



Derby City Council

one Derby one council

Derby City Council

Annual Report of Independent Reviewing Officers (IRO) Team

April 2012- March 2013

Author : Maggie Duggins – Senior IRO

INTRODUCTION

The following report is an overview and evaluation by Derby City Council's IRO service over the last 12 months, from 01.04.12 – 31.03.13.

Contents:

- 1) Profile of Derby City Children in Care / Adopted children
- 2) The IRO service, legal framework, quantitative information about the service
- 3) Children in Care Council- New Children's Rights service/ The Pledge
- 4) Quality Assurance data and findings - between April 2012 and March 2013
- 5) Dispute Resolution Process/ statistics of activity
- 6) Participation Issues
- 7) Performance Indicator for timeliness of Reviews
- 8) Education issues
- 9) Health issues / Performance Indicators
- 10) Children Placed Out of Area
- 11) Audit of Children in Care who go missing
- 12) Links to other teams/ services
- 13) Looked After Children Strategy
- 14) Summary and Action Plan – priorities for 2013-2014

1. Profile of Derby City Children in Care

There were **468 children in the care** of Derby City Council as at 1st April 2013. Breakdown as follows:

Numbers of Children in Care as at 01.04.13

Children in care Rate per 1000 = 8.21

| Placement Groups | DCC or other | Private / Agency Provision | Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|-------|
| Foster Placement | 184 | 149 | 333 |
| Homes and Hostels | 37 | 8 | 45 |
| Independent Living | 16 | | 16 |
| Placed for adoption | 48 | | 48 |
| Placed with parents | 17 | | 17 |
| Residential School or Hospital | | 8 | 8 |
| Secure Units, YOI or Prison | | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 302 | 166 | 468 |

Legal status of Children in care:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Care Order: | 223 (47.6%) |
| Placement Order Granted: | 118 (25.2%) |
| Accommodated under Section 20: | 80 (17.1%) |
| Interim Care Order: | 41 (8.8 %) |
| Freed for Adoption (freeing order granted): | 4 (0.9 %) |
| In L A on Remand, or Committed for Trial or Sentence: | 1 (0.2 %) |
| Subject to Emergency Protection Order: | 1 (0.2 %) |

Total 468 (100%)

Ethnicity

A large majority - 79% - are White British, 11.3% Dual Heritage; while the remaining children constituted small numbers across the other black and minority ethnic groups. The total proportion of looked after children who are from Black and Minority Ethnic Communities is significantly below that expected from proportion of BME children in Derby's child population (ratio 0.63:1). This has been identified for further analysis.

Adopted Children

Derby City Council does very well in placing older and difficult to place children in adoptive placements.

During 2012/13 **36** children were adopted, in 2011/12 there were 40 children adopted and 29 in 2010/11. Over the three year period April 2009 – March 2012 Derby had 110 children adopted which puts Derby City in the top 25% nationally and is more than double the national average. The IRO service has helped to reduce delay for children in care achieving permanence through adoption by ensuring that any delay or drift in initial care planning is challenged. We have introduced a new review form for Adoption Social Workers to complete prior to a review, giving full details of all family finding activity between reviews to highlight if there are any problems.

Senior IRO has also had a meeting with Service Manager CAFCASS to raise concern about section 26 orders being requested by Guardians in relation to permanency plans with high levels of sibling contact that undermine the possibility of finding prospective adopters.

Summary

There has been a slight fall in numbers of children in care since last year. The Local Authority has made great effort to reduce delay or drift in cases so that children can either return home if it is safe to do so, or move on to an alternative permanent placement. There have also been other measures put in place such as the use of Family Group Conferences, and the creation of an Exit from Care Team.

Over the last 12 months, **152** children and young people have entered care and **169** have left care.

2. The IRO service

The legal framework for the IRO service is set out in the Care Planning, Placement and Case Review (England) Regulations 2010 and the IRO Handbook 2010.

The role of the IRO is to ensure that Derby City Council acts as a caring and responsible Corporate Parent to the 468 children in council care, and to ensure the service provided to these children is compliant with legislation and regulations. It is also to support social care staff and other agencies working with children in care to achieve the best possible outcomes for these children.

IRO Caseloads

The IRO Handbook 2011 (statutory guidance), states that in order to carry out the new IRO responsibilities as laid out in the Care Planning Regulations 2010 a full time IRO should ideally have between 50 – 70 cases.

Caseloads have reduced significantly over the last 12 months as the team has increased capacity by employing two extra part time IROs and the numbers of Children in care have slightly reduced. The team now have 5.5 fte IROs and 0.5 fte specialist IRO for children receiving short breaks. The Senior IRO manages the team and also carries half a caseload.

Caseloads are therefore still in excess of statutory guidance; to comply the team requires an establishment of 6.5 fte IROs at current numbers of children in care, or 6 fte if numbers in care reduce to the 420. An additional full time IRO post is therefore needed to meet the regulations at current Children in care levels. Senior IRO has raised this with Head of Service (QA), but has been told that no additional funding is available in this financial year.

Staffing and caseloads of IROs as at 31.03.13

| | | |
|---|---|------------|
| Maggie Duggins | Senior IRO (P/T manager, P/T IRO) | 47 |
| Diarmuid Browne | Independent Reviewing Officer (F/T) | 84 |
| Nilufer Algas | Independent Reviewing Officer (F/T) | 84 |
| Tonimarie Benaton | Independent Reviewing Officer (F/T) | 89 |
| Sallie Dukes | Independent Reviewing Officer (F/T) | 77 |
| Johanne May | Independent Reviewing Officer (P/T) | 48 |
| Amanda Reade | Independent reviewing officer (P/T) | 39 |
| Total number of Children in care | | 468 |
| Johanne May | IRO for children with disabilities (short breaks) (P/T) | 54 |

Reviews completed by IRO 01.04.12 – 31.03.13

| IRO | No. of Children in care reviews | No. of S/Break reviews |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Nilufer Algas | 217 | |

| | | |
|--------------------|------|----|
| Tonimarie Benaton | 223 | |
| Diarmuid Browne | 220 | |
| Maggie Duggins P/T | 143 | |
| Sallie Dukes | 221 | |
| Amanda Reade | 74 | |
| Jo May P/T | 132 | 72 |
| Total | 1230 | 72 |

Administrative Support

The Review team has had an increase in its administrative support in that there are now 3.4 full time senior clerk posts, plus the team has had the additional resource of a one year apprenticeship post for 4 days per week since August 2013.

This has meant that the circulation of review minutes are now carried out within timescales and the inputting of health data and QA data is being done more efficiently.

Management Issues

The team is managed by Head of Service Quality Assurance who reports to Service Director – Specialist Services. There was a potential conflict of interests as this Service Director was line manager for the Children in Care Teams. However, a re-organisation is taking place so that these teams will be line managed by the Service Director – Early Intervention and Integrated Safeguarding.

Senior IRO is a Committee member of the National Association of IROs (NAIRO) and is involved in national developments regarding IROs.

The NAIRO Management Toolkit is used by the Senior IRO in Derby City (Management Protocol, IRO Code of Practice and list of IRO competencies). This improves the overall service and has helped to improve outcomes for children in care of Derby City Council.

3. Children's Right's Service/ Children in Care Council

There is a new Children's Right's Service in Derby City. The Project manager now attends part of each IRO team meeting. IROs will refer a case for a child to have an advocate from this service if the child wishes to make a complaint. Independent Visitors are appointed where a need is identified and they will often attend the review. The IROs regularly attend the Children in Care Council meetings and the IROs promote "The Children in Care Council Pledge" – pocket sized copies of the Pledge are given out by IROs to children and YP at their

review meetings. IROs will discuss the Pledge with older children and ensure that all our children in care are aware of their rights in relation to the care provided.

4. Quality Assurance data and findings between April 2012 and March 2013.

SEE APPENDIX A

This information is taken from a sample of 343 reviews held from April 2012 – February 2013. This represents 28% of the total.

There is an analysis of the qualitative and quantitative indicators related to the Children in care population attached.

Issues analysed:

i) Relevant reports/documentation provided by child's allocated social worker for LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN reviews:

Documentation was received in **93%** of reviews; this is an improvement on last year when this figure was **78%**.

The documentation was received *on time* in **76%** of cases; this is similar to last year's data. This needs to improve.

The documentation was perceived by the IRO to be satisfactory in **87%** of cases. The main reason why the reports were not satisfactory were that there was insufficient information and some poor care plans (for which a QA Notification Form would be completed).

ii) Reports provided by Residential, Fostering, and Adoption social workers for LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN reviews:

Residential care : Review Reports were received in **77%** of cases and these were on time for just **59%** of reviews. However, the reports were seen as satisfactory in **97%** of cases. Therefore, although these reports are good and contain very detailed information about the child, these reports need to be emailed to the IRO at least 3 working days prior to the review.

Fostering : Fostering SW Review Reports were received in **69%** of cases and of these **80%** were received on time. This needs to improve. However, IROs felt that of those reports received, **99%** of them were satisfactory. This is due to the new style of report created last year which contained much more detailed and relevant information.

Adoption : Adoption SW review reports were provided in just **49%** of cases and of these **82%** were received on time. This needs to improve. However **93%** were deemed as satisfactory. A new Adoption SW report format was created last year giving more information about family finding activity and this has proved very beneficial in identifying potential delay or drift in cases.

iii) Child's Placement

IROs felt that the child's placement was satisfactory in **93%** of cases. The main reason why a placement was not deemed satisfactory was due to it not being appropriate to meet all of the child's needs. Action was taken in these cases to ensure a more suitable placement was identified.

iv) Change of allocated social worker:

There was a change of allocated social worker within the review period in 19% of cases, which was 66 cases of the 343 analysed. The main reason (26 cases) was that the case had transferred to another team (e.g. from a Locality Team to a Children in Care team) the second reason was that the worker had left the team or Department (13 cases). 4 were transferred due to the child's request, and 7 were due to workers being absent. Although all the transfers were for valid reasons, IROs monitor this and if any change in worker is deemed unnecessary then this is raised with the manager involved.

v) Number of placement Moves since last review:

The vast majority of cases analysed (82.5%) did not have any move between the reviews. 55 children had one move, only 4 children had 2 moves, and only 1 child had 3 moves. This low number of moves is very positive.

The main reasons given were that the placement was deemed not to meet the child's needs or the child had moved on to an adoptive placement or to semi-independent living.

vi) Emotional/ therapeutic needs met:

The IROs felt that in 91.5% of cases the child's emotional and therapeutic needs were being met. Some children were waiting for an assessment or for therapy to begin when the child was deemed to be emotionally ready.

This is a positive picture overall, but there are still some difficulties in accessing services from CAMHS and other services outside of the area of the Local Authority.

vii) Life Story work:

Appropriate Life Story work was being carried out in 61% of cases. However, not all children would be seen as needing this work depending on how long they had been in care and their plan etc.

Many social workers state that they do not have sufficient time to carry out life story work or complete Life Story books and this can lead to delays. This is a cause for concern and needs to be addressed.

5. Dispute Resolution Process – QA Notification Forms

Where an IRO has significant concerns about practice or other issues affecting a child's care plan then they send a QA Notification Form to the manager involved outlining the issue and requesting action be taken. If the response is not satisfactory then the issue will go to stage two of the process whereby the Senior IRO will meet with the Deputy Head of Service responsible. The Dispute Resolution Process has four stages and can lead to a referral to CAFCASS.

It has been noted that use of this process has not been consistent across the team and criteria have been agreed for when these notifications will always be used.

57 FORMS WERE COMPLETED IN TOTAL:

10 forms were for good practice by a social care worker or foster carer

| Team | Number of forms |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Children in care Chatsworth | 3 |
| CiC Haddon | 3 |
| CiC Kedleston | 1 |
| Lighthouse | 2 |
| Foster carers | 1 |

STAGE 1

45 were for reasons as follows:

| Issue | Locality/ team | Number of cases |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| No legal documents sent to IRO | LA Legal section = 11 | 11 |
| Delay/drift | Loc 1/5 = 3 Loc 2 = 3 Lighthouse = 2 CiC = 1 Adoption team = 2 | 11 |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Review Decisions not carried out | CiC = 3 Loc 1/5 = 2 | 5 |
| No paperwork/ report for review | CiC = 2 Lighthouse = 1 | 3 |
| IRO not informed of change of plan | CiC= 2 Loc 2 =1 | 3 |
| Education issue | CiC = 2 Lighthouse = 1 | 3 |
| No Fostering SW at review/ no report | Fostering team = 3 | 3 |
| Child not enabled to participate | Shine = 1 Fostering team = 1 | 2 |
| Poor Care Planning | Loc 2 = 1 | 1 |
| Stat visits not completed within timescale | CiC = 1 | 1 |
| No Adoption SW at review/ no report | Adoption Team=1 | 1 |
| No CAMHS Assessment | CAMHS | 1 |

STAGE 2 –

2 forms

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|
| Stage 1 form not responded to | CiC Haddon = 2 | 2 |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|

The most forms (11) were sent in relation to LA Legal section and in regard to Delay or Drift in cases:

Legal- There has been great difficulty in the IROs obtaining legal documentation regarding cases in care proceedings. It is the duty of the LA Legal section to send all relevant court papers to the allocated IRO within 5 working days of care proceedings, however these documents are not being sent in many cases. This will hopefully now improve as there is agreement that these documents will be sent to Review Team clerks as a matter of course for each case in proceedings. This will be monitored in the coming year.

Delay/Drift – IROs are monitoring all cases very closely, especially where there is potential for delay or drift to occur. Examples include cases where care proceedings are not initiated quickly enough even though the case is deemed to meet the threshold for this, or assessments are not started quickly to avoid delay, as this could influence the eventual care plan in obtaining permanence for a child.

STAGE 2 cases: These cases were taken further as initially the manager did not respond to the Stage 1 QA form and when they did the response was unsatisfactory. The cases did not go past Stage 2 of the Dispute Resolution Process.

6. Participation issues

The number of children who have participated in their reviews during this year has increased :

2010 - 2011 - 92.7%

2011 - 2012 - 81.9%

2012 - 2013 - 95.1%

The figure of 95.1% is much improved on last year's statistics. The IROs attempt to see all children at their review or prior to/after each review. This is sometimes not possible; sometimes the IRO is informed that a child is attending and then does not for various reasons.

Some young people refuse to engage with the IRO but the IRO service will strive to further improve this figure over the next year. As caseloads have reduced, IROs should have more time to visit children separately from their review meeting.

Additionally, or as an alternative if a young person does not want to attend their review, a consultation document is available. A new consultation form for children and young people has been created, including an electronic version and this is used to gather children's views regarding their individual care and future care plans, and also to inform wider quality assurance and development of services.

This is undergoing a pilot at present for 12-18 year olds. This started on 01.01.2013 and after 6 months this will be analysed and if satisfactory, this will then be used for all children in care over four years old.

7. Timeliness of reviews

The number of reviews that have been within timescales has risen this year :

2011 - 2012 88.6%

2012 – 2013 94.4%

This is a real improvement on last year and should be sustainable given that caseloads have reduced over the last six months and the IROs have more time to fit in urgent reviews or re-arranged reviews.

Some of the reasons for reviews being late this year have been either the social worker or IRO being on sick leave and the severe weather conditions over the winter. There has then not been enough time to re-arrange the review within timescales.

Obviously, if the numbers of children in care decrease then this would give IROs more time to see children more often, hold reviews within timescales and to carry out the extra responsibilities taken on by IROs since the implementation of the IRO Handbook.

8. Education issues for Children in care:

Educational attainment of children in Derby gives cause for concern and so the IRO monitor the educational performance of children in care very closely, ensuring that they achieve the best level of support possible.

Personal Education Plans are reviewed 6 monthly, and this is done around the time of the LAC review if possible. There are now two part time PEP clerks and they are based within the IRO team and so the team has a close working relationship with Derby City Virtual Head Teacher. The PEP completion rate has fallen from last year- it was 87.4% as at 31.03.13, whereas last year it was at 96.9%. IROs will be monitoring this closely to try to increase the completion rates to nearer 100%.

At least one IRO will be involved in the Personal Finance Education Group training regarding My Money Week. It is hoped that this will help young people in care to access knowledge and develop skills with personal finance.

School attendance of children in care of all ages is generally excellent. Only a small number of older children have very poor attendance.

There are very few children who have to change school due to being in care as this is discouraged unless there is a valid safeguarding reason or it is deemed to be best for the child. However, there has been one case this year when a child in care had a change of school when the IRO felt that this was not necessary- this led to a QA Notification Form Stage 2.

9. Health Issues for Children in care

There is a very good working relationship with the Children in Care nurses/ Health Visitor and the Lead Nurse.

The Senior IRO attends the CICA Health Steering Group on a quarterly basis and also meets with Children in care nurses/ health administrators to look at processes of how Health

Assessments of children in care are carried out and how health data is collected and used to improve the lives and well being of children in care of Derby City Council.

A new initiative, providing **Blue Books** for children over 5 in care has been started (this is equivalent to the Red Book that babies have from birth). These books will include all the Health Action Plans and immunisation records and so the child can keep these until they leave care.

The figures for children receiving their health assessments, dental checks and immunisations have improved since last year, as follows:

Health data as at 31.03.13;

Provisional figures show;

345 out of 361 have up to date immunisations – 95.6% **(up from 92.8%)**

337 out of 361 have had a dental check recorded – 94.2% **(up from 75.4%)**

249 out of 285 had a health assessment recorded – 87.4% **(up from 73.9%)** (this is for children aged over five requiring one check during the year)

51 out of 75 had two development checks recorded – 68% **(up from 38.5%)** (this is for children aged 5 and under, they require 2 checks during the year).

Overall these statistics show that many more of the children looked after by Derby City Council are receiving their health assessments and routine checks within timescales. This is due to increased capacity/ resources within the Children in Care health service and better monitoring by IROs who ensure that carers and social workers are aware of the importance of regular checks.

There have been some difficulties in obtaining accurate data regarding the above performance indicators and so new procedures are being put in place so this does not happen again in 2013-2014.

10. Children placed out of area

When a child is placed out of Derby City, then the IRO will assess the need for the next review to be brought forward in order to ensure that the placement is meeting the child's needs and that appropriate support systems (such as education and health services) are in place as early as possible.

11. Audit on Children in Care who go Missing

The IRO team carried out an audit of 6 cases where a child had been missing from their placement within the last 6 months. These were all residential placements.

The results were that although in each case the Missing Person Procedures were largely carried out, (and no harm came to the child) - there was limited information on the Child Care

Management (CCM) system. This is because the residential units do not have access to CCM –This needs addressing and new procedures put in place. There is also a need for better on-going liaison with the Missing Panel and from Head of Locality 3/4 who oversees the Missing Children protocol for Derby City.

12. Liaison with Social Care teams and services

Each IRO is linked to a Locality/ CiC team or service, including Youth Offending Service and The Lighthouse (Children's Disability Service). They attend management team meetings on a quarterly basis.

Managers of the Fostering and Adoption Teams attend IRO team meetings on a six monthly basis.

Senior IRO attends the Residential Managers meetings and is due to hold quarterly meetings with the Head of Integrated Safeguarding as from May 2013 as she is now responsible for all of the social work teams dealing with Children in Care.

Senior IRO also meets regularly with the Professional Adviser to Adoption Panel, Adoption Team Manager, and Deputy Heads of Service to oversee the process of moving children on to adoption and identify any issues that may cause delay or drift.

There are plans for the IRO team to have joint meetings with local Children's Guardians in order to improve working relationships and develop an updated IRO/Guardian Protocol. This is currently being arranged with Service Manager CAFCASS.

The Family Justice Review has led to the formation of Local Family Justice Boards. The Head of Service (QA) sits on the LFJB for Derby City/ Derbyshire. The role of IROs will be affected by the recommendations of the Family Justice Review and so the Head of Service (QA) and the Senior IRO will ensure that any new regulations or statutory guidance from the new Children & Families Bill will be implemented in respect to the IRO service in Derby City.

13. Looked After Children Strategy

Derby City Council has a Looked After and Adopted Children and Young People Strategy 2012-2015. The document includes an Improvement Plan with a list of priorities for action and areas for development. The IRO team will ensure that all key actions that relate to the IRO service are carried out and the Senior IRO will assess whether this has made improvements to the outcomes for Children in Care of Derby City Council over the next 12 months.

14. Summary

Overall, it has been a very positive year for the IRO service. With an increase in IRO capacity and additional admin posts, the team have been able to help improve many of the Performance Indicators for Children in Care of Derby City.

The numbers of Looked After Children have decreased slightly and this trend seems to be continuing. This could be due to plans for permanency being carried out more efficiently and effectively, leading to better outcomes for those children. This could also have been assisted by the Family Justice Review recommendations that care proceedings should be completed within 6 months. The introduction of a single point of decision making around admissions to care has also helped ensure the correct application of the threshold for care.

With fewer Children in Care the IROs are now able to carry out more of their duties and responsibilities as outlined in the IRO Handbook.

ACTION PLAN

IRO team- Areas that need priority action for 2013-2014:

- Reduce delay for Children in care achieving permanence through adoption by:
 - setting appropriately high expectations, monitoring closely and promptly raising any delay with managers,
 - Contributing to scrutiny of children waiting for permanent placements
 - Ensure timely assessments/ plans for children including sibling assessments
- Ensure that there is a robust response to the forthcoming OFSTED Thematic Review of the IRO service and its recommendations
- Improve the process of collection of Health data for Children in care
- Adoption SW reports improvement and new Adoption report for children in adoptive placements
- Work with Local Authority Legal Department to ensure compliance with statutory guidance regarding communication with IROs during care proceedings- to ensure that IROs are sent all relevant legal documentation when a case is care proceedings, especially the Final Court Care Plan and any Orders that are granted.
- Update the Joint IRO/ Children's Guardians Protocol to ensure improved dialogue during and at the completion of care proceedings
- Intervening where there is an issue regarding sibling relationships affecting permanence to ensure that the individual child's needs are met.
- In relation to the four Children in Care of Derby City who remain on Freeing Orders- IROs to pursue a plan to discharge these orders as per the instruction of the previous Children's Minister.
- Ensure that there is no delay in discharging Placement Orders when the plan changes from a plan of adoption.
- Missing children – ensure that staff in residential settings communicate with SW so all relevant info about an episode of a child missing is put on CCM.
- Maintain the participation of all children and young people in their review
- Analysis of Pilot of new Consultation forms for 12-18 year olds and consideration for rollout to all LAC over 4 years old
- Increase PEP completion rate.
- Review ethnicity of children in care compared with the local population
- Pursue revocations of care orders in PWP where appropriate

Maggie Duggins

Senior IRO

May 2013

APPENDIX A Annual report MD

IRO data forms April 2012 – Feb 2013

Total sample 343 reviews from April 2012 – Feb 2013

Social Worker, Paperwork Received

| | NO | YES | |
|-------------|-------|--------|------|
| Grand Total | 11 | 152 | 163 |
| plus | 12 | 168 | 180 |
| New total | 33 | 320 | 343 |
| Percentage | 6.75% | 93.25% | 100% |

Paperwork Received on Time

| | Late | On Time | Total |
|-------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Grand Total | 36 | 127 | 163 |
| plus | 33 | 135 | 180 |
| New total | 69 | 262 | 343 |
| Percentage | 23.65% | 76.35% | 100% |

Social Worker Paperwork Satisfactory?

| | No | Yes | Total |
|-------------|----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 21 | 142 | 163 |
| plus | 12 | 157 | 180 |

| | | | |
|------------|-----|-----|------|
| New total | 33 | 299 | 343 |
| Percentage | 13% | 87% | 100% |

| IRO | Reasons Unsatisfactory | Total |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| Jo May | No care plan | 5 |
| | Late and no care plan | 3 |
| | No pathway Plan | 1 |
| | Not up to date care plan | 1 |
| Diarmuid Browne | No care plan | 6 |
| | Out of date plan | 1 |
| | Poor info | 2 |
| | No pathway | 1 |
| | | |
| Maggie Duggins | Limited info | 4 |
| | No care plan | 3 |
| | No review report | 1 |
| | Care plan redone on old form | 1 |
| | | |
| Sallie | ROA only | 1 |
| | | |
| Tonimarie Benaton | No care plan | 3 |
| | | |
| Grand total | | 33 |

Fostering Social Worker, Paperwork Received

| | No | Yes | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 33 | 73 | 37 | 19 | 163 |
| plus | 35 | 76 | 53 | 16 | 180 |
| New total | 68 | 149 | 90 | 35 | 343 |
| Those applicable | 68 | 149 | | | 217 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 31% | 69% | | | |

FSW Paperwork Recd on Time

| | Late | On Time | N/A | N/K | Total |
|------------------|------|---------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 16 | 57 | 71 | 19 | 163 |
| plus | 14 | 62 | 84 | 20 | 180 |
| Those applicable | 30 | 119 | | | 149 |
| Percentage..... | 20% | 80% | | | 100% |

FSW/FC Paperwork Satisfactory?

| | yes | no | N/A | N/K | Total |
|------------------|-------|------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 72 | 1 | 71 | 19 | 163 |
| | 76 | 0 | 84 | 20 | 180 |
| New totals | 148 | 1 | 155 | 39 | 343 |
| Those applicable | 148 | 1 | | | 149 |
| Percentage | 99.3% | 0.7% | | | 100% |

FSW/FC Reasons for Unsatisfactory Paperwork

| IRO | Reason unsatisfactory | Total |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|
|-----|-----------------------|-------|

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Maggie Duggins | Insufficient information | 1 |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|

Residential Worker Paperwork Received

| | Yes | No | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 12 | 8 | | | 163 |
| plus | 21 | 2 | | | |
| New total of those applicable | 33 | 10 | | | 43 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 77% | 23% | | | 100% |

Residential Worker Paperwork Received on Time

| | On Time | Late | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|---------|------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 7 | 11 | | | 163 |
| plus | 16 | 5 | | | |
| New total of those applicable | 23 | 16 | | | 39 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 59% | 41% | | | 100% |

Residential S/W Paperwork Satisfactory?

| | Yes | No | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 17 | 1 | | | 163 |
| plus | 21 | 0 | | | |
| New total of those applicable | 38 | 1 | | | 39 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 97% | 3% | | | 100% |

Adoption S/W Paperwork Received?

| | Yes | No | N/A | N/K | Total |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 11 | 9 | | 143 | 163 |
| plus | 17 | 22 | | | |
| New total of those applicable | 28 | 31 | | | 59 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|--|--|------|
| Percentage of those applicable | 47% | 53% | | | 100% |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|--|--|------|

Adoption S/W Paperwork Received On Time?

| | On Time | Late | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|---------|------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 9 | 2 | 9 | | 163 |
| plus | 14 | 3 | | | |
| New total of those applicable | 23 | 5 | | | 28 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 82% | 18% | | | |

Adoption S/W Paperwork Satisfactory

| | Yes | No | N/A | N/K | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 10 | 1 | 9 | | 163 |
| plus | 16 | 1 | | | |
| New total | 26 | 2 | | | 28 |
| Percentage of those applicable | 93% | 7% | | | 100% |

IRO's view: placement satisfactory?

| | Yes | No | Total |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|
| Grand Total | 150 | 13 | 163 |
| plus | 168 | 12 | 180 |
| New total | 318 | 25 | 343 |
| Percentage | 92.7% | 7.3% | 100% |

Reasons for Placement Being Unsatisfactory

| Reasons Unsatisfactory | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| More therapeutic placement required | 1 |
| Inappropriate for child's needs | 2 |
| Foster placement needed | 2 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Concerns about family capacity | 1 |
| Improvements in practice to be made | 1 |
| Value for money | 1 |
| Children should be split | 1 |
| Adopters, adoption leave | 1 |
| Borderline. More stimulation needed | 1 |
| Reason not given | 2 |
| Total | 13 |

Change of worker since last review?

| | Yes | No | Total |
|-------------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grand Total | 33 | 130 | 163 |
| plus | 33 | 147 | 180 |
| New total | 66 | 277 | 343 |
| Percentage | 19% | 81% | 100% |

Reasons for change of worker

| Reasons For Change of Worker | Total |
|--|-------|
| Worker left/retired | 13 |
| Transfer requested by child | 4 |
| Worker on long term sick leave | 4 |
| Transfer to another team | 26 |
| Lack of staff | 1 |
| Breakdown in relationship with parents | 1 |
| Allocated to service manager | 1 |
| Worker on maternity leave | 1 |
| Reason not given | 15 |
| Total | 66 |

Number of Placement Moves Since Last Review

| | 0 moves | 1 moves | 2 moves | 3 moves | Total |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Grand Total | 138 | 24 | | 1 | 163 |
| plus | 145 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 180 |
| New total..... | 283 | 55 | 4 | 1 | 343 |
| Percentage | 82.5% | 16% | 1.2% | 0.3% | 100% |

Reasons for Placement Move (20% example only included) Not AB stats

| Reasons For Placement Move | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Placement Breakdown | 4 |
| Move to semi-independent living | 4 |
| Placement did not meet needs | 8 |
| Move to adoptive placement | 4 |
| Left placement | 1 |
| Moved to live with mother | 1 |
| Moved to residential school | 1 |
| New bridging placement | 1 |
| Emergency placement | 1 |
| Total | 25 |

Emotional/Therapeutic Needs Met?

| | Yes | No | Total |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|
| Grand Total | 146 | 17 | 163 |
| plus | 168 | 12 | |
| New total | 314 | 29 | 343 |
| Percentage | 91.5% | 8.5% | 100% |

Life Story Work Undertaken?

| | Yes | No | N/K | Total |
|--|-----|----|-----|-------|
|--|-----|----|-----|-------|

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----|-----|----|------|
| Grand Total | 92 | 56 | 15 | 163 |
| plus | 118 | 60 | 2 | |
| New total | 210 | 116 | 17 | 343 |
| Percentage | 61% | 34% | 5% | 100% |