

CORPORATE PARENTING BOARD – PERFORMANCE REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2010

CONTEXT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with performance information in relation to Children in Care also referred to as Looked after Children (LAC) and to highlight results as of July 2010. The information included is that which has already been agreed and presented to the Children and Families Management Team. At each Corporate Parenting Board, an overview of performance will be given against available monthly and/or quarterly measures.

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Performance against key measures is listed below:

| NI/Code | Description | Monthly / Quarterly | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2010/11 | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|----|---------------|
| | | | Stat Neighbour *1 | Outturn | Target | April | May | June | Q1 | July *2 |
| CSS101(a) | Number of Looked After Children | M | - | 517 | 480 | 521 | 533 | 528 | - | 534 |
| CSS101 (b) | Rate per 10,000 of Looked After Children | M | - | (92.5) | (85.8) | (93.3) | (95.4) | (94.4) | - | (95.5) |
| CSS114 | Number of Admissions to Looked After | M | - | 273 | - | 20 | 32 | 11 | - | 16 |
| CSS115 | Number of Discharges from Looked After | M | - | 229 | - | 17 | 13 | 6 | - | 15 |

*1 No statistical neighbour benchmarking data is available for 2009/10 until September 2010

*2 RAG rating is based on latest results (Q1 or July) against 2010/11 target data

| NI/Code | Description | Monthly / Quarterly | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2010/11 | | | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|-------|------|---------|
| | | | Stat Neighbour *1 | Outturn | Target | April | May | June | Q1 | July *2 |
| NI 62 | Stability of placements of Looked After Children: Number of Moves (based on rolling 12 months) | Q | 11.3% | 9.9% | 12.0% | - | - | - | 8.9% | - |
| NI 63 | Stability of placements of Looked After Children: Length of Placement | M | 65.2% | 63.9% | 67.0% | 65.7% | 67.2% | 69.0% | - | 65.4% |
| NI 66 | Looked After Children Cases which were reviewed within required timescales | M | 89.1% | 85.9% | 90.0% | 90.4% | 90.9% | 87.2% | - | 89.8% |
| PAF C63 | Participation in Reviews | M | 86.0% | 74.3% | 85.0% | 75.4% | 81.7% | 81.6% | - | 86.3% |
| CSS 158 | % of Children Looked After for more than 3 months with an up-to-date health assessment | M | - | New local measure for 2010/11 | 80.0% | 71.7% | 66.2% | 65.4% | - | 65.9% |
| CSS 159 | % of Children Looked After for more than 3 months with an up-to-date dental check | M | - | New local measure for 2010/11 | 80.0% | 74.2% | 71.1% | 71.5% | - | 76.3% |
| CSS 160 | % of Children Looked After for more than 3 months with an up-to-date SDQ | M | - | New local measure for 2010/11 | Awaiting | 47.0% | 44.7% | 42.3% | - | 41.5% |
| CSS 151 | % of Care Leavers with Pathway Plan | M | - | Awaiting | 100.0% | 76.0% | Awaiting | 92.0% | - | 92.0% |

*1 No statistical neighbour benchmarking data is available for 2009/10 until September 2010

*2 RAG rating is based on latest results (Q1 or July) against 2010/11 target data

| NI/Code | Description | Monthly / Quarterly | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2010/11 | | | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | | Stat Neighbour *1 | Outturn | Target | April | May | June | Q1 | July *2 |
| CSS 153 | % of Looked After Children with a completed PEP | M | - | 22.0% | 100.0% | 27.0% | 50.0% | 64.0% | - | 73.0% |
| NI 147 | % of Care Leavers in suitable accommodation | Q | 91.1% | 91.4% | 100.0% | - | - | - | 83.3% | - |
| NI 148 | % of Care Leavers in Employment, Education or Training (EET) | Q | 58.8% | 72.4% | 75.0% | - | - | - | 91.7% | - |

Performance against LAC measures remains challenging. Whilst performance in some areas has improved, significant focus is being placed on areas where performance is weaker. Robust action plans have been put in place to drive performance improvements and are being monitored by senior management.

Over the coming months work will be undertaken to review the effectiveness of current performance metrics of LAC and to introduce improved outcome measures for this vulnerable group.

*1 No statistical neighbour benchmarking data is available for 2009/10 until September 2010

*2 RAG rating is based on latest results (Q1 or July) against 2010/11 target data