

Modified joint area review methodology

Phil Pullen

Asst Divisional Manager, Ofsted

Jane Attwood, HMI Probation

Trish Wilson, Healthcare Commission

Kathy Turner, Audit Commission



Programme

- 1.30pm The Modified JAR, APA and EYI**
- 2.30pm Opportunity to discuss particular issues in small groups**
- 3.00pm Question Time**
- 3.15pm Plenary**
- 3.30pm Depart**

Purpose of the Briefing

- Inform local areas of changes to the JAR/APA methodology that will affect Block 19
- Provide opportunities for dialogue
- Establish lines of communication beyond the Briefing Conference for all partners



Purpose of the Joint Area Review

- To evaluate how well all services, taken together, improve the well-being of specific groups of children and young people in a local area.

Annual Performance Assessment

Makes a judgment on the **5 Every Child Matters (ECM) outcomes** for children and young people in the council area:

- Being healthy
- Staying safe
- Enjoying and achieving
- Making a positive contribution
- Achieving economic well-being

AND

- children's services of the council with its partners
- capacity to improve of the council with its partners.

Reasons for modification of the JAR

- Reduce burden
- Be proportionate
- Cut costs
- Need to focus on specific groups or activities which were being lost in the assessment of universal services.

Changes to APA and JARS since April 2007

- **Scope of APA remains unchanged – 5 ECM outcomes and service management**
- **APA provides the grade for children’s services**
- **APA informs the JAR investigations**

- **JARs focus on:**
 - **three core investigations – safeguarding, LAC and LDD**
 - **1 – 3 additional investigations**
 - **service management/capacity to improve**

Changes to APA and JARS since April 2007

- JARs no longer include a neighbourhood study
- Case tracking remains a key element
- JAR documentation largely unchanged but field work visits tailored around core investigations and additional investigations
- EYI and YOT inspections contribute to core, additional investigations and service management

Changes to APA and JARS since April 2007

- Team size proportionate to risk (6-10 inspectors) and 'matched' to investigations
- Lead inspectors for core and additional investigations but heavy reliance on team work
- Core investigations graded, judgements given for additional investigations
- JAR report no longer has separate sections on outcomes and impact. Context section much shorter, main findings more focused.

What will be different for JARs?

What will be the same?

- Investigations will be determined through a review of the most recent APA, consideration of the local area's CYPP and any additional evidence including the AHC and findings from regulatory inspections such as fostering and adoption. **The investigations will always include safeguarding, LAC and LDD**
- Good or very good outcomes will = fewer issues and smaller inspection resource. Poorer outcomes = more issues and larger inspection resource
- Team stays onsite for the same length of time though
- No requirement to address all 36 key judgements in the JAR or make 12 grades
- No separate health service grade

What will be different? What will be the same?

- Greater evaluation of the impact and partnership working of all partners including the voluntary and community sector.
- Greater emphasis on CYPP and any reviews/updates.
- No self-assessment for JAR but it remains for the Youth Service and the corporate assessment
- LAs may have undertaken evaluations of the areas being investigated. These may be shared with inspectors but no requirement to undertake further work if not.

What will be different? What will be the same?

- Inspectors (usually the LI and DLI) will provide a formal feedback session much earlier in the process than previously
- Reporting will incorporate APA outcomes and JAR findings
- Modifications to the inspections of youth work
- Quality assurance activities further developed

How many inspectors to do the job?

- Predicted staffing levels would be as follows:
 - JAR based on an APA grade 4 would be a maximum of four team inspectors, the lead inspector and the joint inspector (half-time)
 - JAR based on an APA grade 3 would be a maximum of six team inspectors, the lead inspector and the joint inspector (half-time)
 - JAR based on the APA grade 2 would be a maximum of seven team inspectors, the lead inspector and the joint inspector (half-time)
 - JAR based on an APA grade 1 would be a maximum of nine team inspectors, the lead inspector and the joint inspector (half-time)
 - Each inspector would lead on each are of focus and support in others

Judgements and notice

- Local areas will have a shorter period between set up and analysis stage
- Grades (scores) for LAC, LDD, safeguarding, service management and capacity to improve
- Grades and judgements from all investigations undertaken will be taken into account at the next APA

CA and JAR alignment remains

- Key elements of alignment remain
- simultaneous briefing pack
- set up meeting
- analysis stage
- on-site phase
- Consistency
- Reporting

- INCLUSION - involvement of all providers/commissioners
 - CYP/parents/carers
- DATA & INFORMATION - case file selection
 - current/delivery
 - national policy/guidance
- INVESTIGATIONS – core
 - additional
 - impact/outcomes

Phase 4 Youth Offending Team Inspection

- 5 year rolling programme started September 2003
- YOT inspection is separate to the JAR but integrated
- Composition of team reflects multi-agency working of YOT
- Criteria have changed; increased emphasis on safeguarding and public protection
- Framework is Assessment, Interventions and Outcomes
- No overall score

Links between YOT inspection and JAR

- YOT Lead Inspector part of JAR team for fieldwork week 2.
- Records of Evidence provided to JAR
- Feedback to YOT given at the end of that week
- Ensuring that YOT issues extend throughout the JAR report
- Increased contribution to JARs where YOTs have already been inspected

EYI - A Framework Revision – not new

- The modified EYI framework will reflect how recent legislative and structural issues are shaping the delivery of youth work
- It captures “the local authorities’ response to the requirement for access to sufficient educational leisure time activities which are for personal and social development”
- Youth work not the youth service
- The framework retains three key aspects: achievement, curriculum and resources, and management
- Inspectors are mindful that arrangements are in flux and transition
- Comment on progress being made toward integrated youth support services but not inspect these

Analysis stage

- Each inspector deployed will lead an investigation *and* provide support in others.
- Joint set-up meeting and alignment with CA remain
- JAR inspectors visit the area for three days usually from Wednesday to Friday
- Case-file reading and beginning of other investigations including analysis of much reduced documentation supplied by the LA during Thursday
- Further document scrutiny and team meeting Friday morning, linkages with CA and discussion with LA officers

- Importance of frontline services observation increased
- Increased importance of children and young people's view of service
- Continuing attention to equality and diversity issues.
- Flexibility on neighbourhood study area to allow inspection teams to go where they really need to
- Evidence gathering ceases at the end of fieldwork

What will the report look like?

- Each investigation will be reported with all inspectors making a contribution. This ensures a broad view of the issues investigated. For example, the quality of services for looked after children will include the contributions made by all 5 outcomes + service management
- Will include the most recent APA letter (annex)
- Will include summaries of EYI and YOT reports (annex)
- Context section for local areas to agree

Discussions

Some key issues for you to consider:

- Are there any issues raised that might require further discussion amongst local partners?
- How might these issues be conveyed to the CYP and staff in the partnership?
- How will the local partnership ensure inspectors gain access to robust and reliable local evidence including any evaluations?
- Any questions you would like to raise?