



Mr Andrew Bunyan
Director Children and Family Services
Derby City Council
Council House
2nd Floor
Corporation Street
DERBY
DE1 2FS

26 July 2013

Dear Andrew

Adoption Diagnostic Assessment

In June Derby City Council commissioned Core Assets Consultancy and Resourcing (Outcomes UK) with BAAF to undertake a five day assessment of the Council's Adoption Services; we are pleased to feedback on our findings.

Methodology

We had the benefit of reading a number business activity reports, action plans and data which you used to measure activity, which were sent prior to the assessment. We were also provided with additional material on the last day of the assessment; unfortunately these documents could not be fully included in the final analysis. We were grateful for the support that Sarah Walker, Clive Maunder, Noreen Clemens and Hazel Lybery provided throughout our visit.

Assessors Lesley Goode and Nicky Probert spent the 3rd–7th June 2013 carrying out an assessment of the child's journey to permanency and reviewing the effectiveness of the Adoption Service. We were asked to focus on 3 keys areas during the assessment:

- Timeliness of adoptions
- Care planning process
- Post adoption support

We found the staff we met with to be professional and responsive; they engaged fully and were generous with their time. The staff we met showed loyalty to the council and there was a positive attitude to the new senior management team. At the initial briefing session the managers provided an overview of the targets relating to the scorecard and the improvement activity currently being



undertaken to improve the child's journey to permanency. During the five days we had the opportunity to observe an Adopters Information Evening, conducted a number of Focus Groups, and met or had telephone interviews with a variety of staff, as listed below. . A request was made for a meeting or discussion with Judge Orrell; unfortunately this was not arranged as part of the assessment.

Individual Interviews

Hazel Lymbery - Head of Fostering and Adoption
Mark Barrett - Service Director Specialist Services
Jane Parfremont - Service Director Safeguarding lead
Andrew Bunyan - Director Children and Family Services
Jackie Colley – Commissioning Manager
Dal Guram - Marketing and Promotions Officer
Hannah Hogg, Anna Pollard and Sue Cooper - Legal Advisors
Lyn Bugarski - Professional Advisor (Adoption)
Christine Cassell - Chair of Safeguarding Board
Councillor Rawson, Councillor Whitby and Councillor Bailey
Maggie Duggins, Tonimarie Benaton, Diarmuid Browne - Independent Reviewing Officers
One Birth Parent

Telephone Interviews

Meg Staples and Rose Ruddick - Adoption Panel Chairs
Paul Gillingwater - CAF/CASS
Maureen Farren - Training Officer
Two individual adopters (adoption support)
One Birth Parent

Focus Groups

Prospective and approved adopters
Adopted Children and Young People
Adoption and adoption support teams
Locality social workers and managers
Children in Care social workers and managers
Fostering social workers and managers



GOOD PRACTICE IDENTIFIED

Multi Agency Locality Working

The locality social workers described a system where children's cases are processed quickly through the First Contact Team which then filters the referrals and transfers those which meet the threshold for social care involvement. The Reception Team then undertake an Initial Assessment/Section 47/Core Assessment. The recommendations from these assessments are then discussed at the Multi Agency Vulnerable Children's meeting, and multi-agency packages of support are agreed. The Social workers reported there was no delay in the transfer of cases and this is evidenced through the achievement of the 26 week court process. The strength of this process was noted in the recent Safeguarding Inspection October 2013 and resulted in the Council receiving a rating of Good for Safeguarding children.

Engagement of adopted children, young people and Adopters

Prospective adopters and approved adopters reported good working partnerships with the adoption and post adoption workers. The adopted children whom we met felt valued and that their comments and concerns were being listened and responded to. They felt that having a space to discuss their feelings and to receive professional advice from a worker experienced in the field was very important to them.

Comments from Adopters:

- *'Having met the staff at the preparation group we knew we could work with any of them'*
- *Information evening 'Telling it like it is!'*
- *Assessment helped them to reflect on their own experiences: 'The reasoning behind questions during the assessment was explained well.'*
- *Post adoption workers were praised for their support and assessors in the adoption team for their professionalism.*

Comments from Adopted Children's Group:

- *It's good to ask questions like what happens after you're 18*



- *I can ask the staff things that I can't ask mum and dad*
- *It's good to have some professionals to talk to who know about adoption*
- *I like the activities and the pizza!*

Strategic Planning

Evidence was provided that demonstrated strong strategic management and the local authorities overall openness and wish to develop self awareness in understanding and tackling delays and by a passion for adoption. There has been significant transformation activity to review and re-engineer parts of the service and try to understand the current issues and actions that are required to bring about positive change. There is a culture of commitment to the 'improvement journey', and a clear commitment to sustaining the improvements. 'Turning the Curve' activities on fostering and adoption have resulted in the development of comprehensive Improvement Plans.

IRO Scrutiny

The consultants were aware of the internal scrutiny of IROs, and were impressed with the role and contributions of the IROs, including around challenge.

Support to Leadership Team from Members

The leadership team is fully supported by the Leader of the Council and there is a commitment to harness the opportunities provided by the new management structure and the council's passion for adoption.

Disruptions

The evidence provided and the discussion with staff suggested that, for over 3 years, there have been no post adoption order disruptions. This is a significant result as the Service has placed older children and children with special needs. However, we should note that as for other authorities the incidence of disruption of out of area placements is difficult for the authority to track.

Feedback to the Council

On the last day we presented our initial feedback orally to a range of staff, Councillors and managers who engaged fully in the session and provided us with their initial thoughts and some areas for further consideration. We have not included all the data analysis information shared at the presentation.



Senior managers acknowledge further detailed analysis needs to be conducted of the different data reports to enable the service to have a clear understanding of the child's journey through the Care system towards permanency and the process of recruiting, assessing and approving applicants.

Key data which will require further analysis includes:

- Conversion rate from enquiry to approval for adoption and fostering applicants
- The timeline from when a Child becomes looked after, through to a decision that s/he should be placed for adoption, dates for granting the Care Order and Placement Order – Matching – Placement date and Adoption Order

There was some verbal evidence given that despite the 26 week timescale being met, the placement order was not always granted at the same time. As we did not receive this dataset until 6th June, we were unable to analyse the time taken to secure a PO in the remaining cases.

The feedback from the Diagnostic Assessment is divided into the three areas specified for consideration:

1. Securing Permanency for Children

'Planning for permanency is part of the broader care planning process, which focuses on long term goals for looked after children. It involves finding placements for them which offer a family for life and consideration of a range of solutions'

(Thomas: Adoption for looked after children: messages from research: BAAF 2013)

Placement Types

In its emphasis on adoption we did not feel the agency was giving a clear message that a number of different routes to permanency exist, each of which may be a valid solution if it can give looked after children a sense of long term security and continuity in their placements.

We were concerned that family and friends care is seen as an assessment process that 'has to be got through' to satisfy the courts, rather than first choice for all children where viable.

There is only limited evidence that family and friends care, appropriately financed and with the carer provided with the relevant support, is considered as a valued resource that can appropriately secure permanency. We were informed by various staff within the organisation that



friends or family are mainly assessed when the local authority receives an interim care order, rather than at the stage when the decision is made at the Case Review Panel that the evidence has met the threshold for local authority intervention. The fostering team manager said they are currently supporting 23 family and friends carers but as the manager did not identify the number of children placed in these circumstances, this information needs further clarification.

There has recently been an investment in staffing resources to assess and support family and friends carers. The fostering service manage these additional resources but do not have in place a strategy or development plan which would change the practice or culture regarding family and friends arrangements. A Kinship policy is being drafted which as yet does not fully demonstrate the importance and significant contribution that these type of placements play in securing permanency for some children.

Mediation Works has recently been commissioned as provider to coordinate family group conferences. This development needs to be linked to the cultural change required regarding the active use of family and friends placements. This development could lead to a positive increase in the placement of children with family or friends.

*Research shows that where it is well supported, family and friends care is capable of delivering stable placements for the majority of children. A range of studies show placement stability from 56 – 72%. In Hunt's research 92% of children in her sample enjoyed close relationships with their family and friends carers and many did well despite high levels of pre placement adversity. (Hunt, Waterhouse, and Lutman **Keeping them in the Family, 2008**)*

Support is key. Farmer (**Adoption and Fostering, Volume 33, Number 3, 2009**) found the good outcomes are sometimes at the expense of the kin carers themselves, and the recovery of some children was compromised by a lack of services in these placements. So appropriate services and policies need to be in place.

The consultants did not find evidence of specific recruitment for permanent foster carers who wish to provide care for children on a long term basis. Permanent fostering arrangements are arrived at through short term foster carers eventually being re-approved at fostering panel as long term carers.



Independent Reviewing Officers reported that foster carers were sometimes dissuaded from progressing applications for Special Guardianship Orders by Children's Guardians, due to a perceived lack of support services. Special Guardianship is an important permanence option which does not seem to have been widely used in Derby. This could provide some children with legal and psychological security, and whilst the Council may have to provide financial and other support, there can be considerable savings in social work and IRO time as cases do not require further reviews.

Sibling Assessments and Sibling Contact Orders

Discussion with CAF/CASS, Legal Services, panel chairs and social workers identified sibling assessment and section 26 contact orders as a key issue contributing to delay in securing permanency. In discussion with CAF/CASS they reported that in their view the Local Authority *was too ready* to contemplate splitting sibling groups. This has led to Children's Guardians attempting to secure care plans through the use of contact orders.

There is a council guidance note available to social workers when assessing whether brothers and sisters should be placed together or apart, and social workers did mention the publication: *Together or apart? Assessing brothers and sisters for permanent placement*. (Lord, J. and Borthwick, S. (2001) BAAF: London, British Association for Adoption and Fostering) It was reported by social workers that there is no set format for these assessments and no training has yet been provided to assist them in developing their understanding or practice in this area.

For many foster children, the relationship with their brothers and sisters is what they value most about their family and contact is very important. *Remember my messages...The experiences and views of 2,000 children in public care in the UK*, London: (Who Cares? Trust Shaw, C. (1998)). There are also more recent views on sibling contact in 'Keeping in Touch' (2009) A report by Ofsted for the Children's Rights Commissioner which show the value placed on brothers and sisters but also offers some more mixed views on sibling placement which would be useful to consider alongside other literature when presenting plans to court. A recent BAAF conference featured research by Ottaway (BAAF 2013) on the continuing significance of enabling sibling contact over the life-span.



There may have been an historic culture within the adoption services where the view is sibling placements are not achievable. The Adoption Research Initiative and Hadley Centre research suggest the importance of local policies and practices that can help to create enduring adoptive placements for older children and siblings groups of three children or more. Adopting Large Sibling Groups - Experiences of Adopters and Adoption Agencies (Saunders and Selwyn, Adopting Large Sibling Groups BAAF,2011) found that assistance with the practicalities of caring for larger sibling groups enabled adopters to focus more fully on developing their relationship with the children.

Placing Older Children

Adoption services are proud of their achievement in successfully securing adoption placements for older children. Using an 'older child' definition of 5plus the current tracking data of children waiting indicates potential matches for eight children aged 5plus (and a 4year old as part of a sibling group.) However, in all but one of these placements the children are being adopted by their current foster carers and they have already been in placement for between 19 – 53 months.

The children now aged 5plus and waiting were aged between 1 year old up to a 7 year old on entry to care.

Ages at entry to care:

- 1 x 7 yr old
- 3 x 5yr olds
- 1 x 3yr old and
- 1 x 2yr old
- 2 x 1yr olds

This group included two sets of sibling groups of three children (one 4 year old not included but forms part of one of the sibling groups).

There is a national shortage of adopters and those willing to adopt older children and sibling groups. The data from the Adoption Register has shown a fall in supply of adopters whilst numbers of children with an adoption plan have increased. It may be that the reason for delay in the above cases was due to court requirements to place children together but we do not have the detailed information to analyse the reasons.

It may be that in the past the service has placed children who were older on entry to care but the evidence suggests the current cohort of children are older due to delay in finding adoptive placements.



The adoption service managers did report successful placement of 2 younger sibling groups of three.

Case Audit Information

As part of the Diagnostic Assessment we audited 6 cases and tracked the process for a relinquished baby.

There was evidence from the case audits of some children being placed at home on care orders when the home situation had not changed. Historical case information showed that care orders had been granted for three babies who subsequently were placed back with the parent, and with one of the babies further abuse and neglect occurred. Senior managers reported that these cases reflected past practice and that the effect of neglect on children is now recognised.

In two cases audited we found evidence of an efficient process of decision making, case planning and joint working which had secured permanence for these children. We have also spoken to adopters where planning has been very proactive and has enabled children to move quickly to a permanent placement. What we are not able to confirm is how common this practice is. During the week of the assessment we were made aware of two separate cases involving children subject to care orders being placed with parents. Also during the week we learnt of a case transfer to children in care team of a child on a care order placed at home.

We also tracked a relinquished 7 month old baby where the agency's processes, and lack of a specific tracking tool, meant delay arose at a succession of stages in the child's journey:

- The department has previously removed 10 other children from these parents.
- No evidence that the court process was used to secure the child's legal status.
- Too much weight given to the fact the parents said they would relinquish the baby.
- The transfer of paperwork has not yet been completed; therefore the case had not transferred to the CiC.



- A placement with adopters of a sibling where it was unclear how this was explored and the final decision made.
- Lack of robust monitoring of the child through the statutory review process.

The tracking and case audits identified some good practice where children had moved to permanent adoptive placements in a timely fashion. But the audits also indicated current practice that could contribute to significant delay, such as the lack of early discussions between Locality teams and Adoption Team Family finders, which meant opportunities could be missed for accessing the advice of adoption team workers on permanency plans and potential placements, especially for more 'difficult to place' children and siblings.

We were unclear why some cases are managed so efficiently and others have significant delay. Ward's DfE-funded study found that the wellbeing of 60% of permanently separated children had been doubly jeopardised by the late separation from an abusive family. Of the children who remained with birth families at age three 43% were considered to be at continuing risk of significant harm. The research challenges the view that entry to care should only be used as a last resort, because it suggests delay in children's entry to care can reduce chances of their achieving permanence. (*Ward et al 2010 Infants Suffering or Likely to Suffer Significant Harm- a prospective longitudinal study*)

This year's draft IRO report noted that 11 QA forms had been issued to challenge issues of drift and delay. 'IROs have a key role in championing the permanency needs of vulnerable children and ensuring timely decision making' (*Adoption: current themes Gill, Coleman and Jennings – discussion paper on findings from Diagnostic assessment, unpublished.*)

2. Internal Joined up thinking

In the discussions with the specialist Fostering and Adoption staff they were not able to outline an agreed vision with key objectives for them all to work towards in respect of the agenda of permanency. Subsequently the staff teams as a whole appeared unclear about the overall vision for the fostering and adoption service. Key documents from the Fostering Review were only shared with the team on the morning of our meeting.

As part of the child's journey to permanence the worker should be informed by the expertise of the Adoption service. There appears to be a culture of sequential rather than parallel planning for children looked after. Current practice is for family finding to start when the Placement Order is granted; therefore any delay in receiving a Placement Order delays the family finding activity.



We were told that permanency planning meetings are held and that the adoption service is on occasion invited to attend. The purpose of this meeting seems unclear, as it did not appear to be an arrangement to track each child's journey to permanency, to consider elements of the care plan relating to contact and sibling placement and to aid the process of family finding and assessment. It was unclear who is expected to attend and what are the decisions that should be made. It was reported by adoption social workers and managers that if they do attend it is in a liaison role answering queries received from the case management social worker rather than to pro-actively track the permanency process. The adoption team do not routinely attending the LAC 4 month review when the permanency plan is endorsed.

Where the Agency has decided that adoption is the plan for the child, IRO's have a responsibility to monitor at each review whether adoption is still an appropriate plan for the child and what is being done to progress this plan. Management Information held by the Professional advisor for Adoption reports that 10 children with placement orders have an actual or likely change of plan. Legal services are aware that there are a number of children whose Placement Orders should be revoked and there are still 5 children on Freeing Orders. The IROs raise concern through the Dispute Resolution Process and 45 QA forms concerning complaints were completed. 43 were resolved at stage one and 2 progressed to stage two. The majority of notification forms related to legal documents not being received by IRO from the Legal Department and evidence of delay and drift in cases.

Skilled staff trained in life story work are not sharing their expert knowledge with Children's team workers. The Child's Permanence Report is completed by the child's social worker during the court stage of the permanency process when a Placement Order is being sought. Again the adoption service has no active role in supporting or guiding social workers completing CPRs.

The transfer of cases between the locality teams and CiC is causing delay. Transfer of cases may also be causing some difficulty in progressing the plan scrutinised by the court. It was reported by the CAFCASS officer interviewed that aspects of the care plan put before the court were being missed and at times orders were overlooked. The transfer after court led to a lack of ownership of care plans by the CiC social workers.

The recruitment team, which is an integral part of the Fostering Service, does not support the Adoption Service's marketing and recruitment needs. Across the city there is a visible marketing campaign to recruit more foster carers. A part time marketing officer provides advice and



assistance to the adoption service but there is no Recruitment Strategy for Fostering or Adoption and it was unclear who is responsible for monitoring the specific marketing activities which are required to attract adopters for older children, children from minority ethnic groups, sibling groups and children with disabilities. The senior managers are aware of the improvement required relating to the marketing recruitment and assessment across the fostering and adoption services. 'Turning the Curve' exercises have been undertaken with clear actions; unfortunately, according to focus group information, the specialist fostering and adoption teams were not aware of the actions required for improvement. At the matching stage when post adoption support plans are in place, therapeutic support is identified in a few cases and a request for funding submitted to the Out of Area panel. Workers report they are unable to attend and there is delay in them receiving the outcome of the decision. The complaints file we reviewed did hold a complaint from adopters who report that funding and support agreed within the adoption support plan had not been provided.

We had the pleasure of meeting with adopters, prospective adopters and adopted children who had a wealth of experience and positive comments about the service they received. We recommend that these groups are used to inform your improvement. Outlined below are the key areas of concern they have identified throughout the assessment process.

- *Significant delay in completing adopter approvals – Prospective adopters who attended the June 2012 adoption training have still not been given a panel date*
- *Medical advisor could not make a firm decision about adult health issues and there were delays on seeking specialist advice to inform that decision*
- *Information evenings and training is delivered by adoption staff who are very knowledgeable but the information given only outlines the difficulties that adopters will face and it does not balance this against the positives of adopting. There was a view that there may also be a need to review material in the light of much younger babies and children being placed. Some baby adopters stated that the information did not 'chime' with their experience and it may be that the service has to think of how to prepare new parents for much younger placements and issues these may bring in terms of potential future placements of siblings born subsequently. There is a post approval training programme for adopters which is reported to be underused.*



- *The 'rule' relating to fertility treatment which requires adopters to wait for 6 months after fertility treatment was felt to be insensitive and unrealistic. It was also not applied uniformly across all applicants. The Local authority needs to be mindful that guidance is clear that there should not be blanket bans.*

Lack of flexibility re number of bedrooms required to take sibling groups, ethnicity of child placed etc.

The meeting with adopted young people highlighted the fact that they have been proactive in writing to the service and wanting to become involved. A meeting has been set up with Mark Barrett. This group has, however, not had the same visibility as the Council's Children in Care Council and the need for more support, including financial support was highlighted. At present this group only works with children from 10-18 and the young people were insistent that younger children also need a group, particularly to deal with issues that arise in school from being adopted which includes bullying.

3. Change Management and Tracking Tools

The leadership team have identified significant challenges for the service, particularly around the increased use of Independent Fostering Agencies, the small and reducing pool of foster carers and the limited number of in-house adopters. The strategic improvement plans developed through 'Turning the Curve' exercises have not been effectively disseminated for implementation by the relevant team and there was an insufficient sense in the Specialist Service of the urgency to get things done

There are good opportunities with the change of the adopter assessment and approval process due for implementation 1st July 2013, to review the way staff resources are used to achieve the challenge of meeting the new timescales. The government's fostering review has now published guidance on the assessment and approval of foster carers which will need to also inform your revised fostering assessment process: Amendments to the Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations Volume 4: Fostering Services July 2013.

During our five days in Derby, we were not provided with comprehensive tracking tools to examine. It was unclear who had responsibility for this task, and separate individuals were trying to track part of the permanency process in their part of the service which was not then shared or used to inform business plans.



Failure to provide an effective tracking tool meant we were unable to confirm information that over a three year period there have been no disruptions post adoption orders. The children in care team reported some disruption post placement but we were assured by the Adoption manager that these disruptions were pre-placement during introductions. It is important that this data is captured accurately.

Both fostering and adoption teams are not able to report an increase in the numbers of adopters recruited, and that assessments are now conducted in a timely manner. A new tracking tool for measuring the effectiveness of the recruitment of foster carers was implemented 1st April 2013. We conducted a mystery shopping exercise via Derby Direct and found that full details of all your fostering enquiries are not being recorded, therefore will not appear within the new tracking tool. We understand from the commissioning manager that enquiries to fostering and adoption are transferring to the specialist services.

The Challenge

The most significant challenge for the authority is to establish a culture which prioritises permanence as an outcome for all children, and considers adoption wherever possible, for children who cannot safely stay in within their birth families.

While we acknowledge that it can be easier to see things from outside than from within an organisation, we observed within the specialist service a workforce which is struggling to deliver a service informed by recent research and guidance and with a sense of purpose. These observations indicate that all staff will need a combination of challenge and support to bring about the changes required.

- Training in skills for assessing sibling groups, particularly evidence based assessments of the needs of individual children within sibling groups where younger children could be placed for adoption;
- Using the skills and expertise which already exist to support social workers in completion of life story work, including direct work with children and completing CPRs;
- Achieving the right balance between avoiding delay and finding an appropriate match;
- Training and mentoring to the individuals within the specialist services responsible for delivering the permanency improvement plan



Derby City is robustly trying to address the issue of children in the LAC service who do not have the correct legal status. The council is aware of children within the system still subject to Freeing and Placement Orders when the plan for adoption has changed. This activity will impact on the scorecard measure of the percentage of children for whom the permanence decision has changed away from adoption.

Also the new Exit Team is actively identifying older children with care plans which have changed. These children will be discharged from the LAC system during the next 12 months. An increase in older children exiting care will have an impact on the scorecard measure –

Adoptions from care (number adopted and percentage leaving care who are adopted). Currently Derby is performing better than its comparable LAs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We wish to qualify some of the conclusions of our report as it was not possible to verify all reported practice within our timescales. It may be useful for the Local Authority to perform more in depth case audits and present these in learning sets for staff. Some key tracking data was only provided late on Thursday so that it did not inform our original lines of enquiry during interviews and focus groups. As is highlighted below, one of the key messages is that the information and statistics held by different parts of the local authority need forming into a coherent and meaningful tracking system which focusses on the child's journey through the care system.

- Implement a Permanency Strategy, providing a Vision Statement and Action Plan, which should contain clear, simple, achievable and measurable goals for all parts of the service.
- A review of the function and resources within the specialist services with a focus on all types of permanency, which would enable the Service to find permanent families for more Derby children. This may require further information regarding workload management.
- A mapping exercise of the permanency process may be seen as part of the service review, which would include reviewing the function of the numerous panels and timing of key decisions.
- A whole service approach to address issues of delay and drift. There is a need to establish a baseline of good practice perhaps through reflective supervision and learning sets led by Heads of Service.



- Develop a marketing and recruitment strategy, then update the adoption website, information and refresh the image of the permanency service in Derby. An effective tracking process to understand conversion rate from enquiry to approval for fostering and adoption.
- Exploration of joint working with other Consortium members to deliver certain services jointly.
- A vigorous approach to implementing an effective Transfer Protocol particularly in relation to those cases inappropriately held in localities which belong in CiC.
- An effective tracking process, which follows the child through the permanency journey, could perhaps be of greatest benefit to the child, if owned by the Heads of Service. Currently, the service might wish to review
 - Children held by the Adoption team, to determine whether the present permanency plan is realistic, and if it is not, to consider other routes to permanence. (Children on Freeing and Placement orders)
 - The cohort of children whose plans have changed away from adoption and require revocation of orders held. The method through which these changes of plan are notified to key parts of the service.
 - Care Order Children placed at home with parents
 - Frequency when Placement Order is granted at same time as the Care Order
- Further support for the Adopted Children and Young People's group and consultation with them on how to shape the service
- Steps to be taken by Derby to revoke Placement Orders and Freeing Orders where children's plans have moved away from adoption and where this is still consistent with the child's welfare
- Consideration to be given to identify children who require specialist family finding services and to commission these from specialist agencies or schemes



- Identification of support services and the resources to deliver these for Family and Friends carers and Special Guardians

Conclusion

Overall there is evidence that Derby's senior management team have started the journey to embed the key messages identified from the 'Turning the Curve' Workshops. There are a number of Action Plans in place which are monitored through the Performance and Improvement Division. Everyone we interviewed expressed their commitment to improving the child's journey and the most important resource Derby has is its professional workforce.

Lesley Goode
Core Assets Consultancy and Resourcing Limited
26 July 2013

Jeffrey Coleman
Projects Programme Director
BAAF
26 July 2013