

<b>SECTION 1: SECTION 47 INVESTIGATION</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical</b>
Strategy Discussion – rationale/ decision	Rationale for decision to progress to strategy discussion well evidenced, decision making focussed and robust. Includes reference to statutory framework and threshold criteria.	Rationale for decision to progress to strategy discussion appropriate and well evidenced.	Decision to progress to strategy discussion appropriate, but rationale could have been more effectively evidenced.	Rationale for progressing to strategy discussion not evidenced.	Decision not to proceed to strategy discussion placed the child at risk.
Strategy Discussion – timeliness and multi-agency	Decision for Strategy meeting/discussion is appropriate. Strategy meeting held in a timely manner. Discussion or meeting includes all relevant agencies. Minutes of the meeting clearly outlines information which is relevant to decision making. Outcome of the meeting is evident as is the interim safety plan for the child. Professionals are provided with the action plan in a timely manner.	Strategy meetings/discussions held in timescales and include all relevant agencies. Minutes are appropriate. Outcome of the meeting is evident as is the interim safety plan for the child. Professionals are provided with the action plan in a timely manner.	Strategy meetings/discussions held in timescales and includes the police. Minutes of the meeting/discussion are adequate. Outcome of the meeting is evident.	Strategy meetings/discussions not held in timescales. Outcome of the meeting/discussion is not evident.	
S 47 – multi agency and timeliness	S47 enquiry is multi-agency, rigorous and holistic, carried out in accordance with the plan, within timescales and demonstrates defensible decision making and good recording.	S47 enquiry carried out in accordance with plan, in appropriate timescales and covers key areas.	S47 enquiry carried out in accordance with plan but did not cover all key areas and was outside of planned timescales.	S47 enquiry not carried out in accordance with the plan, significantly delayed or lacking in focus on key areas of risk/need.	
S 47 – consideration of family members and relevant others	All appropriate agencies and family members were consulted/involved, and all checks made (including regular visitors and recently estranged). Relevant information gathered.	Appropriate agencies and family members were consulted and involved. Relevant information gathered.	Appropriate agencies and family members were involved but not widely enough.	Significant gaps in consulting relevant agencies and/or family members.	

S 47 – child seen alone	Child seen alone and wishes, and feelings recorded and evidence of skilled practice in how child/young person's views were sought. Direct work with the child is in relation to the presenting risk.	Child seen alone and wishes, and feelings recorded. Direct work is in relation to the presenting risk.	Child seen alone but wishes and feelings are recorded.	Child not seen alone and/or views not evident.	
S 47 – assessment of risk and protective factors	Risks and vulnerabilities are identified. Social worker has used relevant information and intuitive understanding of behaviour to inform the analysis. All the children in the family (if relevant) are considered. Protective factors are identified and considered. Outcome of assessment is evident and appropriate.	Risks clearly identified and actions taken to reduce risk. All the children in the family (if relevant) are considered. Outcome of the assessment is evident.	Risks are evident. Evaluation and analysis lacks detail. Brief response to reducing the risk. Outcome of assessment is provided.	S47 does not clearly evaluate risks and how to manage risks. Outcome is unclear.	
S 47 – professional judgement	Assessment is thorough and shows evidence based professional judgement and identifies all risk evident at that time	Assessment shows sound professional judgement and identifies some risks	Appropriate assessment undertaken and risks are beginning to be identified	Assessment not clearly evidenced	Requires an immediate response to safeguard child/ren
S 47 – outcome of enquiry	Outcome of enquiry appropriate to level of risk and appropriate decisions evidenced and made.	Outcome of enquiry appropriate to level of risk and appropriate decisions made.	Outcome of enquiry appropriate.	Outcome of enquiry is inappropriate.	

## SECTION 2: CASE RECORDING

Criteria	O: Outstanding	G: Good	R: Requires Improvement	I: Inadequate	I/C: Inadequate Critical equate Critical
up to date and comprehensive	Recording is well written, up to date, detailed, analytical and concise, providing a coherent account of issues and intervention, and provides a narrative for the child's story. Also provides sufficient detail to ensure effective safeguarding and focussed planning at all times.	Recording is well written, up to date concise and analytical and provides sufficient detail to ensure effective safeguarding and focussed planning at all times. There is some narrative of the child.	Recordings are more or less up to date. There is some focus on planning and narrative of the child.	Recording is out of date and does not provide sufficiently clear information to support planning.	There are no recordings on child's file.

Suitability	Records clearly indicate they have been reviewed, updated and quality assured by social workers and managers.	Records indicate that social workers and managers have reviewed and quality assured records.	Records provide some evidence of quality assurance activity on records.	No evidence of quality assurance activity on the child's records.	
Chronology and genogram;  Consideration of case history	There is an up to date chronology which details significant events only. Evidence that case history has been considered and in cooperated in case work and supports assessment, analysis and planning.  Comprehensive genogram which includes all significant relationships	There is an up to date chronology (within 3 months) which details significant events only. Evidence that case history has been considered and in cooperated in case work and supports assessment, analysis and planning. Comprehensive genogram which includes all significant relationships	Chronology requires updating. Genogram does not include all significant relationships. Evidence that case history has been considered and in cooperated in case work and supports assessment, analysis and planning	No evidence of a chronology. No evidence of a genogram. No evidence that case history has been considered and in cooperated in case work.	
overall judgement	Recordings are concise and well written. Void of jargon and clear. There is evidence to show that the SW has considered in case file recording not only the here and now needs in managing the child's case, but also the longer-term needs of the child with respect to access to their records at a later date.	The case file recording is of a good standard which will facilitate access to the records in the future should this be required.	Case file recording is of sufficient quality to enable the file to be accessed at a later date if required.	Case file recording is difficult to understand, inconsistent or incomplete.	

**SECTION 3: SUPERVISION/MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT**

Criteria	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate/Critical</b>
Frequency	Supervision taking place within a frequency which is in accordance with the supervision policy and is appropriate to the complexity of the case and is responsive to social worker's needs.	Supervision taking place in accordance with supervision policy and is responsive to social worker's needs.	Supervision has been taking place in accordance with supervision policy.	Supervision has not been taking place in accordance with supervision policy.	Significant gaps in supervision

<p>Review of previously agreed actions;</p> <p>Review of the progress of any plan in place</p> <p>Critical discussion and case reflection</p>	<p>Supervision is timely, reflective, analytical and evidences issues which have been raised, setting clear parameters with a focus on the CP/CIN/LAC plan regarding required actions, contingencies, and outstanding work, addressing timescales effectively. Evidence of review of actions identified in previous supervision.</p> <p>Supervision notes are recorded on the child's electronic file in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Supervision is timely, reflective, and analytical and evidences issues which have been raised. It sets clear parameters with a focus on the CP/CIN/LAC plan regarding required actions, contingencies, and outstanding work. Evidence of review of actions identified in previous supervision. Supervision notes are recorded on the child's electronic file.</p>	<p>Supervision is not timely and has limited evidence of reflection and evaluation of work. Minimum focus on the CP/CIN/LAC plan</p> <p>No evidence of review of previous supervision actions.</p> <p>Supervision decisions are recorded on the child's electronic file</p>	<p>Supervision is not timely, and records do not provide outline of decision making, have no evidence of reflection or analysis and/or fail to address concerns. No evidence of review of previous supervision actions.</p>	<p>No evidence that Supervision has taken place.</p>
<p>Discussion of audit findings and improvement plan</p>	<p>Where a case has been audited in the past 6 months, evidence of Management Decision/Supervision case notes showing discussion of 'audit findings and improvement plan' by Team Manager and allocated practitioner specifying clear timescales of addressing actions identified in the improving plan. Evidence of subsequent management oversight on progress of improvement plan.</p>	<p>Where a case has been audited in the past 6 months, evidence of Management Decision/Supervision case notes showing discussion of 'audit findings and improvement plan' by Team Manager and allocated practitioner specifying clear timescales of addressing actions identified in the improving plan.</p>	<p>Where a case has been audited in the past 6 months, evidence of Management Decision/Supervision case notes showing discussion of 'audit findings and improvement plan' by Team Manager and allocated practitioner.</p>	<p>Where a case has been audited in the past 6 months, no evidence of Management Decision/Supervision case notes showing discussion of 'audit findings and improvement plan' by Team Manager and allocated practitioner.</p>	
<b>SECTION 4. CHILD CENTRED PRACTICE</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical</b>
The Child as 'the golden thread'	The s.47 investigation and Child and Family Assessment focuses on the individual needs and safety of all the children in the family. There	The s.47 investigation and Child and Family Assessment focuses on the individual needs and	The s.47 investigation and Child and Family Assessment focuses on the safety of all the children in the family.	The s.47 investigation and Child and Family Assessment focuses on the safety of the subject of the	

	<p>is good use of information from relevant professionals to evidence the general well-being, development, risk and history of the child and family. Throughout the case there is evidence that the child has remained the focus of assessment and planning. Research is used to illustrate understanding of the child's development and their immediate and emerging needs.</p>	<p>safety of all the children in the family. There is good use of information from relevant professionals to evidence the general well-being, development, risk and history of the child and family. Throughout the case there is evidence that the child has remained the focus of assessment and planning.</p>	<p>There is use of information from professionals to evidence general well-being and risk. There is some detail of the history of the child and family. The child does not always remain the focus of the assessment and planning.</p>	<p>referral. Little or no information from relevant professionals. The history of the family has not been explored fully. The child has not remained the focus of the assessment and planning.</p>	
Voice of the Child	<p>Voice of the child is evident. Child seen alone and provided with an opportunity to provide their views of the family situation. Direct work with the child includes creative methods of ensuring age appropriate and purposeful interaction. Advocacy services are actively encouraged when appropriate. Child seen regularly and in accordance with statutory guidelines. Worker is able to provide a description of the child's experience within the household and in relation to the presenting issues.</p>	<p>Child seen alone, regularly and in accordance with statutory guidelines. There is evidence that Direct work with the child includes creative methods of ensuring age appropriate interaction. Information on Advocacy services are provided. The child's views are recorded.</p>	<p>Child has been seen alone and in accordance with statutory guidelines. There is some evidence of direct work and the child's views are recorded.</p>	<p>Child has not been seen alone and/or not in accordance with statutory guidelines. There is no record of the views of the child.</p>	
Safety of the child	<p>Throughout the assessment and planning, focus is maintained on the safety of the child. Safety planning tools are utilised to assess risk. Immediate risk is addressed in a timely manner. Safety plans are evidenced on child's file. CP and CIN planning meetings are held in accordance with statutory guidelines and utilised effectively to</p>	<p>Throughout the assessment and planning, focus is maintained on the child's safety. Immediate risk is addressed in a timely manner. Safety plans are evidenced on child's file. CP/CIN planning meetings are held in</p>	<p>Risk to the child is responded to. Immediate risk is addressed in a timely manner. Safety planning is not always evidenced on child's file. CP and CIN planning meetings are held but not always in accordance with statutory guidelines. The child is safe.</p>	<p>Risks have not been assessed appropriately. Immediate risk is addressed but not in a timely manner. Safety plans are not evidenced on the child's file. CP and CIN planning meetings are not held in accordance with statutory guidelines. There is an</p>	<p>The child is not safe.</p>

	calculate, manage and prevent risk of harm. The child is safe.	accordance with statutory guidelines. Child is safe.		uncertainty as to whether child is safe.	
Ethnicity and Diversity	Child's ethnicity and diversity is given full consideration in relation to the child's development, experiences and family functioning. This information is utilised appropriately within assessment and planning. Research on varying cultures is utilised to inform practice and to plan possible outcomes for the child.	Child's ethnicity and diversity is given full consideration in relation to the child's development, experiences and family functioning. This information is utilised appropriately within assessment & planning.	Child's ethnicity is noted and some consideration given to the family functioning. Ethnicity and Diversity are not fully considered within assessment and planning.	Child's Ethnicity is noted but is not given consideration and is not used to inform assessment and planning.	

**SECTION 5. ASSESSMENT**

**For cases where there has been no Child and Family Assessment completed in the past year, this section considers the quality of the Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference or LAC Review**

Criteria	O: Outstanding	G: Good	R: Requires Improvement	I: Inadequate	I/C: Inadequate Critical
Quality	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review is of high quality and well written. Includes detailed and robust analysis with good Social work judgement. Includes strengths/ needs/ risk/vulnerabilities in considering all children present in the household. Includes relevant research and use of strengthening practice tools. Timeline and significant events completed. Includes Genogram.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review is well written and clearly identifies strengths and areas of concern Provides a detailed analysis and good social work judgement. All children present in the household are considered. Includes relevant research and use of strengthening practice tools. Includes reference to an up to date chronology.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review identifies strengths and areas of concern, provides an appropriate analysis and social work judgement. All children present in the household are considered.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review does not fully identify strengths and areas of concern and provides an inadequate analysis. All children present in the household are not considered.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review does not enable a decision to be made regarding progression.
Analysis and plans	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of	The plan does not address risk/need.

	to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review is of high quality, provides a clear analysis of strengths, need/risk/ vulnerabilities and sets out a robust plan which responds appropriately to this. Plan utilises local resources and is considered manageable.	Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review is of a good quality. Provides an analysis of strengths, need/risk/ vulnerabilities. Identifies a clear case plan which is considered manageable.	Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review provides an analysis and identifies a case plan, which addresses risk/need.	Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review analysis is weak. Identifies a plan which does not fully address risk/ need.	
Outcomes	Clearly identifies outcomes. Rationale is provided. Reference is made to statutory guidelines.	Clearly identifies outcomes. Rationale is provided.	Clearly identifies outcomes.	Outcomes are not clear.	
Management oversight	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review; reviewed and upon completion signed off by Manager within timescales. Evidence of quality assurance and analysis re: decision making by manager and feedback to social worker.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review; reviewed and upon completion signed off by Manager within timescales. Evidence of some quality assurance by manager.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review; reviewed and upon completion signed off by Manager within timescales.	Assessment has not been reviewed or signed off by Manager.	
Multi-agency context	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review includes historical and present multi agency information which is utilised appropriately within the case analysis to inform decision making and planning.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review includes multi agency information which is utilised to inform decision making and planning.	Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review includes some information from other agencies.	No multi-agency context to assessment included, despite clear indication that other agencies are involved.	Multi agency information has been missed which places the child at risk.
Child's views	Child seen alone (where appropriate), spoken to and views recorded. Views and wishes clearly reflected in	Child seen alone (where appropriate), spoken to and their views recorded and reflected in	Child seen alone (where appropriate), spoken to and their views recorded within Assessment/ Pathway	No evidence to suggest child has been seen.	Child has not been seen.  Disclosures of a

	assessment and taken into account as far as possible. Evidence of Direct Work Tools used to engage with the child. Disclosures of a safeguarding nature are appropriately considered.	assessment. Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review demonstrates a sense of the child. Evidence of Direct Work Tools used to engage with the child. Disclosures of a safeguarding nature are appropriately considered	Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review Disclosures of a safeguarding nature are appropriately considered	No evidence to suggest that they have been spoken to on their own.	safeguarding nature are not appropriately considered
Diversity	Diversity and disability issued identified and appropriately considered within Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review and planning.	Diversity and disability issues identified and considered within Assessment/ Pathway Plan/Review of Child's Plan and Assessment/practitioner's report to Child Protection Conference /LAC Review.	Diversity and disability issues noted. No evidence issues have been considered.	No evidence of diversity or disability issues having been noted or considered	
Sharing with families	Evidence that assessment has been shared with parents/carers and child/young person (appropriate to age and understanding) throughout the assessment process. Feedback on assessment has been sought and evidenced in electronic case note.	Evidence that assessment has been shared with parents/carers and child/young person (appropriate to age and understanding).	Assessment shared with parents/carers and child/young person (appropriate to age and understanding).	Assessment not shared with family.	
Feedback evidence	Outcome of assessment is shared and feedback is well evidenced (appropriate to age and understanding).	Outcome of the assessment is shared with parents/carers and child/young person (appropriate to age and understanding). Feedback is sought.	Outcome of assessment shared with parents/carers and child/young person	Outcome not shared with family.	



**6. CHILD IN NEED PLANNING (See review of the plan in the last section)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical equate Critical</b>
CIN – rationale	Decision to progress to CIN was appropriate and in accordance with threshold and eligibility criteria. Rationale for decision making well evidenced.	Decision to progress to CIN was appropriate and in accordance with threshold and eligibility criteria.	Decision to progress to child in need was appropriate, though rationale not evidenced.	Decision to progress to CIN not appropriate/ or lack of evidence to demonstrate rationale for involvement by CSC	No plan has been identified for the child.
CIN - timeliness	Child in need meeting held 10 days after the completion of the assessment and then 12 weeks after. Child in Need Meetings are held every 6 weeks to review the plan. CIN Plan has clear timescales. Plan is reviewed and updated. Visits to the child are carried out every 4-6 weeks according to plan. Safeguarding needs are responded to accordingly.	Child in need meeting held 10 days after the completion of the assessment and then 12 weeks after. Visits to the child are carried out every 4-6 according to plan. Reviews have taken place. Safeguarding needs are responded to accordingly	Child in need meeting held. Gaps identified in the plan with little evidence of timescales. Plan requires updating. There is evidence that visits are taking place but not always in accordance with plan.	Significant delay in child in need meeting taking place.	
CIN - effectiveness	CIN meetings highly effective, held within timescales, analyse needs/risks, engage parents and professionals and set out clear and robust and focussed plans that are appropriate to identified need and risk within measurable timescales. There is good monitoring of the child's welfare and child's immediate or safeguarding needs are responded to accordingly.	CIN meetings held regularly, clearly analyse needs/risks, include parents/carers and relevant agencies and set out clear plan for addressing needs/risk. There is good monitoring of the child's welfare. Safeguarding needs are responded to accordingly.	CIN meetings held, some analysis of needs/risks, include parents and agencies. Plan is devised to address needs/risks. There is adequate monitoring of the child's welfare	CIN meetings held infrequently, have insufficient focus on risk/need. Plans are unclear and do not adequately the needs of the child.	
CIN - implementation	Strong evidence to demonstrate that the CIN plan is being driven forward robustly in a timely way. Plan is reviewed, evaluated and updated as required. Parents	Evidence that CIN plan is being progressed and driven forward. Plan is being reviewed. Parents and professionals are	CIN plan is in place but evidence lacking to demonstrate the progression. Plan has not been updated though there is some	Lack of evidence to demonstrate sufficient progress in relation to actions set out in CIN plan.	

	and professionals are aware of the plan and are able to implement accordingly.	aware of the plan.	evidence that reviews have taken place. Parents and professionals are aware of the plan.	Delays in work progressing and lack of focus.	
CIN – visiting	Social worker visits in accordance with the plan and has built relationship with the child/ren, which enables the child/ren to be safeguarded and their needs to be well met. Child's wishes and feeling recognised within the plan.	Social worker visits in accordance with plan and sees child/ren with sufficient frequency to establish relationship and safeguard the child. There is some evidence that the views of the child have been considered in planning.	Social worker has visited in accordance with plan and sees the child/ren on their own to obtain wishes and feelings. Child's voice lacking in the planning.	Social worker has not visited in accordance with the plan and/or does not see the child/ren on their own (where this would be expected).	

**7. CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING (See review of the plan in the last section)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical</b>
CP - rationale	Decision to progress to ICPC was appropriate, rationale for decision making defensible and very well evidenced. Statutory framework referred to.	Decision to progress to ICPC appropriate and well evidenced.	Decision to progress to ICPC was appropriate, though more robust analysis would have provided better evidence.	Unclear rationale provided for decision to progress to conference.	
CP - timeliness	CP conference held 15 working days from the strategy meeting which determined start date of s.47 enquiry with evidence of maintaining focus on safeguarding child. Child and Family assessment is provided for conference which is robust and clearly identifies the risks, needs and strengths. Any delay in conference evidenced as being in the best welfare of the child.	CP conference held 15 working days from strategy meeting which determined the start date of s.47 enquiry whilst maintaining focus on safeguarding child. Child and Family assessment is provided to the Conference identifies risks. Delay in conference evidenced as being in the best welfare of the child.	CP conference held 15 working days from the strategy meeting which determined the start date of s.47 enquiry. Child and Family Assessment is provided to the conference. Any delay in conference has not been clearly evidenced.	CP conference inappropriately delayed and actions to safeguard the child in interim not robust enough. Child and Family Assessment does not provide a good enough analysis of risks and needs.	
CP – sharing with families	Social Work report shared with family 5 days before conference and includes their comments	Social Work report shared with family 3 days prior to conference and includes their comments	Family have had sight of the Social Work report prior to conference. Comments are not gathered prior to	Social Work report not shared with family prior to the conference.	

			conference.	No social work report provided to the conference	
CP - effectiveness	CP conferences highly effective, held regularly, clearly analyse needs/risks, engage parents/carers and network of professionals and set out clear and robust plans for addressing needs/risks with measurable timescales provided. Every child within the family have been provided with due consideration.	CP Conferences effective, held regularly, and clearly analyses needs/risks. Includes parents/carers and relevant agencies and sets out clear outline plan for addressing needs/risk. Every child within the family have been provided with due consideration.	CP conferences held regularly with the participation of parents/carers and some professionals. Risks are analysed to some extent and sets an outline plan. Due consideration has not been provided to all of the children in the family.	CP conferences held inconsistently and provide insufficient analysis of risk. Outline plans not sufficiently focussed on reducing risk. Due consideration has not been provided to all of the children in the family.	
CP – child's view	Child's wishes well evidenced, child enabled to participate appropriately and considered during the conference. Advocacy services utilised if necessary.	Evidence of child's wishes and feelings being considered during the conference.	Record of child's wishes and feelings.	No evidence of child's wishes and feelings.	
CP – multi-agency	Evidence of good communication and working together with relevant professionals/agencies. New Agencies are considered as plan is reviewed and updated. Implementation of plan is progressing and in accordance with timescales.	Evidence of good communication and working together with relevant professionals/agencies. Implementation of plan is progressing and in accordance with timescales.	Some evidence of good communication and working together with relevant professionals/agencies. Implementation of plan lacks progress.	Little evidence of good communication and working together with relevant professionals/agencies. Impact on implementation of plan.	
CP – Core Groups	Core group meets within timescale and always in accordance with the plan, with good attendance by agencies and clear engagement with parents/carers focussed on reducing risk. Tasks are clearly identified for parents and professionals within the meeting. Core group minutes	Core group always meets in accordance with the plan, with good attendance by agencies and engagement with parents/carers focussed on reducing risk. Core group minutes sent to all members of the meeting within 5 working days.	Core group meets regularly but just outside of timescales. The meetings are well attended, adding detail to plan, some engagement with parent to reduce risk to child. Core group minutes are sent to parents and professionals but not within timescales.	Core group not meeting regularly.	

	sent to all members of the meeting within 5 working days.				
CP - implementation	Strong evidence to demonstrate that all elements of the plan are being driven forward robustly, in a timely way, evaluated and amended as required.	Evidence to demonstrate that the plan is being driven forward robustly, in a timely way, evaluated and amended as required.	Some evidence to suggest that CP plan is progressing and is being implemented.	The CP plan is not being implemented in any way which evidences that the child is safeguarded.	
CP – visits	The child is visited in accordance with the plan, unannounced and announced. The children are spoken to alone (where appropriate). Direct work is utilised to encourage a good relationship and open communication with the child. CP visits are utilised to assess the safety of the child and to progress the plan with the parents. Evidence of CP visits are recorded 24 hours after the visit has taken place.	The child is visited in accordance with the plan, unannounced and announced. The children are spoken to alone (where appropriate). CP visits are utilised to assess the safety of the child and to progress the plan with the parents. Evidence of CP visits are recorded 24 hours after the visit has taken place.	The child is visited in accordance with the plan, unannounced and announced. The children are spoken to alone (where appropriate) to obtain wishes and feelings.	SW has not visited in accordance with the plan and/or does not see the child/ren on their own (where this would be expected).	
CP – diversity	Diversity and disability issues appropriately identified, understood and considered in the plan	Diversity and disability issues identified and considered.	Diversity and disability issues identified.	Diversity and disability issues are not identified	
CP – contingency	A cogent and clear contingency plan is in place. Parents and professionals are aware of the plan.	Evidence of contingency planning in place. Parents are aware of the plan.	Evidence of some contingency planning in place.	No evidence of contingency planning.	

**8. CARE PLANNING FOR LAC (See review of the plan in the last section)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical equate Critical</b>
LAC – Planning	The Care Plan is comprehensive and updated to ensure it addresses all identified	The Care Plan is up-to-date and includes a PEP, health plan, placement	An up-to-date Care plan is in place (including a PEP, health plan, placement plan	There is no up-to-date care plan – including the	There is no plan recorded.

	needs for the child / YP, which is based on a robust and comprehensive multi-agency assessment. The plan includes a PEP, health plan, placement plan, permanency plan and placement - day to day arrangements. Child/ YP's views are reflected within the plan. The plan is recorded.	plan and permanency plan and placement - day to day arrangements. The plan is based on a clear assessment of the child's needs and how these needs will be met. The plan is recorded.	and permanency plan), setting out the child/YP's needs and how they will be met. The plan is recorded.	absence of any of the following (PEP, Health Plan, Placement Plan, Permanency Plan (from 2nd LAC review)).  The plan is recorded.	
LAC – Child's needs	The plan shows evidence of a thorough and analytical understanding of the child/YP's present and future needs and how these will be met, within clear timescales.	The plan shows evidence of a good understanding of the child/YP's needs and how these will be met, within clear timescales.	The plan shows some understanding of the child/YP's needs and how these will be met.	The plan shows minimum understanding of the child's needs.	
LAC – Pathway Plan	A Pathway Plan is in place (where appropriate), showing effective use of multi-agency working in how the YP's transition to adulthood will be achieved & supported. Contingency planning is evident.	A Pathway Plan is in place (where appropriate), which sets out the YP's transition to adulthood – including the use of a contingency plan.	Pathway plan (where appropriate) is in place.	Where required, there is no evidence of a pathway plan.	
LAC – Service user involvement	There is evidence of innovative ways of involving the child/YP and their family (where appropriate) in developing and implementing the plan.	There is evidence that the child/YP and their family (where appropriate) has been involved in developing the plan.	There is evidence to show that the child/ YP, their parents/family, and carers have been provided with a copy of the care plan.	There is no evidence of the child/ YP or their family (when appropriate) being involved in planning and/or decision-making	
LAC – Implementation	The implementation of the plan has adhered to timescales and utilised local as well as national resources which have supported a significant improvement in outcomes for the child/ YP. Where appropriate family members have been	The plan is progressing and meeting the child/YP's needs.	There is some indication that the care plan is being progressed, but this is poorly evidenced.	The care plan is drifting and has not been progressed	

	encouraged to participate in the implementation of the plan.				
LAC – Direct work	Social worker visits the child/ YP at a frequency that meets statutory guidelines. There is evidence to show that the social worker has established a positive and responsive relationship with the child / YP. Any use of Direct Work tools is evidenced. Good working relationship with carer is evident.	Social worker visits the child/ YP at a frequency that meets statutory guidelines and is responsive to the wishes of the child/ YP. Good working relationship with carer is evident.	Social worker has visited in accordance with statutory intervals and there is evidence that the child / YP has been seen on their own.	There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the child / YP has been seen alone at any time during visits.	The child/YP has not seen.
LAC – Accessibility of recording	Case file recording exceeds required standards and has considered longer term function of the case file as a means of accessing information by the YP.	Case file recording meets required standards; it has considered longer term function of the case file as a means of accessing information by the YP.	Case file recording meets required standards.	Recording on file is limited with respect to key issues and information including visits to the child	

**SECTION 9: REVIEW (CIN/CP/LAC)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>O: Outstanding</b>	<b>G: Good</b>	<b>R: Requires Improvement</b>	<b>I: Inadequate</b>	<b>I/C: Inadequate Critical equate Critical</b>
Review – plan	Plan (CIN, CP or LAC) has been reviewed in accordance with statutory/procedural requirements and is appropriate and responsive to the child/YP's changing needs. Multi agency context is evident. Updated plan is recorded.	Plan (CIN, CP or LAC) has been reviewed in accordance with statutory/procedural requirements and is responsive to the child/YP's changing needs. Updated plan is recorded.	Plan (CIN, CP or LAC) has been reviewed in accordance with statutory/procedural requirements. Plan has not been appropriately updated.	Plan (CIN, CP or LAC) has not been reviewed in accordance with statutory/procedural requirements. Plan does not reflect update/review of plan.	The plan has not been reviewed for a significant period of time.
Review – service user involvement	The timetable of parents and school (childminding) are considered in arranging time and date for Reviews. Key family members/child/YP or professionals invited. Explanation is provided to the family of the Review meeting.	The timetable of parents and school (childminding) are considered in arranging time and date for Reviews. Key family members/child/YP or professionals invited to attend.	Explanation is provided to the family of the Review meeting. Parents/carers/child/YP and professionals are invited to reviews and their attendance supported.	Key family members/child/YP or professionals are not invited to review meetings.	

	Emphasis is placed on participation rather than attendance. There is evidence to show imaginative and innovative ways of involving the child and their family in reviews of the plan. When parents/child cannot attend, feedback is provided.	Explanation is provided to the family of the Review meeting. Emphasis is placed on participation rather than attendance. When parents/child cannot attend, feedback is provided.	When parents/child cannot attend, feedback is provided.		
Review - meetings	Review meetings are meeting the child's needs in a holistic way and assisting the child to reach their potential. They ensure the child/YP's participation and respond proactively to feedback and adapt accordingly.	Review meetings are focused on and meeting the child/YP's needs and ensure their participation.	Review meetings are meeting the child/YP's needs to some extent and encourage participation.	Review meetings are not meeting the child's needs and do not act to encourage the child/YP's participation.	
Review – records	Records of reviews are comprehensive and inclusive. Providing detailed analysis of the issues and actions that are required to meet outcomes, including timescales. Jargon free and comprehensible. Minutes are sent out to family and professionals within 5 working days. Record of Review is recorded.	Records of reviews are comprehensive and provide analysis of the issues and actions that are required to meet outcomes, including timescales. Minutes are sent out to family and professionals within 5 working days. Record of Review is recorded.	Records of reviews set out key information, including recommendations, actions and timescales. Minutes have been sent out to family and professionals. Record of Review is recorded.	Review records are insufficiently detailed to enable clear planning and action.  Minutes have not been sent out. Record of Review is recorded.	There is no record of review on the child's file
Review – monitoring plan	For LAC; IRO is reviewing plan in accordance with regulations between LAC Reviews and there is evidence that review has an impact on the progression and well-being of the plan. Concerns are escalated appropriately. Outcome of Review is clearly recorded.	For LAC; IRO is reviewing plan in accordance with regulations between LAC Reviews and is escalating concerns.	For LAC; IRO is reviewing plan between reviews	No evidence that the IRO is monitoring the LAC Care Plan between reviews in accordance with regulations	