. Most areas reported that their Integrated Children's Service Plan set out their joint vision for children and young people and identified the underpinning values of GIRFEC. One area referred to their joint working with neighbours as the first of the GIRFEC learning partners.
 3. A number of areas referred to the vision for children being set out in their Single Outcome Agreement.
 4. Several areas referred to inspection reports of children's services which had positive references to GIRFEC being reflected in the area's priorities and evidence of a shared strategic commitment to making GIRFEC core business for all staff across all services.
 5. Some areas reported that they had set up an Integrated Children's Services Partnership representing key public and third sector agencies to improve services and deliver better outcomes for children and young people in the city.
 6. It was noted by those areas where the council and health board areas were coterminous, that this underpinned a joint approach to service planning and delivery.
 7. One area had set up a children's commission which has responsibility for children's services planning.
 8. A few areas had reported that they had set up or working on setting up local area GIRFEC groups within the local community planning process.
 9. One area reported on its integration of health and social care where it now has lead agency responsibility for delivery of community based services for children and young people.
 10. Some areas referred to their work in the GIRFEC Groupings which included drawing up of joint guidance, staff training conferences and e-learning

11. A CPP grouping from one area referred to the development of their local electronic solution (AYRshare) for sharing information that will help progress implementation.

Q2 How well are services embedding core components around?

- **A proportionate approach to the development and delivery of services (including addressing risk)**
- **The Named Person and Lead Professional roles**
- **An integrated approach to assessment and a single Child's Plan**
- **The National Practice Model?**

12. All CPPs reported that all the GIRFEC core components are being embedded through a range of activities such as GIRFEC training both multi agency and single agency in education and health, the production of guidance and other training material and through the establishment of GIRFEC champions in service areas.

13. Several areas reported that they had introduced Named Person, Lead Professional and the Single Child's Plan –some as far back as 2011.

14. All reported that they are delivering multi agency and single agency training to progress changes to cultures, systems and practice. One area reported an extensive programme of multi-agency GIRFEC training that has been delivered to 888 people over 49 sessions between September 2011 and June 2012. This training has focussed on the core components of GIRFEC. In addition, where required, more specialised training has been delivered to key staff.

15. Several CPPs said they are looking forward to publication of the Bill and supporting guidance to help clarify and support the work already being carried out as set out in their GIRFEC development plan. There was also a common view that this would drive forward implementation.

16. There were several references to the work of the GIRFEC groupings. For example the partners in one grouping separately reported that they are designing in service training and establishing GIRFEC champions.

17. One area provided the example of the work of the Multi Agency Domestic Abuse Response Team which provides a prompt and effective response to those subject to domestic abuse or witness to it.

18. Several areas highlighted the capacity challenge in Health and in schools in delivering statutory requirements in the Bill.

19. Some areas reported that they operate a locality model which they considered encourages and supports partnership working. There was also reference to the use of eLearning packages in embedding the core components.

20. Three CPPs specifically mentioned they had some issues with embedding the core components. One said that GIRFEC was not fully rolled out for all children but it is now being addressed as part of a whole system review. One CPP said that the Named Person not fully in place in Health and the Single Plan only in place for vulnerable children. The third reported that training needs had been identified for staff (outwith Social Work) on Named Person and Lead Professional roles.

Q3 In terms of maturity model, what level are you at now compared with August 2012. How would you describe the detail of this, in relation to the core components?

21. CPPs were asked to self-assess using the Maturity Model on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest), for the five key GIRFEC themes.

22. Summary of responses from CPPs using The Maturity model (Question 3)

	Level 1 – Executive Sponsorship <i>Commitment at the most senior level</i>	Level 2 – Corporate Strategy <i>GIRFEC is widely understood across the organisation</i>	Level 3 – Service Development <i>GIRFEC process are implemented in critical areas of the business</i>	Level 4 – Implementation <i>Corporate exceptions to implementing GIRFEC processes are known and reported</i>	Level 5 – Embedded <i>Responsive GIRFEC processes are integrated as part of normal business</i>
1. Identifying a Named Person for every child and young person in the universal services	0	4	14	4	2
2. Identifying protocols and governance for Lead Professional	0	1	17	4	2
3. Supporting partnerships to take a proportionate approach to managing all concerns and risks	0	2	13	7	2
4. Redesign business processes to secure a single planning process for all children and young people supporting a single plan	0	3	12	8	1
5. Use of the National Practice Model	0	3	11	8	2

Note: Four CPPs had submitted progress reports but said that they could not provide scoring. Two areas said that they will clear the scoring with their senior management/ partnership board and will submit this data to us shortly, but 2 areas said that they did not use the maturity model and therefore could not offer scores.

23. Almost all CPP areas self-assessed in the 3 and 4 categories for the five themes. No CPP scored 1 for any GIRFEC category on the maturity model. Only 1 CPP scored 2 for the lead professional, but 4 CPPS scored 2 for Named Person. Two CPP areas scored 5 across most of the five themes. This shows significant progress from the position reported last year in an exercise carried out last year by local authorities' chief executives. This exercise which covered GIRFEC readiness in September/ October 2012 had responses from 20 areas, but only 18 provided scores using the maturity model. This exercise also had most areas in categories 3 and 4, but had 5 areas reporting level 2 (the lower level) and only 1 areas at level 5 (the highest level). Additionally almost all CPPs commented in the report that they had made significant progress in implementation since last year, and again most CPPs reported that they expect to embed further and move up the maturity model scale in the coming months.

Q4 To what extent have children and families been engaged in understanding and implementation of the GIRFEC approach and how far are children and families involved in the planning of services to support them individually? Next steps?

24. The **majority of CPPs** report to have **actively engaged with parents and families** in their areas. There is an **overall acknowledgement of the importance of engaging with and involving children and families** in processes to take forward GIRFEC development plans. In some cases engagement with children and families is a systematic part of the CPPs' policy for children and families services and goes beyond the GIRFEC agenda, as they are then consulted in the redesign of services and their views consulted on the CPPs' vision for future service development.
25. Returns show evidence of the use of a **wide range of platforms to engage** with children and families and to involve them in the development of GIRFEC policies, but also as part of some CPPs' overall improvement of services, such as: parents' groups, networks, local projects, local pilots, consultation with young people on upcoming plan and on upcoming legislation changes, youth platforms and children's champion boards.
26. A recurring statement across returns is that "From an operational perspective individual service users and their families are actively involved in identifying issues during the assessment phase and contribute/identify services which will support them".
27. One area emphasised their positive progress on familiarising children with the Wellbeing web and the SHANARRI indicators; and another focussed on children being encouraged to take part in decision-making about their Child's Plan.
28. There were a few statements which provide little evidence of what action has been taken by the area and read more like general policy statements; while some CPPs recognise the need for further work to provide a more coherent and relevant service to children and families – through partnership approach, consultation with both parents and young people, strategies, youth councils among other means. One area admitted to having no specific initiative" to promote GIRFEC to children and families, although it went on to mention a "review of policy and procedures for systematically gathering young persons' views across a range of services".

Q5 What systems are in place or planned to monitor impact and improve outcomes?

29. All CPPs reported that they have local arrangements in place for monitoring impact and improving outcomes. Many areas reported that they conduct regular multi agency self-evaluations.
30. Many areas reported that their CPP Board receives a report of progress in implementing GIRFEC and associated outcomes for children and Young People. Below the partnership board the various partnership sub groups or working groups (including in many cases a GIRFEC working group) receive updates from lead agencies for the strategic priorities in the Children's Services Plan over the year.
31. Most areas reported that they are using a range of different types of outcomes frameworks or evaluation tools
- Evaluation framework
 - Delivering outcomes tool using wellbeing
 - Outcomes framework
 - Covalent performance management software
 - Quality Improvement framework using the 10 Core Components
 - the Dartington social research model
 - Performance Framework for outcomes for Children and Young people
 - Use of the well-being web
32. Other specific pieces of work that was reported to being carried out include:
- One area is undertaking further evaluation of outcomes for implementing GIRFEC/ Practice model.
 - One area has mapped performance Improvement measures to GIRFEC SHANARRI indicators
 - Work currently being undertaken with the Early Years Collaborative.
 - Care Scotland inspections and reports.
 - Two CPPs are piloting the use of external frameworks such as the Barnardos outcomes framework (Question 5).
33. One area expressed a slight note of caution in monitoring impact of GIRFEC given that the GIRFEC approach permeates through all children and young people work. They considered that it is therefore difficult to have discrete outcomes that can be categorically attributed to GIRFEC on its own. But rather that all the variables (which will have GIRFEC built in) will together have a positive outcome on children and young people.

Q6 To what extent have policies and protocols been developed to support the delivery of the GIRFEC approach?

34. All CPPs reported that policies and protocols have been developed to support the GIRFEC approach. Many areas linked their answers to this question back to previous answers in Sections 2 and Section 5. Many areas said that they have established approaches agreed at CPP and reflected the Integrated Children's Services Plan (ICSP) and other strategic documents. Most areas reported the existence of supporting material, with the GIRFEC Practice guidance being identified most often as the key document. It was noted that the C and YP (S) Bill will inform all these documents.
35. It was reported that reference to the GIRFEC approach is present in all children and young people policies, and that these policies are regularly reviewed to ensure that they are 'GIRFEC *proofed*'. In some areas whole services have been redesigned to ensure that they reflect GIRFEC.
36. One area reported that they have mainstreamed GIRFEC and do not to see it as a separate policy requiring separate documentation, policies etc. They have worked with their Additional Support for Learning (ASL) colleagues to produce a folder for effective child planning. In most other areas GIRFEC guidance has been integrated into other legislative requirements such as ASL. Another area said that they had adapted the wellbeing indicators into the CPP corporate statement and plans.
37. Again there was reference to the GIRFEC Groupings in amending procedures to embed the GIRFEC approach. GIRFEC training programme, newsletter and all materials are available on the website, and these are updated as appropriate.

Q7 Can you provide us with your change plan for implementation of the core components of GIRFEC, including the proposed statutory components?

38. More than half of CPPs who responded advised that they have a change plan in place, in one area since 2011. And the plans ranged from high level to detailed implementation.
39. A further 7 are currently developing or updating their GIRFEC plans and all are reported to be completed by end June 2013. Some areas said that the drafting of the plans will reflect the contents of the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill, which had not been published when the questionnaires had been issued.
40. Four CPPs have not set up a specific implementation or change plan for GIRFEC but have incorporated GIRFEC implementation planning into their ICSP or similar.
41. One CPP reported full GIRFEC implementation and therefore while they had not produced an implementation plan, they were currently drafting a Practice Model improvement Plan which will be completed by August 2013.

Q8 What further assistance to assist local implementation would you find helpful from the Scottish Government GIRFEC Team, and the National Implementation Group?

42. Some CPPs acknowledged the support currently being provided by the centre to CPP groupings. Further local support was identified as being required in areas such as information sharing, the provision of local training and guidance material and several requests for Scottish Government run national training event/ Masterclass. **This will be the subject of on-going discussions with CPPs in terms of on-going assistance from the GIRFEC National Implementation Group**

43. CPPs were also invited to highlight any other points. Some commented on on-going progress, others gave examples of good practice and some highlighted challenging issues.

44. Recurring points to arise from this question were: the need for definitions of terms in relation to the Children and Young People Bill; more training resources, sharing of information and good practice, benefits of relationship with SG and related implementation group, IT systems alignment.

45. These points are set out below in more detail:

- **CYP Bill:** definition of the Named Person, local flexibility in relation to the National Practice Model, the Child's Plan the roles of Named Persons and Lead Professional; further guidance/ good practice in respect of single planning process aligning ASL Act requirements and GIRFEC; national view on GIRFEC Named Person responsibilities for children who are Home Educated
- Assistance with development of quality improvement and assurance framework for **evaluating implementation and impact**
- **IT: Electronic sharing of information:** issue raised by two areas around SEEMIS. They asked that SG should seek to influence SEEMIS to prioritise technical changes to allow 'Ayrshare' to be fully operational or saying it is a 'barrier to progress'
- Assistance with data sharing and cost effective solutions within existing IT structures
- **Additional financial resources** in particular for national and local training resources
- Strong recognition of the **value of the support from relationship with the SG implementation team**, and the wish to continue to network with SG and other CPPs to share resources; how the links helped provide a network to contribute to sub groups, share advice with SG to support local implementation of GIRFEC
- **Sharing best practice, experiences and ideas across CPPs:** specific request of experience of ensuring Child's Plans are in place for children with additional needs within universal services and challenges around added bureaucracy and restricted resources

- **Capacity and workload issues** and specific request to SG to “provide a resource” to help “essential partners to commit more of their resources to working together towards GIRFEC”.

Q9 Any other information you wish to share or highlight in terms of practice?

46. As this was an open question, it attracted variations in responses, with some CPPs giving full, detailed answers and a few not responding to the question.

47. Some CPPs used the opportunity of this question to highlight that they **continue to progress GIRFEC within their area**, in particular through a multi-agency approach; use of electronic information sharing (such as AYRshare); have a well-developed GIRFEC website and accompanying training material, share good practice through the SG implementation team; and show their awareness of other major children’s policies such as the Early Years Collaborative.

48. Some CPPs also mentioned **local achievements in specific areas**, such as an Integrated Assessment Framework approved by SCRA; the development of an Early Development Instrument to provide baseline information; leading on training resources and material and some other local projects related to improvement of services for children and families.

49. **A number of specific issues were raised:**

- would like SG to share information on major developments such as on the Health and Social Care integration agenda and the EYC to help effective implementation across Children’s Services
- access to other localities documentation and other development work has been very useful and time saving
- challenges in providing a snapshot of progress made and with engaging with the full range of voluntary sector providers.
- AYRshare;
- Early Years Network.

Q10 Do you have a web link reporting on progress? Is there a representative of the CPP we could liaise directly with?

50. Some CPPs have provided a web link on GIRFEC (See ANNEX B) and all have provided a CPP rep in their area. We have noted the names of the representatives and will use this (and our existing GIRFEC contacts if these are different) for GIRFEC communications in the future.

ANNEX C CPP GIRFEC Web links

CPP	Web-Link
-----	----------

Aberdeen City Council	www.aberdeengettingitright.org.uk
Aberdeenshire Council	http://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/about/departments/girfec.asp
Angus	www.angus.gov.uk/angus
Argyll & Bute	www.argyll-bute.gov.uk/GIRFEC
Clackmannanshire	http://www.clacksweb.org.uk/children/girfec/
Dumfries & Galloway	http://www.dumgal.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=9562&p=0
Dundee City Council	www.dundee.gov.uk/chserv
East Ayrshire	No public webpage
East Dunbartonshire	Website being updated
East Lothian	http://edubuzz.org/gettingitright/
East Renfrewshire	http://www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=6299&p=0 Website under development
Edinburgh City Council	http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/girfec
Falkirk Council	www.falkirk.gov.uk/girfec
Fife	www.fifechildprotection.org.uk
Glasgow	
Highland	http://www.forhighlandschildren.org
Inverclyde	http://www.inverclyde.gov.uk/community-life-and-leisure/community-planning/inverclyde-alliance-board-papers
Midlothian	http://www.midlothian.gov.uk/info/543/for_young_people/345/services_for_children_and_young_People
Moray	http://www.moray.gov.uk/moray_standard/page_56873.html
North Ayrshire	http://www.girfecna.co.uk/

North Lanarkshire	www.girfecinlanarkshire.co.uk
Orkney	No web link http://www.orkney.gov.uk/Service-Directory/G/Getting-It-Right.htm
Outer Hebrides	No web link
Perth & Kinross	http://www.pkc.gov.uk/article/4815/Getting-It-Right-for-Every-Child-GIRFEC
Renfrewshire	Website being updated
Scottish Borders	Website being updated
Shetland	http://www.shetland.gov.uk/children_and_families/GIRFEC.asp
South Ayrshire	http://www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk/getting-it-right-for-every-child/
Stirling	http://www.stirling.gov.uk/services/social-care-and-health/childcare-and-family-care/getting-it-right-for-every-child
West Dunbartonshire	http://www.west-dunbarton.gov.uk/education-and-learning/schools/additional-support-needs/getting-it-right-for-every-child-girfec/
West Lothian	http://www.westlothianhchcp.org.uk/what/families/every_child/

Further information also available on the Scottish Government GIRFEC website:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/gettingitright>