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Structures for integrated planning for children and young people and families
NETWORK OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S LOCALITY GROUPS
The role of each locality planning group is to:-

be a **partnership** between children and young people, families, communities and representatives of agencies at locality level at a geography that makes sense to the local community.

draw up a locality **plan** to address priorities identified through **outcomes based planning** and to

**mobilise local resources** from the statutory, voluntary and community sectors to address these priorities – as part of the Children and Young People’s Plan.
To improve outcomes for children, young people and their families by:

- Establishing a local partnership
- Building on existing social networks
- Developing community ownership of need to improve children’s outcomes
- Listening to children, young people and families in relation to their views and needs making the best use of local knowledge
- Needs analysis, and mapping existing provision - outcomes based planning
- Drawing up a local plan to address local priorities
- Mobilising local resources
- Developing Services to meet the needs of children, young people and their families
Key components of Outcomes Based Planning

Outcome indicators
Trends over time
“turning the curve”

All agencies working in the area – partnership
“local knowledge and emerging needs”

Knowledge of services capacity and gaps
Family Support Database/Family Support Hubs

Emerging issues
What will work?
Children, Young people, Parents Communities
East Belfast Locality Planning Group
Early stages of preparation for implementation


Understanding of the local big picture
Current status of efforts
How can the innovation contribute
Mobilise interest consensus and support among key stakeholders
Identify champions
Clarify feasibility
How functions can be mainstreamed
Long term plan

Edwards et al. (2000)
Figure 5 Stages of implementation

1. Exploring & preparing
2. Planning & resourcing
3. Implementing & operationalising
4. Business as usual

Source: Adapted by CES from Fixsen et al. (2005)
Source: Adapted by CES from the Intervention Assessment Tool developed by the National Implementation Research Network, USA, 2009
Identify the needs of those who will be interacting with the innovation through consultation and research.

Building Partnerships
Relationships
Key Stakeholders
Local Champions
Needs Assessment
Monitoring Outcomes
Participation of children, young people, parents and communities in the decision making processes.
Assess the innovations fit with current initiatives, priorities, structures and values

Mapping local services
Needs analysis
Identifying gaps
Resource Availability

Identify the necessary resources

Mobilising local resources

Feed in and influence Outcomes Group Funding Decisions

IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT TOOL

LOCALITY PLANNING
Evidence

Consult the evidence on what works, with whom and what is cost effective

LOCALITY PLANNING

What will work
Including
low cost and no cost
Innovation Readiness

Ensure the innovation is ready to be implemented and the internal expertise exists to implement it

Linking back to the fit
Commissioning process Provider ability

IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT TOOL

LOCALITY PLANNING
IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT TOOL

- Assess Capacity
- Capacity to Implement

LOCALITY PLANNING

- Local buy in
- Local staffing market
- Implementation Team
- Monitoring and Feedback
Stage 2  Planning and resourcing

Locality Planning Group
Commissioning / Procurement

Stage 3  Implementing and Operationalising

Implementation Team
Monitoring and feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultation and buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to Implementation

External Environment
  needs assessment, mapping and fit

Resistance to change
  local decision making
  champions / stakeholders

Vested Interests
  local decision making
NETWORK OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S LOCALITY GROUPS

Locality Group exists
“Our aim is to raise the educational, health and social development of our children in the Larne area and the environment they live by:

• Listening to them to find their views and needs;

• Building on existing social partnerships;

• Developing stronger community ownership;

• Providing a needs-led range of leisure, social, health, educational and housing services in locally agreed and accessible locations”
LARNE LOCALITY PARTNERSHIP

Examples of Service Developments

- Barnardos Pyramid Plus
- Barnardos Pyramid Transition Clubs
- Larne Parental Support Project (Action For Children) 0-4 .. 5-8
- Larne Peer Education Project
- YO – Intergenerational Young People & Older People - Mentoring
- Sure Start – Additional to LEAP (with Carrick CSP)
- Early Intervention For The Prevention of Offending 8-13 year olds
  - Fund Community Groups/Parenting e.g. Antiville Computer Suite
- Families Matter – range of services across Northern OG Area
- Choices - Family Support Services
  - Adolescents – 10-17 Learning Disabilities & Sensory Impairment
  - Services for Locality Area
- Locality worker & Participation Worker
- Family Support Hub Development
- Chill and Spill

Increased Interagency Partnerships working

Sharing of Information

Increased Access & Knowledge of External Funding

Services Joined Up More At Front Line

Increased Interagency Referrals

2000
2002
2003
2004
2006
2008
2009
2011
2014
### Children and young people taking up the service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Current Value</td>
<td>NI Avg</td>
<td>Baseline 08</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiville</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>🔻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyloran</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>🔻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Primary Pupils less than 85% attendance (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiville</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>🔻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyloran</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>🔻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Post Primary Pupils less than 85% attendance (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes

Percentage less than 85% attendance post primary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.cypsp.org
Strong contributory relationship between locality planning and implementation – e.g. shorter lead in times

Between locality planning and improved outcomes

Need to measure effect on implementation in order to maximise the benefits
“Our understanding of implementation as a process is advancing.

Measurement of implementation must account for the dynamic process.

Patterns of implementation behavior from sites that are successful can help shed light on optimal behavior.

Our challenge is to integrate empirical knowledge regarding successful implementation behavior with user friendly feedback systems to guide future adopters.”
Next Steps

Complete survey of Service providers

Opportunities to develop measurements locally as new services implemented

Explore linkages and learning from conference
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