

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where individuals, communities and businesses flourish

Corporate Parenting Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **12 March 2015** in **Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL**

Membership:

Councillors Bukky Okunade (Chair), James Halden (Vice-Chair), Jan Baker, Charles Curtis, Sue Gray, Susan Little, Joycelyn Redsell and 1 Independent vacancy

Natalie Carter, Thurrock Open Door Representative
Jackie Howell, Thurrock One Team Foster Care Association
Sharon Smith, Thurrock One Team Foster Care Association
1 vacancy – representative of the Children in Care Council

Substitutes:

Councillors Tunde Ojetola, Maureen Pearce, Phil Smith and 4 vacancies (1 Conservative, 1 Independent, 2 Labour)

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Corporate Parenting Committee meeting held on 18 December 2014.	
3 Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4 Declaration of Interests	

5	Adoption Report Outlining Process and Performance	11 - 20
6	Health of Looked After Children	21 - 26
7	Information on Recent External Placements for young people	27 - 32
8	Attendance of the District Nurse at Meetings	33 - 36

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Jan Natynczyk, Senior Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **4 March 2015**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Recording of meetings

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

What is a Non-Pecuniary interest? – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:

- Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;
- Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and
- leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon

If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps

Non- pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.

Vision: Thurrock: A place of **opportunity**, **enterprise** and **excellence**, where **individuals**, **communities** and **businesses** flourish.

To achieve our vision, we have identified five strategic priorities:

1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity

- Ensure that every place of learning is rated “Good” or better
- Raise levels of aspiration and attainment so that residents can take advantage of local job opportunities
- Support families to give children the best possible start in life

2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity

- Promote Thurrock and encourage inward investment to enable and sustain growth
- Support business and develop the local skilled workforce they require
- Work with partners to secure improved infrastructure and built environment

3. Build pride, responsibility and respect

- Create welcoming, safe, and resilient communities which value fairness
- Work in partnership with communities to help them take responsibility for shaping their quality of life
- Empower residents through choice and independence to improve their health and well-being

4. Improve health and well-being

- Ensure people stay healthy longer, adding years to life and life to years
- Reduce inequalities in health and well-being and safeguard the most vulnerable people with timely intervention and care accessed closer to home
- Enhance quality of life through improved housing, employment and opportunity

5. Promote and protect our clean and green environment

- Enhance access to Thurrock's river frontage, cultural assets and leisure opportunities
- Promote Thurrock's natural environment and biodiversity
- Inspire high quality design and standards in our buildings and public space

Minutes of the Meeting of the Corporate Parenting Committee held on 18 December 2014 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Bukky Okunade (Chair), James Halden (Vice-Chair), Jan Baker, Charles Curtis and Joycelyn Redsell

Natalie Carter, Thurrock Open Door
Jackie Howell, Thurrock One Team Foster Care Association

Apologies: Councillors Sue Gray, Susan Little and Sharon Smith

In attendance: Carmel Littleton, Director of Children's Services
Paul Coke, Service Manager (Children & Families)
Neale Laurie – Service Manager
Roland Minto – Service Manager
Keeley Pullen – Head Teacher for Virtual School
Matthew Boulter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

14. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

15. Declaration of Interests

None.

16. Items of Urgent Business

The Committee noted that an additional report titled 'Independent Reviewing Officers Annual Report 2013-14' had been scheduled for this meeting and would be taken in due course.

17. Education Results for Looked After Children

The Committee was informed that there had been an increase in the number of Looked After Children in year 6 who were eligible for key stage 2 tests. Within this cohort, five of the children were not at a required educational level to sit the tests and this represented 29% of the cohort. All five children had special educational needs. In writing and maths, the group had achieved above or in line the national and regional averages. Attainment in reading was above the regional average but below the national average. Performance had declined since 2013 but because of the small numbers involved the presence

of the five children who were unable to sit the tests had significantly affected performance. All children in this cohort had now gone into secondary education with a transition plan to personalise and assist in their future educational development.

Members were assured that the service tracked the children throughout their school career even when they changed school or came in and out of care. Relationships with schools were very good and many worked with the Council to provide a tailored service for the children.

Twenty three pupils were of year 11 age and eligible to take GCSE exams. 30% of this cohort did not take the exams for various reasons including being in prison or being asylum seekers. One pupil achieved five A-C grades, one pupil achieved four A-Cs. 91% that completed year 11 were now in college, apprenticeships or sixth form. Next year, the service was predicting 18% of the cohort would achieve five A-C grades.

In response to a question it was confirmed there was no plan to make budget savings in this service.

RESOLVED: That the Committee note the educational outcomes of key stage 2 and 4 in 2013/14 and the measures in place for 2015/16 to further support the education of looked after children.

18. Item of Urgent Business - Independent Review Officers Annual Report 2013-14

The Committee learnt that Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) were a statutory obligation to be assigned to all looked after child. Requirements were to assign an IRO within ten days of a child coming into care. Thurrock's current average was twenty four hours. IROs in Thurrock had increased from four to five due to an increase in workload but also an expansion of IRO remit. Thurrock IROs had reviewed 659 cases in the last financial year, 98.5% of which were to agreed timescales. It was a strong service where the children themselves were able to engage in their own review and this was an aspect the Council wished to encourage and increase in future years.

Officers stated that the number of Looked after children in Thurrock was similar to other councils of the same size but the focus for the service was to improve the discharge of children from care. Officers assured Members that any child discharged was subject to monitoring either through a child in need plan, child protection plan or other. Those older children in care who regularly showed desires to return to their family home were reviewed as well for a suitable resolution.

The Committee discussed how the IROs escalated concerns in the department and were pleased that none had been escalated to director level. Officers responded that most issues were related to contact or care planning and were mainly resolved by team managers. The one issue escalated to head of service had been where social care and the IRO disagreed on the

course of action to be taken. Children and carers could self-refer concerns and could do this either through the council or Open Door, which was an independent advocacy service.

RESOLVED: That the Committee continues to monitor the activity of the IROs and request any further information it requires in its scrutiny role.

19. Information on Recent External Placements for Young People

The Council placed 73% of young people within twenty miles of their home. The national average was 77%, although the regional average was 68%. Members were also made aware that the Council was now liable for the cost of any child in care who was remanded in custody who was not then served a sentence. The cost for the current year relating to this was £234,000. The projected spend for external placements for this year was £9.4 million, which was £200,000 over budget. However, officers reminded Members that the specialist cases involved meant that this figure could fluctuate either way. It was hoped that a certain placement would end this coming weekend with the person returning to their family. This would have significant savings implications.

The Committee briefly discussed how the council decided when to use in-house fosterers and when to go out to the independent sector. Officers explained that they chose in-house fostering as often as they could but certain situations relating to a young person or persons meant that independent fostering away from the area was sometimes the preferred option. Extended family or friends placements were also considered highly desirable but this was obviously subject to the proper checks to ensure it was safe and suitable for the child.

RESOLVED: That the committee note the efforts made by officers to choose appropriate resources for looked after children, including our more difficult to place children.

20. Housing for Looked After Children and Care Leavers

Officers outlined the 'Staying Put' initiative from government which facilitated young people in care to stay with their foster carers beyond eighteen years of age. The young person could be in employment, education or training. The positives of this initiative were to allow young people to develop relationships with their foster families beyond immediate care and to provide stability in their lives. The challenges were that it reduced the available space for new foster placements. The One Team Foster Association representative also stated that if other younger foster children were living at the house, it would need to be considered whether the older teenager's actions were appropriate and did not negatively influence the younger children.

Officers also explained the new rules surrounding universal credit whereby a looked after child, once eighteen, would receive a universal benefit payment which included their housing benefit. They would then be required to pay their

foster carer the sum, the difference in foster payment being made up by the Council. Officers stressed that this new arrangement would be a challenge for some young people and they would need to be supported in taking responsibility for their income. It was stated that this was an unknown area and the Council would need to see how it worked and develop a policy appropriately.

During the debate it was clarified that the setting up home allowance was a one off payment of £2000 that was given to a young person to buy goods that would be needed to set up a home, for example, a washing machine. This money was controlled by the council and not given to the young person to solely manage.

Officers believed that any policy relating to 'Staying Put' would be agreed internally within the department and then sent to this committee for comment.

RESOLVED: That:

- 1. The Committee monitor the impact of the Staying Put Policy on foster placement and finance.**
- 2. The Committee monitor the impact of Universal Credit on care leavers.**

21. Thurrock Fostering Service

The Committee was informed that a team manager had left during the summer and the service was going to trial a structure without replacing this manager post to see whether it was sustainable or not. Officers also highlighted that the need to recruit foster carers was still required. The Committee agreed that councillors could help greatly in raising the profile of foster caring in the community.

A brief discussion on asylum seekers was had and it was discussed that they were not placed in families until they were assessed for suitability and safety.

Councillor Curtis noted that Alan Johnson had retired as Chair of the Fostering Panel and noted his gratitude for all his work over the years.

RESOLVED: That the Committee note both the current work of the service and the challenges that lay ahead, as well as recognising and supporting officers' work to develop the service.

22. Adoption Report Outlining Process and Performance

The Council was looking at alternative consortium arrangements following Havering leaving the Southend and Thurrock consortium. There was an option to work with a major national organisation but this had yet to be fully explored. If this was agreed there were potential impacts on current staff but as yet nothing had been decided.

Officers assured Members that the council had a very good relationship with Southend Council and there would be potential to work together in the future. In response to Member questions, officers explained that being part of a national consortium allowed the council to access policy development and leading research.

RESOLVED: That

1. **The Committee note the discussions that have taken place to date in identifying potential new partnership arrangements and support officers in their future pursuit of options to ensure sound and cost effective outcomes for children.**
2. **An update on the service be provided at the next meeting.**

23. Work Programme

RESOLVED: That

1. **The Work Programme be noted, with the addition of an Adoption Update report to be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee.**
2. **A report on the addition of a health service co-optee be produced at a suitable time.**

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

12 March 2015	ITEM: 5
Report to Corporate Parenting Committee	
Adoption Report Outlining Process and Performance	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision:
Report of: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes	
Accountable Head of Service: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes	
Accountable Director: Carmel Littleton, Director of Children’s Services	
This report is public	

Executive Summary

This report is for information only and fulfils the requirements of 25.6 of the National Minimum Standards for Adoption 2011, which is:

25.6 The executive side of the local authority, the voluntary adoption agency’s/Adoption Support Agency’s provider/trustees, board members or management committee members:

a. receive written reports on the management, outcomes and financial state of the agency every 6 months;

b. monitor the management and outcomes of the services in order to satisfy themselves that the agency is effective and is achieving good outcomes for children and/or service users;

c. satisfy themselves that the agency is complying with the conditions of registration.

This report updates the report previously presented in September 2014, and updates members on the Committee on activity over the last six months.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 The members of the Corporate Parenting Committee are asked to consider this report and their level of satisfaction with the above criteria on management, outcomes and conditions of registration.

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The work of the team is central to the provision offered to Thurrock's Looked After Children and operates to deliver one of the key objectives of the Children and Young Peoples Plan, "Objective CYPP (PWN) 3.3. Deliver outstanding fostering, private fostering & adoption; develop & maintain excellent services for children in care".

The work of the team helps to meet a fundamental requirement for fulfilling our Corporate Parenting responsibilities, namely wherever possible to seek a permanent substitute family home for Looked After Children for whom there is no potential for reunification with their birth family.

- 2.2 In the main, children who are recommended for adoption will have been removed from their birth parents as a result of likely or actual significant harm. They will have been made the subject of Care Orders. During the legal process, a Care Plan, ratified by the Court, will have determined that it is in the child's best interests to be placed for adoption. As part of the court process the court also review the Adoption Support Plan agreed by the Local Authority to ensure that it will meet the child's needs. Children placed for adoption are increasingly likely to have more complex needs, or be part of a sibling group, resulting in increased support packages. In England the average age of a child at the point of adoption in 2013-2014 was 3 years and 5 months, and 80% of adopted children were below the age of 5.
- 2.3 Occasionally, babies are 'relinquished' by their parents at birth for adoption, when they (with counselling and help) come to the conclusion that they are unable to offer a stable home to that child.
- 2.4 Thurrock was previously part of an Adoption Consortium with Southend and Havering, formed in 1999, which significantly extended the capacity of all three agencies to provide adoptive parents to children who need adoption. As previously reported in April 2014, Havering announced a formal withdrawal from the Consortium, without prior warning.
- 2.5 We made an agreement with Southend to continue with our partnership arrangement for the immediate future, but have both acknowledged that as a formal Consortium we cannot sustain this arrangement and have therefore agree to formally end the Consortium. However this needs to be set in the context of other development possibilities discussed below.
- 2.6 Line management of Adoption falls within the remit of the Service Manager – Placements and Support.
- 2.7 The Adoption and Children Act 2002 (the Act) is the principal piece of legislation governing adoption in England and Wales. It has been in force since 30 December 2005, and has been amended by other legislation since 2002, most recently being the Children and Families Act 2014.

3. STAFFING:

- 3.1 The staffing complement of the Adoption Team consists of one Team Manager, and four full time equivalent Social Worker/Senior Practitioner posts. The Team is almost up to full strength, with a vacancy of effectively one day.
- 3.2 The existing staff availability was reduced by one worker starting maternity leave in January 2014; she is due to return in April 2015. There have also been some significant disruptions caused by periods of illness in the last year. However we created an additional post, using money from the Adoption Reform Grant allocation 2013-2014. This was filled through an internal secondment, which helped offset some of the shortfall created by the maternity leave, although it did not create additional capacity as originally hoped. We have continued this post through 2014-2015 but unfortunately it has been announced that this additional source of funding (Adoption Reform Grant) will not be repeated for 2015-2016, and we therefore need to review whether there is any other potential to retain this extra capacity.
- 3.3 A significant change occurred when the Adoption Team Manager, who had been in post since February 2010, resigned in July 2014. This obviously affected the stability of the team, but as described below this also provided an opportunity to review whether it would be helpful to look at alternative management arrangements. However in order to make sure that the work of the team continued we have had a very capable Agency Team Manager in place.
- 3.4 There is one full-time adoption administrator, who provides both day to day administrative support to the team, as well as being the administrator for the Adoption Panel. Adoption work is very heavily regulated and adherence to timescales is critical. The administrator's role is therefore a crucial one. In response to a number of new government initiatives in the summer of 2013 it was acknowledged that the workload had become unmanageable for one individual and a second part-time post was created on a temporary basis, also using the Adoption Reform Grant. We have just sought agreement to continue this for an additional three months, but following the discontinuation of the Grant funding to sustain this longer term is not guaranteed.

4. EXTERNAL SCRUTINY, CHALLENGE AND PERFORMANCE:

- 4.1 As reported previously, Thurrock Adoption Service was inspected by Ofsted in February 2012, and received an overall judgement of Good. Nevertheless a number of recommendations were made to improve the service, and an Action Plan was developed to address these.
- 4.2 In late 2013 Ofsted launched a new framework for inspection of Children's Services under which there will no longer be separate inspections of the Adoption Service. Instead the new arrangement is that there will be a specific

sub-judgement within the overall report on the effectiveness of the local adoption service. To date we have not received such an inspection although it is highly probable that it will occur in the next few months

- 4.3 The current government has maintained its intention to heighten the profile of adoption as a means to provide permanent care since the publication of “An Action Plan for Adoption: Tackling Delay” in March 2012, which introduced the concept of “Adoption Scorecards”. These set out specific thresholds against two indicators, with clear minimum expectations for timeliness of actions in the adoption system.
- 4.4 The stated intention is to raise these thresholds incrementally over a four year cycle. Local Authorities are expected to return key performance data to the Department of Education on a quarterly basis which will then be consolidated into comparative national data on an annual basis, known as the “Inspection Scorecard”. Local authorities who fail to meet the thresholds will be expected to explain their performance to central government.
- 4.5 The current targets are as follows:
- A1: average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, for children who have been adopted. The target for the three year period April 2012 to March 2015 is 16 months or 487 days
 - A2: average time between a local authority receiving court authority to place a child and the local authority deciding on a match to an adoptive family. The target for the three year period April 2012 to March 2015 is 4 months or 121 days.
- 4.6 The most recent set of data released, covering the three year period to March 31st 2014 show improved performance against the previous three year cycle, although there remained a gap between performance and the target. Our A1 performance against the 2011-2014 target of 547 days was 710 days (or approximately 23 months) and against the A2 target of 152 days it was 244 days (or approximately 8 months).
- 4.7 We are now able to provide updated performance figures for the calendar year 2014. During the year 11 children became subject to Adoption Orders (i.e. the final conclusion of the adoption process). These are the children who will definitely be added to the three year cycle which will form the basis of the next three year Adoption Scorecard cycle, although there may be others to join them between now and March 31st.
- 4.8 For these eleven children the average time against AS1 was 503 days. This would bring our performance for this group of children below the national target of 547 days for 2011-2014, but remains slightly above the 2012-2015 target of 487 days. However it does include a child who was subject to particularly protracted care proceedings, and if we remove this case the

average comes down to 399.8 days which is significantly below the target figure. In addition, 12 children are currently placed with prospective adopters, but still awaiting the Adoption Order. If we combine these children with those described above, making a cohort of 24, the average performance against AS1 comes out as 492.5 days, even including the protracted case mentioned, and without it reduces to 447 days.

- 4.9 Against AS2 we can examine the same two cohorts of children. For the eleven for whom the Adoption Order has been made we achieved an average of 137 days, which is below the 2011-2014 target of 152 days, but slightly above the 2012- 2015 target of 121 days. However removing the most protracted case brings the average down to 110 days, which would be well below this target.
- 4.10 However if we combine the two cohorts, as for AS1, the performance is slightly less positive, averaging out at 182 days, although this still represents significant improvement on the last reported figures of 244 days, with a marginal improvement to 161 days by removing the protracted case mentioned above, together with another where finding a suitable adoptive family proved to be a protracted (though ultimately successful) process. We also had some notable successes, including a best performance of 52 days.
- 4.11 In combination therefore these figures indicate significant improvement in performance over the last year against the National Scorecard indicator. We will however still remain vulnerable to the inclusion of older cases (legacy cases) when the figures for 2012-2015 are published.
- 4.12 Significantly, as of 16.2.15 we have only 2 children for whom we are actively family finding, and who are not linked, matched or placed for adoption.
- 4.13 In 2013-2014 the average length of care proceedings for Thurrock Council was 44 weeks and in 2014-2015 (to date) the average length of care proceedings has been 21 weeks (below the 26 weeks national requirement). All of this adds to an improving picture in terms of timeliness.
- 4.14 For the recruitment of prospective adopters we are now expected to meet the 2 Stage Process introduced nationally in 2013, with both stages completed within six months of receiving a formal request to begin Stage 1. This remains a challenge to meet consistently. However, the national picture is that there are more adoptive households approved than there are available children and this applies equally in Thurrock, where there are eleven households awaiting identification and matching of appropriate children. The challenge for all authorities is finding appropriate adopters for slightly older and more difficult to place children. We continue to target our recruitment and look to see how we can maximise opportunities with the voluntary sector to revolutionise the recruitment of adopters for Thurrock.

5. BUDGETS:

- 5.1 The Adoption and Permanence Team previously had a dedicated budget of just over £1.3 million for the financial year 2012-13, of which over £1 million was allocated to a range of support payments to carers, with most pressure arising from the increased use of Special Guardianship as a means for children to cease to be looked after. This has created problems for many authorities as these have increased nationally by 88% since 2008, often being seen as the preferred option by the Courts.
- 5.2 The overall budget was reduced to just over £1 million for 2013-14, with the intention that the reduction would be achieved through lower expenditure on Special Guardianship Allowances. Further reduction in the allocated budget correspondingly occurred for 2014-15. Unfortunately it has not been possible to contain the expansion of these Allowances, as Courts have frequently chosen this form of Order as a means to conclude Care Proceedings, with an expectation that the authority will provide an allowance. This will undoubtedly create overspend in this area this year. However we also need to balance the demands on this budget against the alternative costs that would accrue for the authority if these children remain looked after.
- 5.3 Unfortunately monitoring arrangements have not functioned in administering these payments (SGO & Adoption allowances) and this has led to some overpayments, which were picked up by Audit. Measures have been identified to strengthen the working relationships between the Adoption Team and Customer Finance and monitoring processes are being strengthened to ensure the right payments are always made at the right time.
- 5.4 Additional financial pressures have arisen from central government decision to equalise the Inter-Agency fee charged between Local Authorities and/or Voluntary Adoption Agencies to £27,000. This fee covers the cost of procuring an adoptive placement from another authority. Potentially this is also a source of income as well as expenditure, but Thurrock's relatively small geographic area, and the size of the team in terms of assessing capability, means we are likely to be net purchasers rather than sellers in the period ahead.
- 5.5 The remainder of the budget remains largely taken up by salary costs, with some additional expenditure required for the provision of the Adoption Panel, Medical Reports, CRB checks, post-adoption support groups, Ofsted fees, etc.

6. PANEL:

- 6.1 As reported previously we have been through a period of change, following the resignations of our previous Panel Adviser and Independent Chair in the early months of 2014. However the new Chair has brought some fresh thinking and challenge about our existing practices, which has been extremely helpful, and he is keen that we improve the efficiency of the administration of the Panel. However more thought is required about how we fulfil the functions

previously performed by the Panel Adviser. The model previously in place was to employ an external individual to add a greater level of scrutiny and QA to our performance, but this is not a requirement, and consideration is under way regarding whether these tasks can be absorbed within existing staffing resources.

7. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 7.1 As indicated in both the September 2014 Committee Report and the update presented in December 2014, the opportunity is being taken to consider more radical changes to how the service might be delivered in the future, to the best advantage of Thurrock children. Specifically we are dialogue with a nationally recognised Voluntary Adoption Agency, to explore whether there some form of joint venture would be beneficial both in terms of outcomes and cost effectiveness. No decision has been taken to date, and discussions are on-going. However we are clear that any formal decision to pursue this option must be based on what is clearly in Thurrock's best interest and will of course require the agreement of elected members, as well as appropriate consultation with existing staff.

8. Reasons for Recommendation

- 8.1 To ensure that members of the committee have made due note of the work of the service in line with the collective corporate parenting responsibilities to provide oversight of the service.

9. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

10. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 10.1 The content of this report is compatible with Health and Well Being Strategy Priority 12: *Provide outstanding services for children in care and leaving care*

11. Implications

11.1 Financial

Implications verified by: Kay Goodacre
Consultant, Corporate Finance Team

The implementation of the mandatory Inter Agency charge of £27,000 creates a potential financial risk if the balance between "buying" and "selling" becomes too weighted in favour of the former. It is therefore imperative that Thurrock retains its capacity to recruit significant numbers of Adopters, which if they cannot be used locally, can at least be made available for other authorities, thus generating compensatory income. It is also the case that if

Thurrock is seeking to find adopters for more difficult to place children there will be a demand for Adoption Support payments. However it also needs to be acknowledged that both these costs are likely to be less than those resulting from children remaining in care for a significant part of their childhood.

It is also critical that the measures identified to avert the possibility of potential overpayments function effectively.

11.2 Legal

Implications verified by: Lindsey Marks
Principal Solicitor

There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report, although it should be noted that a consequence of certain High Court judgments over the last year has been to make Courts apply greater pressure to ensure all options within birth families have been exhausted before they will grant a Placement Order in Care Proceedings. It remains to be seen whether this will have long term impact on the numbers of children becoming available for adoption.

Any decision to pursue the joint venture described above will need to take into account the need to ensure that all the current regulatory requirements will continue to be met.

11.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: Natalie Warren
Community Development and Equalities Manager

The significant Diversity and Equality implications arising from the report relate to the on-going difficulty of finding adoptive placements for “hard to place” children, such as children with developmental delay, sibling groups and some Black and Ethnic Minority Children. We also recognise that older children may also benefit from adoptive placements, but overwhelmingly prospective adopters wish to adopt younger children. We therefore need always to balance the rights of children to have us pursue any possible options, with the need to avoid raising false expectations by persisting with plans that have no realistic prospect of success. These are challenges for all local authorities, and are not particular to Thurrock.

However we do recognise that Thurrock has a changing ethnic profile, and we need to be alert to the need to ensure that our future recruitment of adopters takes this into account.

11.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

12. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

Members may wish to refer to previous reports to the Committee dated 4 September 2014 and 18 December 2014.

13. **Appendices to the report**

None

Report Author:

Roland Minto
Service Manager, Placement and Support
Care and Targeted Outcomes

This page is intentionally left blank

		ITEM: 6
Corporate Parenting Committee		
Health of Looked After Children		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision:	
Report of: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes		
Accountable Head of Service: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes		
Accountable Director: Carmel Littleton, Director of Children's Services		
This report is public		

Executive Summary

Meeting the healthcare needs of Looked After children is a significant priority for Children's Social Care. Many children who become looked after will do so following a period of parental neglect or abuse, and may not have had their health needs addressed appropriately.

1. Recommendation(s)

- 1.1 The members of the Corporate Parenting Committee are asked to note the contents of the report, acknowledging where progress has been made, whilst supporting officers in their efforts to improve where necessary, especially in facilitating inter-agency cooperation. This applies particularly to strengthening the working relationship with Health colleagues, utilising their specialist knowledge to improve our reported performance in the areas of immunisations and developmental checks for younger children.
- 1.2 Members are also asked to support a proposal that Health colleagues are invited to take the lead role in the preparation of future reports on Health matters to the Committee.

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 Looked After Children and in particular care leavers, have historically tended to have poorer health outcomes than other young people their age. This has led to a heightened profile around the performance of local authorities in meeting their obligations to ensure all checks are carried out in a timely fashion.

2.2 This report will therefore focus specifically on the most recent data available; identify some of the key challenges that need to be addressed; and outline the main areas of focus for the Looked After Children's Health Steering Group during 2014-2015.

3. **Reported Performance**

3.1 In December 2014 the Government published the latest figures for all local authorities, which were essentially generated from the annual SSDA903 return. For Health checks figures are reported on two specific cohorts of children, those who have been looked after for at least twelve months at 31st March and the subset of these children who are under 5 at that date, who should be receiving developmental checks.

3.2 The expectation is that all children should have an Initial Health Assessment (IHA) on entering care and a Review Health Assessment (RHA) each year thereafter. Children under the age of 5 are expected to have a Review Health Assessment twice a year.

3.3 Thurrock's reported performance for completion of yearly Review Health Assessments for 2013-14 showed significant improvement on the previous year. There were 190 children who formed the cohort. Of these 165 (86.8%) had had their check recorded (compared to 81.8% the previous year). This was marginally above the East of England Average of 86.4%, but below the National average of 88.4%.

3.4 The same statistical release also publishes the figures for children who have a recorded dental check in the previous period and those whose immunisation records are up to date.

3.5 For dental checks the reported figure (taken from the same cohort) is 84.2% (Regional average – 82.8%; National – 84.4%). For the previous year the figure recorded was 78.7%. (Regional average – 80.7%; National 82%). This therefore reflected an increase of 5.5%, bringing Thurrock closer to the National average.

3.6 The published statistics for Immunisations is a cause for concern, as the published figures would suggest that only 57.8% of the cohort are up to date, compared with 84.9% regionally, and 87% nationally. In practice we know from Health colleagues that the reported figure does not reflect reality and there is a problem that the electronic records held by Health do not "talk" to the LCS system used by Children's Social Care. In addition the LCS system can be confusing to update for non-health professionals, which has led to under-recording.

3.7 We now have agreement for health colleagues to have direct access to our system (LCS) and a commitment from them to assist with the updating process. This should enable them to assist us in reconciling the two records

and with a clear target of completing this work before the submission of the next SSDA903 return. We are confident that next year should show a significant improvement in the reported figures.

- 3.8 Thurrock has previously also appeared to be under-performing against the requirement for children under 5 to have developmental checks. New processes have been introduced to ensure that we capture the full range of developmental checks carried out with this age group. As with immunisations we expect to see an ongoing increase in performance.
- 3.9 Because of the way the figures are collated across the year, taking a snapshot prior to the end year date can be misleading. However current recorded completion rates on RHAs for over 5s for the year 2014-15 are showing as 68.9%, compared to 61.8% around the same time last year, which suggests we are on track for a degree of improvement. However as there are a few weeks to go for the reporting period the combination of Review Assessments that are arranged but still to be undertaken and those which have taken place but are not yet recorded on the system should push this figure significantly higher by March 31st. We will be using the remaining weeks of the municipal year to challenge any cases where it appears appropriate urgency has not been shown.
- 3.10 A further significant improvement has been to establish a new daily report which shows not just the SSDA903 cohort but the “live” position for all currently looked after young people. This creates better monitoring of Initial Health Assessments being instigated in a timely fashion for children recently accommodated.
- 3.11 Another outcome which is reported on nationally is our completion of the “Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire”, which is a widely used tool, recognised for its value in evaluating the emotional well-being of children. Local authorities are expected to ensure that these are completed on young people aged 5-16, and in care for over a year.
- 3.12 For 2013-2014 Thurrock had 145 young people who formed part of the reported cohort for an SDQ score. We achieved 100% completion on making sure these were done, against a National average of 68% and an Eastern Region one of 66%. For both the previous years we achieved 99% completion, against National averages of 71% both years and Regional averages of 70 and 75% respectively.
- 3.13 We continue to review children and young people with high SDQ scores (those over the midway point) at the MALAC group meeting (Multi-Agency Looked After Children) to identify whether concerns have been raised about a young person not already receiving appropriate support.
- 3.14 The commentary for the nationally released data for health checks repeated the previous finding that performance for all authorities was poorest for young people aged 16+, and therefore targeting improved performance for this age

group will continue to be placed as a high priority for 2015-2016. Considerable success has already been achieved in 2014-15 through the flexible & personal approach used by the Specialist Advisor Looked After Children's Nurse to engage some initially reluctant young people.

- 3.15 Amongst the 16+ age group are a small but significant proportion of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking young people. These young people will often have had particularly traumatic experiences and may face specific emotional, mental health and physical health needs. We will continue to target this group for support and improving health outcomes in 2015-2016.

4. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 4.1 Thurrock has a well-established Looked After Children Health Steering Group chaired by the Service Manager for Placements and Support Services, who has the lead responsibility on health matters. The Steering Group meets on a bi-monthly basis, and has a multi-agency representation, bringing together a number of key individuals involved in health care provision. The Group has its own work plan, refreshed on a regular basis, to identify specific issues to be addressed to promote the health and well-being of looked after children.
- 4.2 To supplement the work of the wider forum a Core Group, consisting of the Chair, Social Work Team Manager and representatives of the Looked After Children's Nursing service, as well as other co-opted members as appropriate, meet in between the Steering Group meetings to monitor and progress specific issues.
- 4.3 The proposed Actions within the work plan for 2014-2015 were grouped around four main themes:
- Children in care with emotional and behavioural health needs, and their carers, are supported and positive mental health is promoted.
 - Young people leaving care know and understand their health history and know how to access services.
 - Promote the physical, mental, sexual and social health of looked after children and young people
 - Ensure appropriate systems are in place that enable the Department to record data for IHAs, RHAs , dental & optician checks, and immunisation records, for looked after children that take account of the latest clinical guidance.
- 4.4 The first three of these were chosen to be compatible with of the Quality Standards for looked after children and young people developed by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), and the fourth has been significantly reflected in the discussion above.
- 4.5 Despite some changes in personnel, at a local level working relationships between Social Care staff and NHS staff, particularly the Designated Nurse for LAC (Commissioning) and the Named Nurse for LAC (Provider), are sound

and cooperative. One example of this approach was demonstrated in a joint audit exercise undertaken in late 2014, in which a small sample of Health Assessments were examined by both Health and Social Care professionals.

- 4.6 The findings were that every child whose case was audited had received a health assessment. Health stated that in 100% of the cases audited the assessment covered all the areas required. Both health and social care also agreed that the voice of the child was evident in the all cases of children over 2 years. Over half of the requests for health assessments were received within timescale and where they were not 42% had a reason documented by social care for the delay. All children had received age appropriate PHSE advice.

5. Reasons for Recommendation

- 5.1 To ensure members are adequately informed of the challenges and successes in delivering appropriate health care to looked after children.

6. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

7. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 7.1 The content of this report is compatible with Health and Well Being Strategy Priority 12: *Provide outstanding services for children in care and leaving care*

8. Implications

8.1 Financial

Implications verified by: Kay Goodacre
Consultant, Corporate Finance

There are no immediate Financial Implications arising from this report.

8.2 Legal

Implications verified by: Lindsey Marks
Principal Solicitor

There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report

8.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: Natalie Warren
Community Development and Equalities Manager

The significant Equality and Diversity implications arising from this report stem from the need for carers to have awareness of medical conditions which disproportionately affect different sectors of the community, such as Sickle Cell Trait, as well as professionals generally recognising both the physical and emotional needs of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking young people.

8.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

9. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright): None

10. **Appendices to the report**

None

Report Author:

Roland Minto
Service Manager, Placement and Support
Care and Targeted Outcomes

12 March 2015	ITEM: 7
Report to Corporate Parenting Committee	
Information on Recent External Placements for young people	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Non-key
Report of: Roland Minto – Service Manager, Placements and Support	
Accountable Head of Service: Andrew Carter , Children’s Social Care (CATO)	
Accountable Director: Carmel Littleton, Director of Children’s Services	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report updates members of the Committee on a range of issues regarding the placement choices made for looked after children.

1. Recommendation(s)

- 1.1 That the members of the Committee note the efforts made by officers to choose appropriate resources for looked after children, including our more difficult to place children.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 Reports for previous meetings of the Corporate Parenting Committee have provided elected members with some detailed information about the placement choices being made by officers for looked after children. These reports have included information on new external placements made in the periods immediately preceding them and commented on a number of the presenting issues which influence decision making.
- 2.2 Reports have varied in content, depending on any specific issues in focus, so that officers can respond within the report and within the meetings, to additional queries raised by members. However a consistent and understandable thread has been a focus on the more expensive external placements and how decisions that these are required are arrived at.
- 2.3 However it has been agreed that because of concerns about the possible identification of individual young people, an appendix previously provided will

no longer be included. However in the period to be covered since the last report, i.e. 27.11.14 – 4.2.15, 18 young people have entered the system, of whom 12 currently remain. Of these 12, five were less than two years old and the other seven were aged between 14-17 years old.

- 2.4 During the same period 15 young people left the care of the authority, six of them through reaching their eighteenth birthday, the remainder either to return to their families, or to be placed permanently with alternative carers through Adoption or Special Guardianship, or to receive a custodial sentence which terminated their status as a looked after child.
- 2.5 This background information illustrates the continuing fluid nature of placement demand in Thurrock, with some placement requests being for only a short duration, whilst others obviously become the base for the child or young person for a considerable period. However the overall balance of placement type remains broadly similar. At 5.2.15 there were 278 looked after children in Thurrock. The spread of placements on this date, with the comparative figure in brackets for the previously reported period, is illustrated below. It will be noted that there is a slight reduction in the number of children at the younger end of the age range; this may in part be a consequence of a national pattern of fewer children entering the system as a result of some well-publicised High Court decisions, though it is widely considered that this will reflect only a temporary slowdown.

Age of child	In house fostering	Independent Fostering	Residential	Other	Total by age
Under 1	4 (5)	2 (1)		(2)	6 (8)
1-5	12 (13)	11 (16)		15 (14)	38 (43)
6-11	33 (37)	32 (33)	4 (4)	1(1)	70 (75)
12-15	29 (29)	35 (37)	23 (23)	1 (2)	88 (91)
16+	18 (27)	21 (20)	5 (6)	32 (30)	76 (83)
Total by provision type	96 (111)	101(107)	32 (33)	49 (49)	278 (300)

In total therefore 197 children (or just over 71%), were living in foster placements; this figure rises to slightly over 76% for under 16s.

- 2.6 As noted previously there is a relatively high number of young people in the “Other” category, particularly in the 16+ age group. This category includes a range of semi-independent accommodation, which is frequently used for older adolescents, particularly, though not exclusively, Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Young People for whom neither foster care or more traditional children’s homes settings are appropriate. In addition it also includes young people remanded into custody, who are classed as Looked After Children during the period of remand.

2.7 There are currently also a relatively high number of under-fives in the “Other” category. This covers a number of options, such as children placed with their parent or placed with prospective adopters, pending final Adoption Orders being made. There are currently 12 children in this latter category, which reflects a genuine success story on behalf of those involved in the adoption process.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 Members have asked for some commentary on the question of controllable and uncontrollable financial pressures in relation to placement decisions. Clearly the most significant control possible is in restricting the numbers of young people entering the system, and where possible finding means for them to safely exit the system. Over recent months Managers have strengthened the oversight of this by the establishment of a Threshold Panel to consider all requests for children or young people to become looked after, and there has been a slight fall in numbers entering compared to the same period last year.
- 3.2 We have also established a structure of Looked After Children surgeries, to install a further level of case scrutiny to ensure both that there is no drift in the planning process for young people, and that expensive resources are not being deployed when an less expensive one can secure equal outcomes.
- 3.3 A further strand of enquiry from members has been for some additional detail on the circumstances surrounding decisions to use Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) placements rather than in-house resources, and whether these decisions were made on the basis of specific need or simple unavailability of a local carer.
- 3.4 In reality these decisions normally represent a degree of compromise between these two factors, unless there is a very specific safeguarding or welfare issue which indicates placement further away from the home area.
- 3.5 We currently have 25 young people in IFA placements which have been made since 1.4.2014. Six of these young people belong to two sibling groups, and in these instances there would have been a conscious decision to prioritise keeping the children together over a desire to place them locally. Foster carers who can take larger sibling groups are a scarce and valuable resource, and whilst we do seek to attract and fast track the assessments of in-house applicants with this capacity this is likely to remain a challenging issue. A further placement was for a Parent and Child placement which was needed at short notice.
- 3.6 Of the remainder, only four are still in their initial placement following the young person becoming looked after, and many had previously been placed at some stage with in-house carers, prior to the decision to seek an external resource. Eighteen of the 25 children are aged 13 or above, which strongly

indicates one of our major placement pressures, namely finding foster carers for teenagers, although this is by no means specific to Thurrock. This does not necessarily indicate that in-house carers are any less skilled or resilient in managing teenagers, and the challenges of teenagers are identical for all carers. However there is no question that it is easier to recruit foster cares interested in caring for much younger children.

- 3.7 Of the 12 young people who have come into Thurrock's care since 27.11.14, and currently remain, eight have been placed with foster cares, of which five have been with in-house carers. Of the three in the Independent sector, one referral was to find a specific parent and child placement which we did not have available at that moment, one was following a serious breakdown of a semi-independent living arrangement for a 17 year old, and the third was a deliberate preference to create some geographic distance in order to protect a young person from difficult family dynamics.
- 3.6 As stated in previous reports we remain acutely conscious of the additional cost of using Independent Fostering Agency placements; and this is always taken into consideration, but there is widespread acceptance amongst local authorities that we will continue to need a "mixed economy" and the challenges are twofold, namely to achieve the best possible balance of in-house against external placements, and secondly to ensure that external costs are contained.
- 3.7 As reported previously use of external foster placements is managed as far as possible within the boundaries of the "Eastern Region" agreements to which Thurrock has been party since 2008; with the Sub-Eastern Region Foster Care Framework Agreement (ER5) and now with the Eastern Region Select List (ER Select List).
- 3.8 Despite these measures, and further efforts to ensure that children and young people neither become nor remain looked after longer than necessary, there are clear budgetary pressures this year, and according to the latest figures provided by Corporate Finance we are facing a possible overspend on external placements of around £100,000. This is created by a combination of factors, including an overall increase in looked after children across the year, significant payments for young people on remand and a small number of teenagers requiring high levels of additional staffing to maintain their safety and security. In the latter instances we monitor closely to ensure that additional costs are not incurred longer than necessary, but this has to be balanced with our obligations to ensure safety for both the individual young person, staff members and other children. Fortunately some of the projected overspend can be offset against underspend in the in-house fostering budget, thus containing the overall costs within the Service Area.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 It is hoped that member of the Committee will continue to find this information useful in developing their understanding of the issues involved. Officers

accept there is a very real challenge in balancing the need to find the best possible placement option for young people, whilst simultaneously working within the financial resources available.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: Kay Goodacre
Consultant, Corporate Finance

As previously the key financial implication of the report is to note the continuing strain currently on the external placements budget, and the need to both contain the increase in numbers of looked after children where it is safe to do so, and make the most effective use of the funding available.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: Lindsey Marks
Principal Solicitor

The Children Act 1989 is very clear the best interest of the child should remain the paramount consideration, and the local authority would be very vulnerable to legal challenges if it were evidenced that placement decisions were being made purely on the basis of financial considerations.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: Natalie Warren
Community Development and Equalities Manager

The local authority has a clear duty to ensure that placements are identified appropriate to the needs of all children who require them. This is true for children of all backgrounds, cultures and ethnicities, but also for children with significant disabilities and particularly those less able to communicate their wishes and feelings to those organising their care.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

None

9. **Appendices to the report**

None

Report Author:

Roland Minto
Service Manager, Placement Support
Children's Services, Care and Targeted Outcomes

12 March 2015	ITEM: 8
Report to Corporate Parenting Committee	
Attendance of the District Nurse at Meetings	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision:
Report of: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes	
Accountable Head of Service: Andrew Carter, Head of Care and Targeted Outcomes	
Accountable Director: Carmel Littleton, Director of Children’s Services	
This report is public	

Executive Summary

This report is intended to widen the professional representation on the committee on a regular basis in the interest of encouraging multi-disciplinary participation and accountability in finding services for looked after young people.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 That the Designated Nurse for Looked after Children be requested to attend meetings of the Corporate Parenting Committee.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 Thurrock Corporate Parenting Committee was formally constituted in the Municipal year 2012-2013. It has requested and received a number of reports from Officers on issues within its area of responsibility. However since its establishment it became apparent that there are other key stakeholders with important contributions to make to the Corporate Parenting Agenda.

2.2 Prior to the establishment of the Committee the former Corporate Parenting Group had routinely included wider representation, beyond elected members and senior officers directly involved in managing services for looked after children. Amongst these was a consistent representative from the Primary Care Trust, who was able to ensure that Health issues for Looked After Children remained firmly within focus.

2.3 This consistent representation has not been replicated within the Committee, although the Designated Nurse has attended by invitation when health issues were specifically on the agenda. A previous suggestion of permanent co-

option, made at the same time it was agreed to seek standing representation from the Foster Carers Association, Open Door, and the Children in Care Council, was not pursued at that stage.

- 2.4 However there appears to be widespread interest in revisiting the issue, hence the proposal brought forward to the Committee.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

3.1 Although it is accepted that Children's Social Care are likely to remain the lead agency in delivering appropriate care for Looked After Children, there are areas of expertise and resourcing where we are dependent on the contribution of other professional disciplines. Central to this are colleagues in Education and Health.

3.2 Regular representation on educational issues has already been established through the attendance of the Head of the Virtual School for Looked After Children, but it is important to establish a parallel profile for health matters.

3.3 The Designated Nurse for Looked After Children has expressed a willingness to attend the meetings regularly and is very keen to play a full part in working closely with Social Care colleagues in pursuing the agenda of improving outcomes for children.

3.4 Health Service responsibilities are delivered through a variety of organisational structures, and a representative from the Clinical Commissioning Group familiar with these structures, as well as able to directly respond to questions from members, would be an invaluable addition.

3.5 Agreeing the recommendation would both widen the range of viewpoints consistently available to the Committee and reaffirm the authority's commitment to work in partnership with other organisations.

3.6 Should the Committee be minded to agree the recommendation, a formal report will be made to full Council for the next Municipal year.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

4.1 To ensure members are appropriately supportive of widening the representation of the committee.

5. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

5.1 The content of this report is compatible with Health and Well Being Strategy Priority 12: *Provide outstanding services for children in care and leaving care*

6. Implications

6.1 Financial

Implications verified by: Kay Goodacre
Consultant, Corporate Finance

There are no financial implications to this proposal.

6.2 Legal

Implications verified by: Lindsey Marks
Principal Solicitor

There are no obvious immediate legal implications, provided the recommendation is appropriately implemented in line with the Council's Constitution.

6.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: Natalie Warren
Community Development and Equalities Manager

6.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

7. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

None

8. Appendices to the report

None

Report Author:

Roland Minto
Service Manager, Placement and Support
Care and Targeted Outcomes

This page is intentionally left blank