CENTRE FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICES

CYPSC
CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES COMMITTEES

A Brief Review of Planning and Reporting Arrangements of Interagency Initiatives

Undertaken by Colma Nic Lughadha and Lisa Ann Kennedy

August 2016

Introduction

Children and Young People's Services Committees (CYPSC) are a key structure identified by Government to plan and co-ordinate services for children and young people in every county in Ireland. The overall purpose is to improve outcomes for children and young people through local and national interagency working. In 2015 the Department of Children and Youth Affairs published a *Blueprint for the development of Children and Young People's Services Committees*. It outlines the strategic and operational development of CYPSC within the context of *Better Outcomes Brighter Futures: The National Policy Framework for Children and Young People 2014-2020*. It also forms the basis for a work programme for the CYPSC initiative which includes an enhancement of the planning and reporting process of CYPSC locally and nationally.

Within this context work is being undertaken to explore how existing CYPSC planning and reporting arrangements might be developed further in order to ensure an integration of planning and reporting, as a means to

- continue to promote evidence-informed provision and practice
- heighten learning locally and nationally
- reflect the considerable work of CYPSC locally
- evidence the contribution of CYPSC interagency working in improving outcomes for children and young people in Ireland.

This brief review of planning and reporting arrangements of inter-agency initiatives was undertaken as a step along the development pathway. The review's purpose is to help in identifying, clarifying and informing how the Children and Young People's Services Committees (CYPSC) initiative might advance its planning and reporting framework. The Review has been written to support the Department of Children and Youth Affairs in its role as policy lead for CYPSC and as a tool, for use by the range of CYPSC leaders, members and stakeholders, to support their engagement in this process of developing the CYPSC Planning and Reporting Framework.

This is *not* an evaluation of other reporting frameworks, rather it highlights some approaches to planning and reporting and the types of information that could be usefully included in a planning and reporting framework for CYPSC. It will assist in identifying relevant issues to be resolved, and it is intended that observations within this review be used to stimulate discussion around these issues.

The initiatives reviewed included interagency initiatives from Ireland, the UK and the USA. They were similar in that they each involved public services working together in order to improve outcomes for a particular group (e.g. drug users, at-risk children, children and young people). The review suggests a number of similarities and differences between the reporting arrangements of the various initiatives. It involved both documentary analysis and, where possible, discussions with individuals working within the initiatives. By examining a sample of national and international interagency initiatives it has been possible to:

- identify a range of approaches adopted;
- identify some key features of planning and reporting of each initiative;
- identify some strengths and limitations of different approaches to planning and reporting;
- consider how different initiatives report (or do not) the interagency aspects of their work;

- observe that format and structure by themselves do not necessarily determine the quality of a plan or a report.

Generally, it was easier to determine how the planning and reporting process is *intended* to work for different initiatives (by looking for example at statutory obligations, guidance and templates), rather than how it works in practice.

This exercise in reviewing arrangements across a number of initiatives and jurisdictions also recognises that while style is no substitute for substance, it does promote accessibility and engagement. It also raises a number of important of questions for CYPSC with regard to a planning and reporting framework, including:

- What are the core purposes of planning and reporting for CYPSC?
- Which features are most relevant for a CYPSC planning and reporting framework?
- Who is the audience for CYPSC plans and reports?
- How will plans and reports be used both nationally and locally?
- What should CYPSC be reporting on?
- To what extent should there be uniformity and divergence across reports from different CYPSC?
- How can CYPSC address issues of complexity, breadth and quality in planning and reporting?
- How frequently should plans and reports be developed?
- How can a proportionate balance be struck between planning/reporting and implementation?

Method

The interagency initiatives were chosen based on prior knowledge of their existence. In each case an online search was conducted to identify existing plans and reports in the public domain, in addition to other relevant documents, including legislation, guidance, templates, evaluations of planning and reporting arrangements. In cases where there was an existing relationship with key informants, contact was made and arrangements for a discussion (conference call or skype) were made.

Seven initiatives were reviewed. These are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. **Interagency initiatives reviewed**

Interagency Initiative name	Country / Jurisdiction
Children and Young People's Services Committees (CYPSC)	Ireland
Drugs and Alcohol Task Forces (DATF)	Ireland
Communities that Care (CTC)	Pennsylvania, USA
Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCB)	England, UK
Children's Trusts (CT)	England, UK
Children's Services Planning (CSP)	Scotland, UK
Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP)	Northern Ireland, UK

Discussions were held with key informants from two of these initiatives (DATF and CTC), email communication was exchanged in relation to initiatives in England and one of the project team members acted as a key informant for the CYPSC initiative i.e. the National Co-ordinator for CYPSC.

Eleven predominant features were identified across the initiative reviewed through basic analysis of the documents identified, discussions with key informants (where relevant) and project team discussions. These features are:

i. Thematic Framework
ii. Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA)
iii. Templates
iv. Local Plans
v. Reporting Guidelines
vi. Staffing
vii. Programme Budget
viii. Centralised Data Systems
ix. Interagency Performance Data
x. Trend Analysis
xi. Cross Comparability

These features are presented across the interagency initiatives reviewed in Table 2. overleaf and are described in more detail including some observations about strengths and limitations in Table 3.

Additional features not presented in the table were also identified through the review process, including prescribed target groups to be reported on, a legal requirement to produce plans and reports, the contents of plans and reports, the publishing of plans and reports, and the frequency of planning and reporting.

Table 2. **Key features of planning and reporting identified across the interagency initiatives reviewed**

Initiative	Thematic Framework	OBA	Local Plans	Reporting Guidelines	Templates		Staffing	Programme Budget	Centralised Data Systems	Interagency Performance Data	Trend Analysis	Cross Comparability
					Plans	Reports						
CYPSC Ireland	✓	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	×
DATF Ireland	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×
CTC Pennsylvania, USA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LSCB England	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
CT England	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
CSP Scotland	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	×	×	×	×
CYPSP Northern Ireland	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓

CYPSC – Children and Young People's Services Committees
DATF – Drug and Alcohol Task Forces
CTC – Communities that Care
LSCB – Local Safeguarding Children's Board
CT – Children's Trust
CSP – Children's Services Planning
CYPSP – Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership
OBA – Outcomes Based Accountability

Table 3: **Purpose, composition, strengths and limitations of planning and reporting identified across the interagency initiatives reviewed**

Name and purpose of initiative	Composition	Strengths	Limitations
Children and Young People's Services Committees (Ireland) **A key structure identified by Government to plan and co-ordinate services for children and young people in every county in Ireland. The overall purpose is to improve outcomes for children and young people through local and national interagency working.**	County-level committees that bring together the main statutory, community and voluntary providers of services to children and young people. Members include Tusla-Child and Family Agency, Local Authority, Health Service Executive, An Garda Síochána, Education and Training Board, Probation Service, City/County Childcare Committee, Irish Primary Principals Network, National Association of Principals and Deputy Principals, Community & Voluntary Sector, Young Person (18-24)	Templates available for planning and reporting Quality Assurance Process for Children and Young People's Plans Toolkit for the development of CYPSC	No set of agreed indicators across CYPSC Lack of centralised data collection Limited capacity to produce plans and reports due to limited staffing resources.
Drugs and Alcohol Task Force (Ireland) ***"to combat the threat from problem drug use throughout the country through the use of an area-based partnership approach between the statutory, voluntary & community sectors including public representatives."***	Representatives from a range of organisation, e.g. Probation Services, An Garda Síochána, Health Service Executive, Department of Social Protection, City and/or County Council (local authority), Drug User Forum, T.Ds, Councillors	Information gathered relates clearly to the National Drugs Strategy (NDS) and also to the local drugs strategy A performance measurement framework for DATF is in development	Limited information gathered on what each individual member of the DATF contributes. No information on the quality of collaborative working or evaluation on collaboration efforts Limited information on how these reports are used at a national level or how they feed back into the implementation of the NDS.
Communities that Care, Pennsylvania (USA) ***"CTC is an 'operating system' that takes communities through a well-defined and structured process to prevent adolescent problem behaviours and promote positive youth development."***	CTC communities form a broad-based coalition of relevant representatives, e.g. law enforcement, social services, health services, education, community activism.	Central data collection system Accessible data collection tools (EXCEL) University expertise supporting data capture (EPISCenter, Penn State University) Focussed - information gathered relates clearly to Risk & Protective Factors Reporting captures information on membership of CTC and meeting metrics e.g. information around meeting attendance - this helps to build an evidence base to capture learning on the interagency factors that support implementation. Reporting on Evidence Based Programmes captures information on outcomes of the	There are several different reporting activities which are not necessarily drawn together to produce an overall picture of the CTC initiative. While interagency work is reported this is limited to outputs. There is no data collection on perceived level of networking, collaboration, referral, attitudes.

Name and purpose of initiative	Composition	Strengths	Limitations
		evidence based programmes selected. Information from Pennsylvania Youth Survey (PAYS) can be used to inform planning, reporting and overall evaluation of impact.	
Local Safeguarding Children Board (England) ***"The LSCB is the key statutory mechanisms for agreeing how the statutory partners will co-operate to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in its locality."***	The LSCB should be comprised of the following (where applicable): Local authority, district councils; the chief officer of police; the National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies; the Youth Offending Team; NHS England and clinical commissioning groups; NHS Trusts and NHS Foundation Trusts; Cafcass*; the governor or director of any secure training centre in the area of the authority; the governor or director of any prison in the area of the authority which ordinarily detains children, the governing body of a school; the proprietor of a college; the governing body of a further education institution. *Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service.	Statutory footing of LSCB within Local Authority National Framework of Indicators Centralised data collection Cross comparison - Local versus National; Local versus Local Trend analysis Data is presented with strong analysis, commentary, interpretation.	Large volume of data / information to analyse Interagency measures qualitative and subjective Limited information on how reports are used at a national level.
Children's Trust (England) **Children's Trust brings all partners with a role in improving outcomes for children together to agree plans and prioritise their services to improve children's well-being and to ensure services work closely together - particularly on issues where partnership working is essential to make progress.**	Members are drawn from the following bodies: Local authority, including the Director of Children's Services and councillors including the Lead Member for Children's Services, Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB), Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board, Police, Third sector, Schools, Clinical Commissioning Groups. In addition, some areas' membership extends to the fire services and further education sectors.	Data sets from central Presentation of plans - attractive, clear, accessible language Strong analysis of data, trends	Profusion of planning and reporting formats Complexity of structures and how they relate to each other E.G: - LSCB - Children's Trusts - Health and Well-being Board - Joint Commissioning Board - Thematic Sub Groups Diversity across England ref how Children's Trusts drive change.

Name and purpose of initiative	Composition	Strengths	Limitations
Children's Services Planning (Scotland) ***"to work together to design, plan and deliver services for children and families"***	Health board, local authority, and relevant service providers for example, the Chief Constable of the Police Service of Scotland; the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service; the Principal Reporter; the National Convener of Children's Hearings Scotland; the Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service; and an integration joint board.	Local flexibility regarding the format of reporting and the outcomes that could be reported on, while still being underpinned by a set of defined aims. All Children's Services Plans must be prepared with a view to securing the achievement of certain national aims. However, Scottish Ministers have not set specific outcomes. This provides a local authority and the relevant health board with the flexibility to identify outcomes and objectives which correspond to local needs and context (i.e. demographics, community assets, resources, etc.), and ensures that the Children's Services Plan can be linked into the 'local outcomes improvement plan', the Health and Social Care Strategic Plan, and other relevant local plans.	Some difficulty in comparing across reports due to the flexibility of permissible formats and outcomes and the lack of centrally collected and disseminated data. No focus on interagency working or how it was achieved/challenges encountered Reports are not brought together to give a national picture.
Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (Northern Ireland) **"Agencies, children and young people, families and communities across Northern Ireland working together - to improve outcomes for children and young people through integrated planning and commissioning"**	A multi-agency partnership comprising Chief Executives of statutory agencies and senior representation of organisations from the community sector and voluntary sector. Comprises multiple levels *National CYPSP *Outcomes Group x5 (District Council) *Regional Sub Groups (Targeted at specific minority groups) *Locality Planning Groups *Family Support Hubs	Centralised data collection. Agreed indicator set aligned to 6 national outcomes. Cross comparison - Local versus National; Local versus Local Trend analysis	Uncertain whether indicators were selected based on their availability for data collection rather than their suitability to inform the work. Data is presented with limited analysis, commentary, and interpretation.

Overview of key features identified through the review process

The review identified eleven predominant features of the planning and reporting processes of the 7 initiatives explored.

i. Thematic Framework
ii. Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA)
iii. Templates
iv. Local Plans
v. Reporting Guidelines
vi. Staffing
vii. Programme Budget
viii. Centralised Data Systems
ix. Interagency Performance Data
x. Trend Analysis
xi. Cross Comparability

These are outlined in more detail to follow. Additional features that were not so prominent across a majority of initiatives are also outlined below.

Key Features:

i. Thematic Framework:

Each initiative was expected to plan and report according to a particular 'thematic framework' which described the kinds of outcomes that the initiatives were aiming to achieve, or aspects of the policy framework within which the initiatives operate.

- CYPSC are currently expected to plan and report according to the five National Outcomes for Children and Young People outlined in *Better Outcomes Brighter Futures* i.e. Active and Healthy, Achieving in all areas of learning and development, Safe and protected from harm, Economic security and opportunity, and Connected, respected and contributing. They are also expected to operate according to the six transformational goals i.e. Support parents, Earlier intervention and prevention, Listen to and involve children and young people, Ensure quality services, Strengthen transitions, and Cross-government and interagency collaboration and co-ordination.
- DATF are expected to plan and report according to the five pillars of the National Drugs Strategy i.e. Supply reduction, Prevention, Treatment, Rehabilitation and Research.
- CTC planning and reporting activities are expected to refer to how their activities influence the risk and protective factors measured in the Pennsylvania Youth Survey (PAYS).
- LSCB and CT are expected to plan and report according to the *Children's Safeguarding Performance Information Framework*. The framework is broken down into five themes, with national performance information items and approaches to local information for each i.e. Outcomes for children and young people and their families, Child protection activity (including early help), the Quality and timeliness of decision making, the Quality of child protection plans, Workforce.
- CSP plans and reports are expected to relate to how children's services safeguard, support and promote the wellbeing of children in a given area. Eight wellbeing indicators are

prescribed i.e. Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Active, Respected, Responsible and Included – referred to locally as the SHANARRI outcomes.

- CYPSP are expected to plan and report with reference to the six Outcomes for Children and Young People outlined in the Children's Strategy - *Our Children and Young People: Our Pledge* i.e. Enjoying Learning and Achieving, Experiencing Economic and Environmental Wellbeing, Contributing Positively to Community and Society, Living in Safety with Stability, Healthy, Living in a Society that Respects their Rights.

ii. Outcomes Based Accountability:

An outcomes based accountability (OBA) approach focuses on outcomes that are desired and monitoring and evidencing progress towards those desired outcomes. OBA is characterised by the collection and utilisation of relevant data. It is concerned with population accountability and performance accountability. Population accountability is about monitoring improvements in outcomes for a particular population in a particular geographical area, and performance accountability is concerned with performance of a service and improving outcomes for a particular group of service users. OBA uses performance management categories which distinguish between 'How much did we do?', 'How well did we do it?' and, importantly, 'Is anyone better off?'

CTC, LSCB, CT, and CYPSP can all be described as adopting an OBA approach.

iii. Local Plans:

Each initiative involved planning and reporting processes which were tailored to a local context, as well as planning and reporting within a broader thematic framework. Plans and reports for each initiative were expected to describe relevant details about the contexts in which they operated.

iv. Reporting Guidelines:

Guidelines on what to report and how to report were available for some initiatives. Statutory guidance on reporting was available for LSCB, non-statutory guidance was available for CSP. A handbook published in 2011 offers guidance on reporting for DATF. There is currently no overall guidance on how CT or CYPSC should report.

v. Templates:

While all initiatives were expected to plan and report according to a particular thematic framework, only some initiatives had specific prescribed planning and/or reporting formats and templates.

- CYPSC, CTC and CYPSP had specific planning templates.
- CYPSC, DATF and CTC, CYPSP had specific reporting templates.
- CSP, CT and CYPSP do not have specific reporting templates. Of note is that CSP plans and reports may be constituent elements of other plans and reports.

vi. Staffing for operations:

- CYPSC have 1 National Co-ordinator and Local Co-ordinators for each CYPSC
- DATF have staff teams for local delivery
- CTC can draw on a staff team at the Evidence-based Prevention and Intervention Support Center (EPISCenter), and have local 'community mobilisers' for each CTC
- LSCB are staffed by Local Authority children's services staff
- Children's Trusts are staffed by Local Authority children's services staff
- CSP duties are fulfilled by local authority and health board staff

- CYPSP have a strategic partnership staff team employed by the Health and Social Care Board and local organisers for locality planning groups.

vii. Programme Budget:

Most initiatives were financed by the organisations involved in the interagency initiative. DATF and CTC can be described as holding programme budgets. DATF programmes are funded by the Health Service Executive and CTC programme activities are funded by Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) grants.

viii. Centralised Data Systems:

Over half of the initiatives were able to draw on a centralised data system for relevant local and national data (CTC, LSCB, CT, CYPSP).

ix. Interagency Performance Data:

Most initiatives collected some basic interagency data, for example data on membership. Details reported on varied from membership only, to reporting on meeting attendance and each member's contribution to the initiative i.e. by way of activities, funding or staff. More sophisticated measures of interagency working were generally lacking.

x. Trend Analysis:

Initiatives which can draw on a centralised data system (CTC, LSCB, CT, CYPSP) were in the best position to be able to conduct an analysis of trends over time. However, all initiatives were potentially in a position to do this, depending on whether they collected data and then reported on this data at regular intervals over time.

xi. Cross Comparability:

Initiatives which can draw on a centralised data system (CTC, LSCB, CT, CYPSP) were in the best position to be able to make local to national comparisons, and local to local comparison. For example, in Northern Ireland local CYPSP can compare outcomes in their area to national outcome data.

Intentional support and structuring for cross comparability was not apparent within the other initiatives reviewed. However cross comparability would be possible within initiatives if matching data is collected and reported within similar timeframes. For example CYPSC County Level Data Sheets do allow for cross comparability across CYPSC areas, however the production of these sheets is not currently systematised.

Additional features:

Additional points not presented in Table 2 were also identified through the review process; including the frequency of planning and reporting, prescribed target groups to be reported on, a legal requirement to produce plans and reports, the contents of plans and reports, the publishing of plans and reports, and who plans or reports are submitted to. Elaboration on the first four additional features is provided below.

- ***Frequency of planning and reporting***

Generally the initiatives involved strategic plans, covering time periods of approximately three years. These strategic plans were broken down into annual plans, which were termed differently for e.g. business plans for LSCB, or operational plans for DATF. Initiatives usually produced annual reports, however in the case of CTC the planning and reporting phases overlapped and reporting could be

said to happen more frequently if we interpret their 'benchmarks and milestones' templates as both plans and reports. The 2011 handbook for DATF recommends reporting twice yearly, however reports appear to be produced annually.

- ***Prescribed Target Groups***

While all initiatives reviewed had to plan and report with regard to a particular group or issue in society i.e. drugs – DATF or children and young people/vulnerable children and young people – CYPSC, CTC, LSCB, CT, CSP, CYPSP; some of the initiatives were also required or expected to report on specific target groups within their population. For example groups of vulnerable children and young people who have been identified as a priority such as Black Minority Ethnic, children and young people who are looked after or children and young people who go missing/are suffering or at risk of sexual exploitation.

- ***Legal requirement to produce plans and reports***

Some initiatives were obliged by legislation or statutory guidance to produce plans and/or reports:

- The requirement for LSCB to publish an Annual Report is set out in *Working Together – A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children* (2013).
- CT arrangements are based on a 'duty to co-operate' set out in section 10 of the Children Act 2004, although there is flexibility in how local partners implement this responsibility. Formerly there was statutory guidance on Children's Trusts, *Statutory guidance on co-operation arrangements, including the Children's Trust Board and the Children and Young People's Plan*, but this no longer applies and Children's Trust Boards are no longer required to produce a statutory Children and Young People's Plan. However, they are free to do so where this is felt to be appropriate locally in taking forward a strategy for children's wellbeing. The Children and Young People's Plan was the joint strategy of the Children's Trust partners setting out in detail how they will co-operate to improve well-being for local children and young people.
- The planning and reporting duties for CSP are set out in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 (Section 3 Children's Services Planning)*, and draft non-statutory guidance is currently out for consultation.
- In relation to CYPSP the Children (1995 Order) (Amendment) (Children's Services Planning) Order 1998 requires every Health and Social Services Board to prepare and publish plans for the provision of children's services within its area and to keep those plans under review. In preparing or updating its plans, a Health and Social Services Board is required to consult Health and Social Services trusts, education and library boards, district councils, certain voluntary organisations, the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, the Probation Board for Northern Ireland, the police and other relevant bodies.[1]

- ***Contents of plans and reports***

The contents of plans, reports and accompanying documentation encountered in this exercise to review other interagency initiatives are far ranging and varied. There is a great volume of information available that can be drawn on by the CYPSC initiative to inform the type of information

[1]The Children's Services Co-operation Act (Northern Ireland) 2015 has been enacted in Northern Ireland. It requires NI departments to co-operate with each other to contribute to the achievement of specified outcomes relating to the well-being of children and young people. It creates a duty for all key agencies to co-operate in the planning, commissioning and delivery of children's services.

to be gathered and elicited and also the manner in which data and information can be presented and displayed.

Questions arising for the CYPSC initiative

The features identified pose a number of questions for CYPSC not least of which being "which features are most relevant for a CYPSC planning and reporting framework?" These questions are proffered below. Addressing some or all of these questions will rely on a shared understanding of

- the purpose of CYPSC and of CYPSC planning and reporting,
- how the plans and reports will be used,
- the audience for CYPSC plans and reports.

Questions arising

- *Thematic Framework* –
  - What framework should be used for planning and reporting – five national outcomes? Six Transformational Goals? Both?
- *Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA)*
  - Is this an appropriate approach to planning and reporting for CYPSC?
  - Is it likely that CYPSC will have access to the types of data and data systems required for Outcomes Based Accountability?
- *Templates*
  - Are templates useful for CYPSC? How much variability is acceptable between reports?
- *Local Plans*
  - What should the relationship be between local priorities, plans and reports, and national priorities, plans and reports?
- *Reporting Guidelines*
  - How detailed should reporting guidelines be?
- *Staffing*
  - What challenges for planning and reporting are posed by limited numbers of staff?
- *Programme Budget*
  - What can reasonably be expected to be achieved relative to programme budget?
  - How can a balance be struck between time spent planning, reporting, delivery and available programme budget?
- *Centralised Data Systems*
  - In the absence of a centralised data system, how can CYPSC plans and reports reflect both the national and local context?
  - How can evidence-informed planning be supported?
- *Interagency Performance Data*
  - The purpose of CYPSC is 'To ensure effective interagency co-ordination and collaboration to achieve the best outcomes for all children and young people in its area'; does that mean that plans and reports should have a focus on interagency work?
- *Trend Analysis*
  - What sort of data will CYPSC need in order to conduct useful trend analyses?
- *Cross Comparability*
  - Is it useful/necessary to be able to compare CYPSC to each other and/or to a national picture?

- What sort of data will CYPSC need in order to conduct useful cross comparisons?
- *Prescribed Target Groups*
- Are there particular target groups that all CYPSC should report on?
- *Legal requirement to produce plans and reports*
- What encourages CYPSC to plan and to report?
- *Contents of reports*
- How detailed should the reports be?
- How will reports reflect implementation of the CYPSC three-year Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP)?
- How will reports cultivate learning?
- *Frequency of planning and reporting –*
- How often should plans and reports be produced?

Conclusion

A brief review of the planning and reporting arrangements of seven interagency initiatives was undertaken in order to help inform how the CYPSC initiative might further develop its planning and reporting framework. Eleven predominant features and four additional features of planning and reporting frameworks were identified.

Consideration of these features raises a number of questions for the development of the CYPSC planning and reporting framework. These questions concern the core purpose of CYPSC planning and reporting, the intended audience, content, the frequency with which plans and reports should be developed, the availability and utilisation of relevant data, and issues to do with resourcing.

It will be necessary to engage in discussion and debate with each other about the material presented in this review with a view to identifying the most practicable, efficient and appropriate way forward. Strengthening CYPSC interagency working towards improving outcomes for children and young people in Ireland being central to those discussions. Addressing some or all of the questions posed by this review can usefully inform the further development of CYPSC and in particular the development of a CYPSC planning and reporting framework.