

Family Justice Board

Action Plan to Improve the Performance
of the Family Justice System

Family Justice Board

Action Plan to Improve the
Performance of the Family
Justice System

January 2013

Contents

Foreword from Chair of the Family Justice Board	3
The Family Justice Board	4
Vision for the Family Justice System	6
Background to the FJB Action Plan	9
The Family Justice Board Action Plan	11
Annex A: Family Justice Board – Terms of Reference	22

Foreword from Chair of the Family Justice Board



It gives me great pleasure to introduce the Family Justice Board's Action Plan. This sets out the actions the Board and its partners have in hand, or planned, to achieve the Government's vision of a family justice system that supports the delivery of the best possible outcomes for all children who come into contact with it.

Much has already been done since the publication of the final report of the Family Justice Review, which I chaired, in November 2011.

The Government accepted the great majority of the Review's recommendations in its Response published in February 2012. This has led on to an ambitious, cross-agency programme of work to address the issues identified in the Review. This Action Plan now sets out the contribution of the Family Justice Board and its partners to the reform agenda, highlighting the major cross-system actions we are undertaking to deliver improvements in private law, public law and the coherence and co-ordination of the family justice system as a whole.

The Plan runs until 2015, three years after the Board's creation, and will be reviewed and updated annually. The Plan currently focuses on actions the Board will deliver by 2013 and 2014. Further actions for 2015 will be included in subsequent iterations, as we review our progress and update our Action Plan accordingly.

This plan sets out a comprehensive, challenging programme of work. But the performance of the Board will not be measured simply by whether it has delivered these actions – rather Ministers will assess our performance by whether our work has delivered the system-wide improvements in performance they expect. The Key Performance Measures, as set out in this report, will be used to assess whether our work has actually made a difference.

But we are also very aware that these kinds of measures can distort behaviour and lead to perverse results. We shall be alert to this risk, and we aim also in the next three years to develop so far as possible ways of tracking the outcomes for children and families. We shall keep firmly in mind that better outcomes are the aim of this whole exercise.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Norgrove". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

David Norgrove

The Family Justice Board

1. The Family Justice Board (FJB) was established in March 2012 as part of the Government response to the Family Justice Review. The Board's overall aim is to drive significant improvements in the performance of the family justice system where performance is defined in terms of how effective (and efficient) the system is in supporting the delivery of the best possible outcomes for children who come into contact with it.
2. In delivering against its high-level aim, the Board has a particular focus on four key aspects of system performance as follows:
 - a) reducing delay in public law cases and making progress against the proposed six month¹ time limit for care cases;
 - b) resolving private law cases out of court where appropriate;
 - c) building greater cross-agency coherence; and
 - d) tackling variations in local performance.

Membership

3. The FJB's members are senior figures from the core organisations within the family justice system in England and Wales: Government departments, delivery agencies, local authorities and, as observers, the judiciary. Board members retain their own existing lines of accountability but are committed to working together collectively in order to achieve their shared aim. The Board has an independent Chair appointed by Ministers and its Terms of Reference are at Annex A.
4. To complement and support the work of the FJB, a Family Justice Network for Wales has also been established to advise on specific Welsh issues and deliver specific actions on devolved aspects of family justice in Wales.

Sub-groups

5. The Board has three key sub-groups to support its work:
 - a) the Performance Improvement Sub-Group (PISG) which, on behalf of the FJB, analyses the available performance information and galvanises action to improve performance at the national and local levels;
 - b) the Family Justice Council which acts as an independent "critical friend" providing the FJB with expert advice, from an inter-disciplinary perspective, on the operation and reform of the family justice system; and
 - c) the Young People's Board which supports the FJB's work and helps it to be child-centred by enabling young people to have a direct say in its work.

¹ While the Board's Terms of Reference refer to a six month time limit, the relevant legislation will be framed as a 26 week limit.

6. There is also a network of 46 Local Family Justice Boards (LFJBs) established to drive significant improvements in performance at the local level. Each is sponsored, supported and challenged by the FJB and the PISG.

Accountability

7. The Family Justice Board is accountable to the Secretaries of State for Justice and Education and reports to them on its progress in improving system performance. In addition, the FJB will provide updates on progress to Welsh Ministers (although it is not directly accountable to them). At the centre of these arrangements is a set of Key Performance Measures (KPMs) which are reviewed and agreed annually between Ministers and the Board and for which Board members are collectively accountable.

8. In 2012–13, the KPMs are as follows:

- KPM-1) Average duration of section 31 care or supervision cases.²
- KPM-2) Proportion of new³ section 31 care or supervision cases on the “standard” track that are completed within 26 weeks.
- KPM-3) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “exceptional” track that are completed within the timetable for the child as set by the judge.
- KPM-4) Timeliness of progression of section 8 cases⁴ in court, comprising:
 - a) Proportion of section 8 cases where the FHDRA⁵ or urgent first hearing takes place within six weeks; and
 - b) Average time from application to first full order for section 8 cases.
- KPM-5) Take-up and initial effectiveness of publicly-funded family mediation comprising:
 - c) Number of couples attending a MIAM⁶ where one or both parties are publicly-funded; and
 - d) Number of publicly-funded family mediations reaching full agreement on the issues in dispute.

² These are cases under section 31 of the Children Act 1989 where local authorities apply for orders placing the child in care of, or under supervision of, the local authority.

³ For KPM-2 and KPM-3, “new” is defined as cases that commenced on or after 1 April 2012, the date that the new Care Monitoring System, which tracks all care cases, went live.

⁴ These are cases under section 8 of the Children Act 1989 primarily involving parents who, following separation or divorce, have been unable to agree future arrangements for their children.

⁵ First Hearing Dispute Resolution Appointment, the first major milestone in private law cases.

⁶ Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting, which all prospective court applicants (in private law cases) are expected to attend before applying to court.

Vision for the Family Justice System

9. In its Response to the Family Justice Review, the Government set out its **vision of having a family justice system that effectively supports the delivery of the best possible outcomes for all children who come into contact with it.** This vision drives the Family Justice Board's high-level aim and objectives which, in turn, are the basis for its Key Performance Measures.
10. The vision described above is far removed from the dispiriting picture painted by the Family Justice Review (FJR) which described a poorly performing system characterised by delay, expense, bureaucracy and lack of trust. A system where unnecessary delay in public law cases meant that children were denied stability in their lives, where too many separating parents argued in court over their children's arrangements, and where children and adults were often confused about what was happening to them and why. In summary, a system that, in many ways, was not really a system at all.
11. The Family Justice Board will play a key role in supporting the delivery of the Government's vision by putting in place a system where, **by March 2015:**
 - i) children's welfare continues to be demonstrably the paramount consideration in any proceedings determining the upbringing of a child and that the system and its practice better reflects this;
 - ii) all agencies and individuals within the family justice system work together to achieve the best possible outcomes for children;
 - iii) case duration in public law cases is significantly reduced, with care and supervision cases completed within 26 weeks, apart from when the court determines that there is a need to extend beyond this as it is in the child's best interests;
 - iv) separating parents are encouraged and supported to resolve issues concerning their children's arrangements out of court, using mediation or parenting support services, unless it is really necessary for the courts to become involved;
 - v) the wishes and feelings of children are actively sought and given careful consideration in the process of determining the outcome of court applications about them;
 - vi) variations in local performance are narrowed by bringing the worst performing local systems up to the level of the best;
 - vii) good practice and innovation are identified and shared widely to help facilitate a continuous process of system-wide improvement supported by feedback to the courts on the impact of decisions made on the outcomes for children; and
 - viii) the totality of resources, both financial and otherwise, within the system are used effectively and efficiently.

12. The Board's Action Plan sets out the actions the Board and its partners will take to achieve our vision for the family justice system between now and March 2015, three years after the Board's creation. The FJB will monitor whether the actions are being delivered and assess, with particular reference to the KPMs, whether they are delivering the performance improvements that we are seeking to achieve. At present, the actions covered in the plan are concentrated in the years 2013 and 2014 but further actions, particularly for 2015, will be added as we monitor our progress and consider what more needs to be done.
13. By March 2013, a year after the FJB's creation, we will have:
 - Developed and disseminated a safeguarding toolkit for use by agencies that provide dispute resolution and other supporting services to separating parents outside of the court process.
 - Consulted on new quality standards for expert evidence and how these can be enforced.
 - Identified the main areas of practice where performance most needs to improve and formulated a programme of performance improvement actions in response.
 - Identified the local areas where there are the greatest challenges overall (particularly delays in public law), and taken forward targeted action to support those areas.
 - Established a Knowledge Hub to aid the dissemination of research on key aspects of family justice to stakeholders and professionals across the system.
 - Ensured Local Family Justice Boards are set up, have in place Chairs, are meeting regularly and have in place robust monitoring arrangements by October 2012.
 - Successfully piloted the new HMCTS Care Monitoring System (CMS), for care cases issued after 1st April 2012, which provides an effective tracking tool for each case and hard data on any drivers of delay within each care centre area.
14. By March 2014, year two of the Board's operation, we will have:
 - Agreed and disseminated new quality standards for expert evidence (subject to consultation).
 - Rolled out a Programme of early support for Local Authorities, targeting key areas of court-related skills and pre-proceedings practice and providing models for quality assurance processes.
 - Made fully operational the updated Operating Framework across all Cafcass areas to help Cafcass staff ensure proportionate use of their time.
 - Developed referrals and approaches so that parents can take up Parenting Information Programmes to support the resolution of disputes out-of-court.
 - Developed and introduced a system for private law children cases to enable less complex cases to be resolved more quickly and to provide better support to self-represented parties.

- Developed and published processes to assist courts, other parties and self-represented litigants to support self represented litigants through private law court proceedings, while maintaining fairness to all the parties involved.
 - Developed a new system so that where a court order is breached within the first 12 months the case can be returned to court within a matter of weeks with the aim of resolving the issue at that hearing, or if the issue cannot be resolved, setting a clear timetable for moving the matter forward.
15. By March 2015, year three of the Board's operation, we will have:
- Delivered a full communications strategy to publicise effectively the Board's priorities and programme of work for reforming the system throughout the first three years of its operation.
 - Developed, monitored and reviewed a framework of the outcomes experienced by children who come into contact with the family justice system.

Background to the FJB Action Plan

16. The FJB's Terms of Reference specify seven objectives, the first of which is:
"To develop and monitor the implementation of a system-wide plan which sets out clear actions to be taken within, and particularly across, delivery agencies, in order to achieve significant improvements in system performance"
17. This objective stems from the Family Justice Review's recommendation that a "central coordinating board" for the family justice system should "develop and monitor implementation of a system wide strategic plan and set out clear actions to be taken across and within agencies". In turn, this was driven by the Review's conclusion that the system lacked a "set of shared objectives to bind agencies and professionals to a common goal and to support joint working and planning between them".
18. **The primary purpose of the Action Plan is, therefore, to set out the most important actions that the FJB and its members will take to improve the performance of the family justice system. Delivery against its Action Plan is the principal way in which the Board will meet its aim, deliver against its Key Performance Measures and achieve Government's vision for the system.**
19. The Action Plan is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of each and every action that is being taken to improve system performance. Instead, and following the same approach as the KPMs, which capture specific aspects of performance, the Action Plan highlights only those actions that are critical to meeting the FJB's aim, delivering its KPMs and achieving Government's vision for the family justice system. The plan is not intended to duplicate or replace the plans that individual agencies are taking forward to improve their areas of the system, but rather to reflect the main cross-system actions that the FJB is focussing on. The judiciary is also taking forward a major programme of reform to support the modernisation of family justice and we are working closely together as we take forward our respective plans. The senior judiciary sit on the Family Justice Board as observers.
20. The plan captures the activity of the Board until March 2015. It should be noted that the plan is intended to be a live document, to be reviewed and updated regularly so that it accurately captures, and indeed drives, the Board's work to improve the system and its progress in doing so.

Structure of the Action Plan

21. The Action Plan itself is set out in the following table and comprises the actions that delivery agencies and wider support services are taking forward to improve the family justice system. However, the extent to which delivery agencies are able to have an impact on performance will also be shaped by whether the Government is able to implement wider legislative changes to improve the system. These planned changes will, if approved by Parliament, be critical in

enabling the delivery of the improvement actions set out in the plan. These legislative changes include:

- Introducing a 26 week time limit for public law cases;
- Mandating a more focused consideration of key elements of the care plan;
- Removing the requirement to renew Interim Care Orders / Interim Supervision Orders at particular intervals;
- Ensuring decisions are child focused and made with explicit reference to the child's needs and timescales;
- Strengthening controls on the use of experts in proceedings relating to children;
- Legislation to create a Single Family Court;
- Legislation to require anyone who wishes to apply for a court order for children's arrangements or a financial remedy to first attend a meeting to find out about and consider mediation as an alternative to court; and
- Legislation to encourage and support shared parenting and to improve the enforcement of orders made by the court about the arrangements for children.

22. For each action in the FJB Action Plan there is;

- i) an overarching objective;
- ii) its link to the relevant KPMs for the Board;
- iii) a breakdown of the key deliverables or outputs that are necessary for the action to be completed;
- iv) delivery dates; and
- v) information about who, within the FJB, is responsible for delivery and the other organisations and individuals from whom they will need support.

The Family Justice Board Action Plan

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
Action 1 – Complement / support action on case management led by the judiciary, (including publication of the family court guide) to ensure that more robust and effective administrative processes and better case tracking systems for care cases are in place within the family courts.	<p>KPM-1) Average duration of section 31 care or supervision cases;</p> <p>KPM-2) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “standard” track that are completed within 26 weeks;</p> <p>KPM-3) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “exceptional” track that are completed within the timetable for the child as set by judge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4,000 extra days allocated for public law in the county court (on top of previous increases) and ring-fencing of family allocation for magistrates courts • Regional HMCTS action plans in place to address local performance and practice issues (including maximising court capacity, and improving cross-agency working) • New HMCTS Care Monitoring System (CMS) successfully piloted and providing effective tracking tool for each case and hard data on any drivers of delay within each care centre area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed April 2012 • Completed April 2012 • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMCTS • HMCTS • HMCTS
Action 2 – Eliminate the unnecessary commissioning of expert reports and improve the timeliness and quality of those that are commissioned.	<p>KPM-1) Average duration of section 31 care or supervision cases;</p> <p>KPM-2) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “standard” track that are completed within 26 weeks;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for the implementation of the rule changes on experts and provide necessary support and guidance • Work with the Family Justice Council, expert groups, Law Society and local authorities to improve the speed and timeliness of expert reports commissioned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed December 2012 • Completed December 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, Judicial Office, DfE, HMCTS, local authorities • MoJ, FJC, HMCTS

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
	KPM-3) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “exceptional” track that are completed within the timetable for the child as set by judge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on new quality standards for expert evidence and how these can be enforced • Subject to consultation – new quality standards for expert evidence agreed and disseminated, and further consideration on enforcement • Simplification and improvement of LSC processes for the appointment of experts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 2013 • April/May 2013 • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, DH, DfE, Welsh Government, FJC, LSC • MoJ, DH, DfE, Welsh Government, FJC, LSC • LSC
Action 3 – Improve local authority social care practice including work to ensure that the effective court-related social work practice already seen in some areas is extended to all.	<p>KPM-1) Average duration of section 31 care or supervision cases;</p> <p>KPM-2) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “standard” track that are completed within 26 weeks;</p> <p>KPM-3) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “exceptional” track that are completed within the timetable for the child as set by judge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme of early support for local authorities developed and delivered within and across regions, targeting key areas of court-related skills, pre- and post-proceedings practice; and providing resources and information on promising local practice, including performance management and quality assurance processes • Court-related skills embedded within CPD training framework for social workers [subject to confirmation by College of Social Work with similar considerations through Care Council in Wales] • Further piloting and research set in train to support continuous improvement in identified priority areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2013 • April 2013 • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children’s Improvement Board • DfE in collaboration with the College of Social Work • DfE, MoJ

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All local authorities actively engaged in joint improvement and development work within their LFJBs • Updated suite of guidance, resources and training made available for local authorities to support introduction of the key legislative changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2013 • April 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, DfE, local authorities • DfE, local authorities
<p>Action 4 – Ensure the timely appointment of guardians, provision of high quality and timely analytical reports to the court and effective representation of children’s interests.</p>	<p>KPM-1) Average duration of section 31 care or supervision cases;</p> <p>KPM-2) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “standard” track that are completed within 26 weeks;</p> <p>KPM-3) Proportion of new section 31 care or supervision cases on the “exceptional” track that are completed within the timetable for the child as set by judge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompt allocation of children’s guardians to all care cases (KPI 1 and KPI 2 of Cafcass 2012/13 KPI set) • Updated Operating Framework fully operational in England to help Cafcass staff ensure proportionate use of their time • Early learning from Pre-Proceedings Pilot assessed and used to inform/refine Guardian practice • CMS data to provide evidence on whether late appointment of guardians or poor quality / absent guardian analyses are recurring reasons for adjournments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2013 • April 2013 • April 2013 • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cafcass, Cafcass Cymru • Cafcass • Cafcass, local authorities • HMCTS

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
Action 5 – Ensure that self represented litigants are able to negotiate the family justice system effectively.	KPM-4) Timeliness of progression of section 8 cases in court, comprising: a) Proportion of section 8 cases where the FHDRA or urgent first hearing takes place within six weeks; and b) Average time from application to first full order for section 8 cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review mitigating actions being put in place by agencies to deal with the anticipated rise in self represented litigants resulting from Legal Aid reform, identify gaps and make suggestions for further work to the FJB Co-ordinate work both within government and more widely to ensure a comprehensive, consistent approach is taken to supporting self represented litigants in the family justice system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 2013 April 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoJ, HMCTS MoJ, HMCTS
Action 6 – Work through the Family Mediation Council (FMC) to achieve a harmonised system of accreditation for family mediators and better regulation of those services.	KPM-5) Take-up and initial effectiveness of publicly-funded family mediation comprising: a) Number of couples attending a 'Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting' where one or both parties are publicly-funded; and b) Number of publicly-funded family mediations reaching full agreement on the issues in dispute.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review with the FMC the findings of the independent report by Professor McEldowney into (i) whether its member organisations meet the criteria for membership of the FMC and that good practice operates so as to protect the public interest, and (ii) the role of the FMC and whether it needs to be changed or strengthened to meet present and future demands Review with the FMC the specific recommendations and the FMC's action plan and provide advice to the Government on steps it may need to take to assist the development and effective regulation of family mediation services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed July 2012 Completed November 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoJ, LSC MoJ, LSC

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FMC/LSC/MoJ Working Group established to drive forward the McEldowney recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed November 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoJ, LSC
<p>Action 7 – Improve the identification of risk to children or vulnerable adults through non-court services and develop practical tools and guidance for use by these services.</p>	<p>KPM-5) Take-up and initial effectiveness of publicly-funded family mediation comprising:</p> <p>a) Number of couples attending a ‘Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting’ where one or both parties are publicly-funded; and</p> <p>b) Number of publicly-funded family mediations reaching full agreement on the issues in dispute.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family Justice Council to consider and develop proposals for a toolkit and generic guidance for out of court services Communication and dissemination of toolkit and guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spring 2013 April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoJ, LSC, DfE, Cafcass, FJC
<p>Action 8 – In partnership with Judicial Office, develop and implement revised pathways for private law cases.</p>	<p>KPM-4) Timeliness of progression of section 8 cases in court, comprising:</p> <p>a) Proportion of section 8 cases where the FHDRA or urgent first hearing takes place within six weeks; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and evaluate a new process for bringing breach of orders in children’s cases back to court within the list for a short duration hearing New breach return process fully operational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer 2013 (tbc) April/Summer 2014 (tbc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoJ, DfE, Judicial Office, HMCTS, Cafcass, LSC (mediators at court)

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
	<p>b) Average time from application to first full order for section 8 cases.</p> <p>KPM-5) Take-up and initial effectiveness of publicly-funded family mediation comprising:</p> <p>a) Number of couples attending a 'Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting' where one or both parties are publicly-funded; and</p> <p>b) Number of publicly-funded family mediations reaching full agreement on the issues in dispute.</p>			

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
<p>Action 9 – Monitor and improve performance across the system.</p>	<p>All KPMs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Performance Improvement Sub-Group (PISG) to identify the main areas of practice where performance most needs to improve and formulate an ongoing programme of performance improvement actions in response • Using evidence, the PISG to identify the local areas where there are the greatest challenges overall (particularly delays in public law), and take forward targeted action to support those areas. [The Family Justice Network in Wales will develop an action plan to deliver improvements in Wales] • Establish an initial plan for working towards the 26 week time limit • Assess potential impacts of the plan for working towards the 26 week time limit, using available data • Develop, monitor and review a framework of the outcomes experienced by children who come into contact with the family justice system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing from July 2012 • Completed December 2012 • April 2013 • April 2013 • March 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, DfE • MoJ, DfE, Welsh Government • MoJ, DfE • MoJ, DfE • DfE, FJB

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
<p>Action 10 – Improve the quality and consistency of management information, research and advice available on the family justice system to help improve system performance.</p>	<p>All KPMs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the most up to date management information in regular Performance Evidence Packs to PISG • Annual research programme developed in consultation with key stakeholders, designed to address principal evidence gaps identified for delivery of family justice reforms • The Family Justice Council to agree its forward workplan with the FJB and provide expert multi-disciplinary advice on key topics accordingly (to include public law, self represented litigants and use of experts) • Establishment of Knowledge Hub to aid the dissemination of key research to stakeholders and professionals across the system • Improve family court management information so that the system, behaviours, costs and use of resources are better understood • In Wales, initiation of a project to identify key data from across the family justice system which will be used to support the development of an improvement plan for key information sources and establish information flows with a view to informing performance improvement in Wales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing from July 2012 • Completed August 2012 • Completed August 2012 • Completed November 2012 • April 2014 (tbc) • Completed September 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, HMCTS, Cafcass • DfE, MoJ • FJC DfE, MoJ • HMCTS • Welsh Government, Welsh Family Justice Network

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
<p>Action 11 – Establish an effective network of Local Family Justice Boards (LFJBs) that drive performance improvement.</p>	<p>All KPMs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide comprehensive guidance to local bodies, setting out national structures and proposed supporting arrangements at the local level • Ensure Local Family Justice Boards are set up, have Chairs in place and hold their first meetings, where possible, by summer 2012 • PISG agreement on the role of LFJBs, accountability structures and expectations in relation to performance monitoring. Subsequently to have written out to all LFJBs setting out what is expected in terms of performance monitoring, confirming key data returns and what support and challenge LFJBs can expect from the PISG and FJB including in relation to the dissemination of best practice • Ensure priorities are communicated to LFJBs and wider partners by establishing effective communication channels based around LFJB meetings to continue FJR momentum and ensure LFJBs are clear about their role and responsibilities • Ensure every Local Family Justice Board is effectively challenged and supported by matching each LFJB with a sponsor from the FJB, PISG or the Family Justice Network in Wales • Hold regional events for Local Boards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed July 2012 • Completed July 2012 (September 2012 in Wales) • Completed October 2012 • Completed November 2012 • Completed November 2012 • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, DfE, HMCTS, Welsh Government, Judicial Office • MoJ, DfE, HMCTS, Welsh Government, Judicial Office • MoJ, DfE • MoJ, DfE, HMCTS, Welsh Government, Judicial Office • MoJ, DfE • MoJ, DfE

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
<p>Action 12 – Develop an inter-disciplinary workforce strategy that provides everyone in the family justice system with the appropriate training and support to enable further development of skills and knowledge.</p>	<p>All KPMs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First tranche of judicial leadership and management training delivered to key members of the judiciary following recommendations made by Mr Justice Ryder • Second tranche of key skills judicial training delivered to remaining members of the judiciary • Family Justice Workforce development strategy agreed and disseminated across family justice delivery agencies: includes agreed set of core skills and knowledge and an agreed interdisciplinary induction course for family justice practitioners • In Wales, through the Family Justice Network, work to identify key components of a strategy focussing on the devolved aspects of the family justice workforce, including developing court related skills and training, for professionals in Wales to enhance the way professions work together to provide an efficient service for children, young people and families • Work with the FJC to determine the feasibility of establishing a pilot in which judges, magistrates and legal advisors would learn the outcomes for children and families on whom they have adjudicated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed December 2012 • April–June 2013 • December 2013 • April 2013 (tbc) • April 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial Office • Judicial Office • MoJ, FJC, DfE, Welsh Government and all FJ delivery partners • Welsh Government, Welsh Family Justice Network • MoJ, DfE, local authorities, Judicial Office, FJC

Action	Relevant KPMs	Key Deliverables	Delivery Date	Lead Organisation and Main Supporting Partners
Action 13 – Develop and implement a system-wide communications strategy to publicise and secure support for Family Justice Board’s reform agenda.	All KPMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with Family Justice Board partners design a comprehensive communications strategy • Implement the strategy, using a variety of communications methods including press releases, road shows, media work and communications from the Family Justice Board Chair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed December 2012 • April 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoJ, DfE • MoJ, DfE, FJB

Annex A: Family Justice Board – Terms of Reference

1. The Board's overall aim is to drive significant improvements in the performance of the family justice system where performance is defined in terms of how effective (and efficient) the system is in supporting the delivery of the best possible outcomes for children who come into contact with it.
2. The Board will collectively work together to achieve its objectives. This principle of cross-agency working will be crucial in ensuring that the Board achieves its overall aim of driving significant improvements in performance.
3. In delivering against this aim, the Board will have a particular focus on:
 - a) reducing delay in public law cases and making progress against the proposed 6-month time limit for care cases;
 - b) resolving private law cases out of court where appropriate;
 - c) building greater cross-agency coherence; and
 - d) tackling variations in local performance.
4. The detailed objectives for the Board which will underpin its work are:
 - i) to develop and monitor the implementation of a system-wide plan which sets out clear actions to be taken within, and particularly across, delivery agencies, in order to achieve significant improvements in system performance;
 - ii) to review and analyse whole system performance, based on evidence, and to report on this including through an annual report;
 - iii) to challenge poor performance and make recommendations on performance improvements to Ministers, agency heads, local authorities and others;
 - iv) to develop, support and monitor local manifestations of the Board (Local Family Justice Boards) which will oversee the operation of family justice in their areas;
 - v) to identify, disseminate and monitor the implementation of local best practice and to help Government disseminate the latest research throughout the system;
 - vi) to oversee the delivery of particular FJR recommendations e.g. on workforce, (excluding the judiciary), national standards and the "voice of the child" as specified by Government; and
 - vii) in the longer term, to consider the case for more fundamental structural change to the family justice system and provide advice accordingly to the Government.
5. The Board will at all times respect and act in a manner which protects judicial independence both in relation to the judiciary generally and in relation to individual judicial decisions.

Further information available by emailing familyjusticereview@justice.gsi.gov.uk

Published on behalf of the Family Justice Review Panel by the Ministry of Justice

© Crown copyright 2013