

Coventry Children's Services - Case audit form

Auditor name	Edgar Poe Moderator: Peggy Carter
Tracked case number	543216
Audited previously	N/A
Age band	7 years
Strand	Help and protection
Date	19/10/17 (Updated 14/11/17)

Field	Quality of child's experience Judgement (J) (Exceeds good/ meets good/ does not meet good)	Text (please keep this evaluative and succinct) Evidence (E) Impact (I)
<p>Risk is identified, responded to and reduced in a timely way Where relevant, include evaluation of identification and response to children who experience and/or are at risk of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ sexual exploitation ▪ neglect ▪ emotional abuse ▪ sexual abuse ▪ physical abuse ▪ domestic abuse 	Does not meet good	<p>Evidence: The level 3 CAF is largely based on the needs of Cadence's siblings. The potential impact of their situations on Cadence does not appear to have been fully considered until more recently in the intervention. In late August it was identified that a window in the property was unsafe and Cadence was trying to climb out. This was not subsequently followed up.</p> <p>Impact: The home may not be as safe for Cadence as it could be and he could be at risk of avoidable injury.</p>
<p>Children, young people and families are appropriately involved</p> <p>Is there evidence of impact of the involvement of children and their families in the assessment, planning and intervention? Are the views of significant males effectively gathered?</p> <p>Are children seen, and seen alone, and do they benefit from stable and effective relationships? Do children and parents/carers have an equal voice?</p>	Does not meet good	<p>Evidence: The intervention to date has been entirely based on information from Mum and schools. Direct work has not yet been carried out with Cadence although it is fair to say that school are involved in the CAF and seem well placed to represent his current well being. At the most recent CAF meeting in October, school reported that Cadence is doing well and some outstanding issues around his provision were being managed by them.</p> <p>Impact: Cadence has not had the opportunity to express his voice</p>

<p>Does it evidence individual work undertaken, including appropriate direct work?</p> <p>Is this linked to the plan and the reduction of risk? What is the impact of this for children and their families?</p>		<p>and we do not know what, if any impact there has been on him, of his siblings' behaviour.</p>
<p>Decision making is effective and timely</p> <p>Is there evidence of effective and timely management oversight and direction on cases, and clearly recorded rationale for decisions being made?</p> <p>Is case recording clear, comprehensive and reflective of work undertaken and focused on the experience and progress of children and young people?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: Last management oversight (October 2017) discusses some issues regarding the siblings which are not clearly represented in the case file recording. This is due to the CAF episodes not being linked across the sibling group. Significant drift in the CAF has not been tackled and there is a sense that the intervention may have lost its purpose. What case recording exists is clear although there is not enough of it to afford a strong sense of Cadence's needs, journey or progress. During audit feedback, team manager reflected that consideration could have been given to closing the CAF for Cadence in order to focus the intervention more effectively on his siblings.</p> <p>Impact: Opportunities have been missed to explore whether the CAF is actually required and whether Cadence's needs are being fully met.</p>
<p>Assessments are timely, comprehensive, analytical and of high quality - and lead to appropriately focused help</p> <p>Do they incorporate historical factors, informed by up to date case chronology? Do they identify risk, needs and protective factors, including parental capacity?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: The current CAF assessment is the same level 2 CAF assessment which was completed in July 2013. This provides a well rounded picture of Cadence's needs at that time, but it is too old to provide any insight into his current situation.</p> <p>Impact: As above.</p>
<p>Coordination between agencies is effective</p> <p>Is joint working, information sharing in improving and sustaining the experience and progress of children and young people?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: Due to the aforementioned drift, there has not been enough communication between the agencies involved. Information from School is good but there have not been enough opportunities provided for agencies to get together and discuss the direction of support provided. The absence of a strong plan means that it has not been possible to</p>

		<p>hold agencies accountable for their actions as few actions have been identified.</p> <p>Impact: The absence of a strong multi-agency plan has led to drift although it must be noted that there is no evidence to suggest that Cadence's needs have not been adequately addressed as a result of this.</p>
<p>Consideration and impact of diversity</p> <p>For example, age, disability, ethnicity, faith or belief, gender, identity, language, race and sexual orientation.</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: The assessment refers to Cadence's autism impacting on his communication and ability to follow instructions. It is not clear how much progress has been made in this area since the assessment although the fact that Cadence attends special education provision and is progressing well, implies that school are happy with his progress. It may be helpful to have a copy of his Education Health and Care plan or school support plan on the case file so that direct work may be completed and Cadence's voice better represented in the CAF.</p> <p>Impact: We have no clear understanding of Cadence's wishes and feelings and therefore, we cannot be sure that opportunities have not been missed to provide the support he needs.</p>
<p>Quality of plans</p> <p>Are they: up to date and updated, timely, comprehensive, specific with measureable outcomes and dynamic?</p> <p>Are they implemented? Consider length of plan or any themes?</p> <p>Do they show quality of management oversight?</p> <p>Are they influenced by views of children and parents/carers and diversity issues?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: The plan has been static for around 1 year. It is not possible to ascertain from the information provided, whether this is due to all needs being met (thereby negating the need for the CAF) or due to outstanding needs not having been identified and included in the plan.</p> <p>Impact: Cadence seems likely to be subject to a CAF which is unnecessary.</p>
<p>Permanence is achieved without delay and reflects assessed needs</p> <p>In this context permanence relates to all children. For example, decisions about children on CP Plans which</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Evidence: There is no evidence to suggest that Cadence is not happy and secure at home with his family.</p> <p>Impact: Work with Cadence's sibling group to support their</p>

<p>result in children remaining at home should be considered to be a permanent plan.</p> <p>Are plans for permanence, including adoption, in the best interests of children and young people, and achieved without delay?</p> <p>Evaluate the quality of preparation for placement.</p>		<p>access to education should serve to further improve the sense of security and stability which, in turn, will lead to Cadence feeling even happier at home.</p>
<p>Children and young people participate in and benefit from effective regular reviews</p> <p>Are reviews scrutinised and challenged robustly to ensure that they support children in making good progress.</p> <p>What is the influence and impact of Independent Reviewing Officer/Child Protection?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: TAF meetings have not been frequent enough to demonstrate any impact of the CAF. Cadence has not been included in reviews but is represented by Mum and school.</p> <p>Impact: As a result of this, the CAF has drifted significantly and the validity of the intervention has not been able to be adequately reviewed.</p>
<p>The quality of the child's living arrangements</p> <p>Are children's living arrangements consistent with their assessed needs?</p> <p>Evaluate the effectiveness of: matching, stability and maintenance of contact with family/friends support for the child's living arrangements (including adoption support)</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: Consideration was given to the home environment in the early days of the level 2 CAF, however this falls outside of the scope of this audit. In the current period of intervention, the only mention of home environment was the unsafe window mentioned above and this does not appear to have been followed up. This issue aside, the key worker expressed confidence that Cadence appears happy and safe at home.</p> <p>Impact: Cadence's home environment may not be as safe as it could be. That said, with the one safety issue resolved it seems apparent that Cadence has the stimulation and safety he needs at home, and consequently he is likely to continue to progress and thrive.</p>

<p>Are young people prepared for independence and are they living in high quality accommodation that meets their needs</p> <p>Is it safe, permanent and affordable (children at home or looked after)?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Evidence: Cadence is too young for preparation for independence to be a current consideration.</p> <p>Impact:</p>
<p>How has the help provided improved outcomes?</p> <p>This domain should record judgements about the impact of outcomes and how they have affected the life of each child.</p> <p>Are children supported to achieve their full potential? Evaluate impact (including education, physical health, and their emotional well-being).</p> <p>Do children have developed networks within their community and are they safe?</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>Evidence: Desired outcomes have not been defined and because the plan is not strong, it is not possible to say if the CAF has added any significant value. The fact that school report that Cadence is doing well, is hugely positive but this cannot be attributed to the CAF intervention.</p> <p>Impact: As mentioned previously; it is not possible to ascertain if Cadence's needs are being adequately met.</p>
<p>Auditors Overall grading</p> <p>This judgement should reflect a judgement based upon aggregated impact on outcomes and in coming to your judgement, you should consider whether progress has been sufficient and appropriately timely. Consider whether other action(s) could have been taken and whether the pace of change was appropriate.</p>	<p>Does not meet good</p>	<p>The fact that there have been changes in key worker adds some context to the absence of a strong sense of direction to the CAF. Technical issues have meant that the CAF has not been linked across the siblings and this exacerbates the difficulty in identifying purpose in the intervention.</p> <p>That said, there is no evidence to suggest that Cadence's needs have not been met as a result of this but rather there is a sense that with a stronger idea of what we hoped to achieve in order to add value to Cadence's lived experience, drift would have been avoided.</p>
<p>Auditors Additional Comments</p>	<p>The audit has been completed based on the intervention around Cadence. The CAF has been more focussed on his siblings although similar observations were made around the CAF in relation to them also. This was due to the fact that the episodes were not linked for all siblings.</p>	

Agreed actions to achieve good outcomes for child	By whom	By when
<p>Feed back findings of audit to Key Worker / Team Manager.</p>	<p>Team Manager</p>	<p>05/11/17 (Completed)</p>
<p>Convene TAF meeting to review current plan for Hamza and ascertain what / if any further support is required.</p>	<p>Key Worker</p>	<p>20/11/17 (Completed)</p>
<p>Ascertain whether or not the window was made safe.</p>	<p>Key Worker</p>	<p>20/11/17</p>

Exemplar