



*Making Social Care
Better for People*

inspection report

ADOPTION SERVICE

**Catholic Children`s Society (Arundel &
Brighton, Portsmouth & Southwark)**

**49 Russell Hill Road
Purley
Surrey
CR8 2XB**

Lead Inspector
Delia Amos

Announced Inspection
6th September 2005 09:00

The Commission for Social Care Inspection aims to:

- Put the people who use social care first
- Improve services and stamp out bad practice
- Be an expert voice on social care
- Practise what we preach in our own organisation

Reader Information	
Document Purpose	Inspection Report
Author	CSCI
Audience	General Public
Further copies from	0870 240 7535 (telephone order line)
Copyright	This report is copyright Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) and may only be used in its entirety. Extracts may not be used or reproduced without the express permission of CSCI
Internet address	www.csci.org.uk

This is a report of an inspection to assess whether services are meeting the needs of people who use them. The legal basis for conducting inspections is the Care Standards Act 2000 and the relevant National Minimum Standards for this establishment are those for *Adoption*. They can be found at www.dh.gov.uk or obtained from The Stationery Office (TSO) PO Box 29, St Crispins, Duke Street, Norwich, NR3 1GN. Tel: 0870 600 5522. Online ordering: www.tso.co.uk/bookshop

Every Child Matters, outlined the government's vision for children's services and formed the basis of the Children Act 2004. It provides a framework for inspection so that children's services should be judged on their contribution to the outcomes considered essential to wellbeing in childhood and later life. Those outcomes are:

- Being healthy
- Staying safe
- Enjoying and achieving
- Making a contribution; and
- Achieving economic wellbeing.

In response, the Commission for Social Care Inspection has re-ordered the national minimum standards for children's services under the five outcomes, for reporting purposes. A further section has been created under 'Management' to cover those issues that will potentially impact on all the outcomes above.

Copies of *Every Child Matters* and *The Children Act 2004* are available from The Stationery Office as above.

This report is a public document. Extracts may not be used or reproduced without the prior permission of the Commission for Social Care Inspection.

SERVICE INFORMATION

Name of service	Catholic Children`s Society (Arundel & Brighton, Portsmouth & Southwark)
Address	49 Russell Hill Road Purley Surrey CR8 2XB
Telephone number	020 8668 2181
Fax number	020 8763 2274
Email address	ruth.dubois@cathchild.org
Provider Web address	info@cathchild.org
Name of registered provider(s)/company (if applicable)	The Catholic Children`s Society
Name of registered manager (if applicable)	Ruth Dubois
Type of registration	Voluntary Adoption Agency
No. of places registered (if applicable)	0
Category(ies) of registration, with number of places	

SERVICE INFORMATION

Conditions of registration:

1. The category of registration is:- Domestic Adoption Services (DA)
2. The agency must only operate from the branches named below:- 4, St Catherine`s Road, Littlehampton, West Sussex BN17 5HS.
3. Familymakers, 50 Mount Pleasant, Reading, Berkshire RG1 2TD
4. Familymakers, 7 Bridge Street, Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8HN

Date of last inspection This is the first inspection under VAAS Regs 2003

Brief Description of the Service:

The Catholic Children's Society is a long established provider of adoption services as well as operating a number of other projects for children in the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton, Portsmouth and Southwark. The Head Office for all the projects is at Purley in Surrey. The Director and the manager of the adoption services are based at Purley. There are also two adoption teams at Purley, one recruiting, assessing and preparing prospective adoptive families, and the other having a more specific remit of post adoption support. Other adoption teams are based at Reading, Winchester and Littlehampton. Each of these recruits, assesses and prepares adoptive families and provides ongoing support. The historical basis of the agency involves the continuing provision of services for adopted adults. Birth parents and other members of birth families are offered counselling in respect of adoption issues, and tracing family members and mediation is also offered where appropriate.

SUMMARY

This is an overview of what the inspector found during the inspection.

The inspection work was undertaken at the Head Office of the CCS in Purley by two inspectors between 5th and 8th September 2005, with further visits to observe panel (13th September), to the Winchester office (12th September), and to the Reading office (22nd September). The Agency provided a number of policy and procedural documents and a comprehensive self-assessment and other pre-inspection information. The inspectors appreciated the openness and helpfulness of all the agency staff throughout the time of the inspection.

Questionnaires were received from 3 specialist advisers, 3 placing Authorities, 8 placing social workers and 23 prospective and approved adopters. During the fieldwork four sets of adopters were visited. Interviews were conducted with social work staff, administrative staff, the Manager, the managers of the local offices, the Director and the panel chair. The chair of Trustees was contacted by phone. The adoption panel was observed and a number of files and other documents were read. Inspectors also observed an interagency developmental forum, held on a two monthly basis, which explored policy and practice in regard to adoption support matters.

What the service does well:

The agency prepares adopters well for the experience of parenting older children or sibling groups through adoption. A placing social worker commented on the "very good understanding of adoption issues" shown by the CCS.

Adopters found the agency approachable and supportive. They received a prompt and friendly response to their enquiry. They were given helpful information and were able to develop trusting relationships with their social worker. "I have got complete faith in my social worker", "our social worker always seemed to call when we were troubled or confused and seemed to have a sixth sense about what made us tick."

Agency staff at every level had a commitment to child focused practice. There was an excellent level of support to adoptive families. A number of adopters commented that the "level of support was far beyond expectations." The agency recognised well the lifelong implications of adoption and support was available to adopted people of all ages and their families, as well as adoptive parents.

The agency had clearly established lines of responsibility. Staff felt well supported and the ethos of the agency was professional, competent, and, at

the same time, warm and nurturing. Staff were encouraged in their continuing professional development and time for reflection on practice issues was valued.

Staff were knowledgeable and effective in working with other agencies to secure stable placements for children matched with families approved by the agency. This was well summarised in a view from a social worker from another agency, that the CCC was a "high quality adoption service. Adopters value their workers and the very long term support the agency can provide."

What has improved since the last inspection?

This is the first inspection under the terms of the Voluntary Adoption Agencies Regulations 2003.

What they could do better:

The agency continues to acknowledge the challenge in recruiting a more diverse range of adopters, particularly from black and minority ethnic groups.

Some areas of record keeping were in need of review. In particular the panel minutes did not include a sufficiently clear record of the reasons for the recommendation made by the panel.

Although staff do some very good work in their assessments, and are clearly reflective in their practice, there is not always sufficient evidence in the case files of this, such as sufficiently detailed records of applicants' employment histories, analysis of information and evidence of competencies.

Likewise, panel members' files need further development in order that they meet the requirements.

Please contact the provider for advice of actions taken in response to this inspection.

The report of this inspection is available from enquiries@csci.gsi.gov.uk or by contacting your local CSCI office.

DETAILS OF INSPECTOR FINDINGS

CONTENTS

Being Healthy - There are no NMS that map to this outcome

Staying Safe

Enjoying and Achieving

Making a Positive Contribution

Achieving Economic Wellbeing - There are no NMS that map to this outcome

Management

Scoring of Outcomes

Statutory Requirements identified during the inspection

Staying Safe

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- The agency matches children with adopters (NMS 2)
- The agency assesses and prepares adopters (NMS 4)
- Adoptors are given information about matching (NMS 5)
- The functions of the adoption panel are as specified (NMS 10)
- The constitution and membership of adoption panels are as specified (NMS 11)
- Adoption panels are timely (NMS 12)
- Adoption agency decision is made without delay and appropriately (NMS 13)
- The manager is suitable to carry on or manage an adoption agency (NMS 15)
- Staff are suitable to work with children (NMS 19)
- The agency has a robust complaints procedure (NMS 24 Voluntary Adoption Agency only)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

2,4,5,10,11,12,13,15,19,24

The agency's practices are child focused and ensure children are placed with adopters who are well prepared and are able to meet their needs, and can provide safe and nurturing family life.

EVIDENCE:

The adoption agency operates over a wide geographical area with local offices linking to different communities and professional networks. The agency works with the South London Consortium and takes part in recruitment. Strategies to recruit prospective adopters vary within the different CCS teams, with some teams having to more actively advertise. Each team plans and records its annual recruitment campaign. The managers and team members meet regularly to consider recruitment trends and children referred. Referrals to the agency come from a wide range of local authorities and the agency seeks to recruit prospective adopters who could care for older children or sibling groups.

The agency has considered strategies to target more effectively prospective adopters from black and minority ethnic groups. More focussed recruitment plans are currently part of a wider review of the agency structure, which may involve alignment with another agency. The management and staff group are aware that their teams at this point are predominantly white and female and

maybe not best placed to promote adoption in minority communities. The proposed changes are likely to lead to a more diverse team and the agency is hoping to increase the number of black and ethnic minority families that it prepares for the needs of the children referred. This is recommended. The recruitment literature is being revised to reflect a more diverse community.

Comments received from single adopters indicated that the agency responded to their applications supportively and positively. One said that they "had checked out I was comfortable" and gave "first class treatment."

There was considerable evidence to demonstrate that the agency expects a thorough approach to the preparation and assessment of prospective adopters. Preparation programmes are organised by the various offices, although the overall model is consistent throughout the agency. The programmes were an opportunity for the prospective adopters to meet all the members of the local team as well as experienced adopters and this was found to be very supportive. One adopter said the process meant that "if your allocated social worker was not available you would be able to speak to anyone." Positive comments were received from a number of adopters: "our preparation was excellent and the agency makes available an invaluable network of adopters to talk to and visit", and "the whole process was well managed, efficient, and sensitively done ...an excellent preparation which built a lot of confidence."

Assessment work undertaken was thorough, relevant checks and references were seen on all files examined, and Form F reports read were of a good standard. This view was supported by several comments from social workers who have placed children with the agency; "a thorough and excellent report", "Excellent Form F", "Detailed, honest and factual information in Form F – sensitively and thoughtfully prepared adopters – would definitely use agency in the future".

Prospective adopters' experience of the assessment was positive; one referred to a "gentle, kind approach", another was "surprised and delighted at how efficiently the CCS processed our application...we have had nothing but conscientious, kind and considerate treatment at all stages." Only one critical comment was received and this related to work by someone no longer with the agency.

Whilst acknowledging a generally high standard, some shortfalls were noted. For example, some Form Fs were less analytical than others. Other examples did not demonstrate the investigative work undertaken, where additional references were sought but not reflected in the Form F. Reports would be enhanced if they all more explicitly included evidence of the work undertaken. For example it was not clear in some cases that family relationships had been sufficiently explored, or that information from schools had contributed to the assessment; yet in examining the file and in discussing with the staff these

areas had been well assessed. Opportunities for evidence to support the assessment of parenting competence were not always well documented.

In some examples it was noted that there was variable practice in regard to recording the applicants' chronologies in adequate detail, for example specific dates in employment histories. Since all Form Fs were thoroughly anonymised for panel and for the purpose of circulation to other agencies, the panel's expectation was that the details were on file, and this was not found to be so in each case. Another area that needed more careful documentation was ensuring that health and safety factors were revisited.

In some cases examined the matching processes built on work undertaken subsequent to the Form F, for example a family recorded as not wanting direct contact but accepting a match with significant contact. It was clear in discussion with the adopters that this movement had been soundly arrived at, although the process was less clear from the file.

Some excellent practice was seen in the way in which adopters were helped to understand the information about the children in whom they had expressed an interest. The process of matching children to adopters was undertaken with great care and sensitivity and adopters valued the input from their social worker. A typical comment was: "I have complete trust in my social worker's opinion and experience". One adopter spoke of being "perfectly matched". A placing social worker described the agency as having "very thorough matching" processes, and another that "agency staff see matching as high priority".

There were systems in place to ensure that adopters' views about contact and passing information to the agency were recorded. Adopters were encouraged to provide appropriate information to help prepare the child. A social worker confirmed that "the agency clearly explains the importance of the birth family in a child's life which leads the adopters to value positively family contact." Families seen in the course of this inspection demonstrated great insight about the way their agency social worker had helped develop their views and feelings about the child's birth family and heritage. They felt well prepared to ensure that the child would be able to have support in understanding their origins.

A personalised adoption storybook had been developed to help children understand the process, and to assist social workers and adopters in helping the child's introduction to their adoptive family.

An adoption panel was observed in the course of the inspection and panel members showed a sensitive and thorough approach to the assessments. The panel was properly constituted and there were clear procedures. Panel members included people of diverse origin and with a range of relevant experience. Applicants were treated with respect and sensitivity. There was a good balance between informality and solemnity and adopters' comments

confirmed that they appreciated the opportunity to attend. Panel members had attended a joint training day with the agency's staff.

The panel seen was well organised with a great deal of thought given to the privacy and comfort of the applicants attending. A number of staff, and some adopters, commented on the cramped nature of the room in which panel meetings were held. Careful consideration was seen to be given to ensuring this did not overly impinge on the applicants' experience. Panels are generally held monthly, although additional panels are on occasions set up to avoid undue delays.

There was a checklist system to assist panel members to consider issues, and this was reflected in the structure of the minutes. The manager reported that this system was to be reviewed and it was felt that revising the process could help improve the minutes. The current format of the minutes does not sufficiently link the reasons for the conclusions reached to the record of the panel discussion, nor to the recommendations made.

The Director of the agency is the decision maker, and he demonstrated a commendable commitment and thoroughness to the responsibility. He has generally been present as an observer at panel meetings and decisions are made very promptly.

Evidence was seen that the agency is thorough in its checking processes of new staff, and CRB checks were recorded on staff and managers' files that were viewed. In a small number of panel members' files it was noted that the agency had accepted as evidence a disclosure applied for elsewhere and this is not acceptable.

The agency ensures that staff have annual child protection training. Staff showed an awareness of good practice in relation to child protection matters. No complaints had been recorded in the last twelve months. There was a complaints procedure and the manager was in the process of revising this to reflect new legislation.

Enjoying and Achieving

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- The adoption agency provides support for adoptive parents (NMS 6)
- The agency has access to specialist advisers as appropriate (NMS 18)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

6 and 18

The Agency is committed to providing support to adopters and children throughout their lives. It enables difficult placements to be maintained and children are supported to have a full and happy family life.

EVIDENCE:

There was a clear strategy for working with and supporting adoptive parents and responses from adopters indicated that they felt confident in help provided by the agency. One said, "our social worker has been with us all the way and has been a tower of strength," another "they have not and would not let us down". Social workers in the agency did much to prepare the adopters in advance of the child coming to live with them. This included working closely with the child's social worker and reading childcare files. A number of the adopters made reference to the support and "persistence" of their social workers in helping them deal with the local authorities placing the children.

Several adopters visited described how vigorous the CCS social workers had been in negotiating support, for example funding for a nursery, domestic help, and therapeutic input. In some cases it was clear from discussion that the social workers had been actively involved with the placing authorities in identifying what support would be needed although the documentation about this was not always on file, or was somewhat vaguely recorded. Although the CCS workers do not have the direct responsibility for devising the adoption support plans the agency will need to consider ways to ensure that the needs of its adopters are clearly documented.

Comments from the childcare social workers also gave evidence of the high level of support provided by the agency: "pro-active and ongoing support", and "the agency significantly contributed to the success of the placement."

A specific team in the Purley office provided post adoption support services. One of the families visited expressed some confusion about the introduction of a different worker to provide support and the workers for this case acknowledged that there was a need to ensure sensitivity about timing. The post adoption team participated in information and preparation sessions in the Purley area to raise prospective adopters' awareness of support needs.

In other offices the social workers all provided the relevant support, working sensitively with families pre-adoption order, and post order if required.

There were examples seen of very active work by agency social workers on behalf of the children in linking with schools and education services to secure school placements. They had established networks with a range of relevant professionals across the area. Some specific training, i.e. 'Your Child in School' workshops, was being provided to adopters in some areas. The manager described continuing consideration being given by the agency to further develop services which promote education.

The local teams facilitated a number of support groups and events for adopters, including picnics, discos and workshops. The post adoption team had run groups for children in adoptive families. The agency had a strong commitment to the ongoing support of adopters and adopters' families.

The agency had medical advisers, both for the adoption panel and for consultation by staff and adopters. A legal adviser was also available. Formal protocols have been established for the role of the professional advisers. During the observed panel an issue arose which highlighted that there had been assumptions on all sides about the scope of the medical advice, and whilst this was dealt with very sensitively, it was evident that expectations should be reviewed.

Staff were confident that they had access to relevant advice and services and this included regular opportunities for consultation with a child psychologist. Some examples were discussed where the agency has been able to seek advice from professionals within the other projects of the CCS for example, the school counsellors. Adopters have also been supported through specialist courses such as "It's a Piece of Cake" and staff within the agency have been encouraged in developing specialist knowledge and skills in supporting families.

Making a Positive Contribution

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Birth parents and birth families are involved in adoption plans (NMS 7)
- Birth parents and birth families are involved in maintaining the child's heritage (NMS 8)
- The Adoption agency supports birth parents and families (NMS 9)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

7, 8 and 9

The agency has a clear, lifelong commitment to all parties involved in the adoption process, which enables children and young people to develop a positive sense of their heritage and identity.

EVIDENCE:

The agency has a long history of adoption work and a continuing commitment to the needs of those people adopted through the agency over a considerable period of time. All workers demonstrated a high level of awareness of the lifelong implications of adoption. This included work with birth families in some cases commissioned specifically by local authorities. A great deal of intermediary work was undertaken. There was a system of regular evaluation of the work and feedback comments seen during this inspection indicated a high level of satisfaction with the "kindness and sensitivity" shown by the staff, with another referring to the agency going "beyond expectations"

Examples were seen of work being undertaken to ensure children had appropriate information about their heritage and the decisions that had been made on their behalf. In some cases CCS workers were commissioned to do life story work.

A placing authority comment was that "contact was actively encouraged" within the agency. Adoptive parents seen during the inspection confirmed how the agency had helped them grow in their understanding of contact and their capacity to engage in direct contact arrangements where it was in the interests of the children.

Evidence was also seen of agency staff providing support and information to adults affected by the adoption process. Information about local and national support services was readily available and the two monthly interagency forum was an opportunity to review practice and exchange ideas about working effectively with birth families.

Management

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- There is a clear written statement of the aims and objectives of the adoption agency and the adoption agency ensures that it meets those aims and objectives (NMS 1)
- The agency provides clear written information for prospective adopters (NMS 3)
- The manager has skills to carry on or manage the adoption agency (NMS 14)
- The adoption agency is managed effectively and efficiently (NMS 16)
- The agency is monitored and controlled as specified (NMS 17)
- The staff are organised and managed effectively (NMS 20)
- The agency has sufficient staff with the right skills / experience (NMS 21)
- The agency is a fair and competent employer (NMS 22)
- The agency provides training for staff (NMS 23)
- Case records for children and prospective / approved adopters are comprehensive and accurate (NMS 25)
- The agency provides access to records as appropriate (NMS 26)
- The agency's administrative records processes are appropriate (NMS 27)
- The agency maintains personnel files for members of staff and members of adoption panels (NMS 28)
- The premises used by the adoption agency are suitable for purpose (NMS 29)
- The adoption agency is financially viable (NMS 30, Voluntary Adoption Agency only)
- The adoption agency has robust financial processes (NMS 31)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

1,2,14,16,17,20,21,22,23,25,26,27,28,29,30,and 31.

This is a well-established agency which is well managed at all levels

EVIDENCE:

The Statement of Purpose was presented to the Board of Trustees in 2004. The agency had clear written aims, outlined in this document and the mission statement, and these were known to staff and adopters. The manager and staff reported that they hope the approach of the agency could become more

inclusive, for example to include the recruitment of unmarried adoptive applicant couples. At this point the religious framework of the agency meant there were restrictive eligibility criteria which were made clear in the information available to enquirers.

The agency focuses on recruiting people who would be most likely to meet the needs of older children or sibling groups. Recruitment plans varied between local offices, with some campaign strategies being more relevant in some areas than in others. Recruitment activity was reviewed regularly.

Adopters confirmed they were promptly sent written information, and there "was clear information from the beginning". They were also invited to group information sessions or to individual information giving sessions. Many adopters commented on the "prompt and friendly" response they received to their initial enquiry. The manager discussed proposals to develop the initial information material to depict more graphically the range of children needing placement.

The agency is managed by a management team with considerable experience. The Director has overall responsibility for the range of CCS work, and is the decision maker for the adoption agency. The Director has a relevant professional background and a strong interest in adoption matters. The manager is qualified and competent and exercised leadership. She was also acting as mentor to a manager in another voluntary adoption agency, and there were ongoing discussions about the future configuration of the relationship between the two agencies.

The agency had strong consortium links and actively participates in Exchange days and other events.

Systems of management information were established. There were clear processes for monitoring and controlling the activities of the agency. The Director of the agency maintained a close level of involvement. One of the trustees was a panel member. An annual report for the Trustees was prepared by the manager.

Managers within the agency met regularly and staff reported that it was an approachable management team with effective systems of communication. Two monthly meetings were held involving all the family placement workers, and each team had monthly meetings. Workers and managers in the local teams said they felt "well linked in" with the overall organisation of the agency. Their comments conveyed a clear sense of corporate identity. There was an effective balance between the need of the teams to respond to local differences, and at the same time promote consistency of practice within the organisation, for example in administrative processes and standards of practice.

Staff described having measured and manageable caseloads, with time for reflection and learning. There were frequent references to excellent administrative support. There was emphasis on a team approach to the business of the agency with administrative staff involved in meeting prospective adopters. This helped avoid delays and also helped ensure that adopters were met with tactful, sensitive responses when they contacted the agency.

IT systems within the agency are developing and some staff found the current system very slow. Some workers did not yet have access to e.mail. It was acknowledged that the agency needed to have systems to support effective communication within and outside the agency.

All social workers had relevant qualifications. Overall staff retention was very good in the agency although some promotional opportunities had led to some vacancies. Some regular independent workers were available to the agency to help provide cover and the agency had been successful in appointing to the posts. Staff made many positive statements about the supportive, caring culture of the agency. At the same time they acknowledged that some terms and conditions were not as favourable as other agencies, but other aspects of employment within the agency outweighed these disadvantages. In particular the flexible, family friendly approach was seen as "brilliant", as well as the fulfilling nature of being able to do quality work: "time to give people, and to research things properly"; "the way things are discussed and knowledge shared", "we know we are privileged".

Training opportunities were described as excellent. Details provided of training attended by staff confirmed that the agency has funded a range of relevant training courses and had encouraged staff to develop skills. Regular supervision and appraisal was valued by staff.

Some, but not all, managers had received management training though the agency was committed to ensuring that relevant opportunities were available to them.

Not all staff were aware of a whistle blowing policy although it was in the Staff Handbook. It is advised that the agency finds opportunities to refresh their understanding of this.

Files seen were well-organised and case records generally comprehensive. Evidence of case supervision was seen on files. A separate children's file was opened when a placement was made with adoptive families and the adopters' file was closed at this stage. This practice is potentially confusing and it is suggested this should be reviewed.

File audit processes were irregular and varied between managers.

There were clear and thorough arrangements for access to records and the agency staff demonstrated a high level of awareness about confidentiality and relevant legislation. Electronic records were password protected. Administrative processes were appropriate in regard to requests for information or records from the agency.

It was evident from personnel records examined that the agency had satisfactory systems for recruitment of staff and for ensuring that the required documentation about each staff member was on record. Panel members' files were not as comprehensive as required with some containing very minimal information.

The agency operates from a number of different premises. This inspection included visits to the sites at Purley, Winchester and Reading. Individual office managers had completed risk assessments of the premises. The premises at Purley had security alarms and lighting and measures were in place to review what should be in place at Winchester. At Reading there had been a recent break-in and again, there were ongoing discussions aimed at reviewing the security arrangements.

Another site at Littlehampton was not visited. The agency reported that there are current proposals to relocate the Littlehampton staff team probably to the Brighton area, and alternative premises were being explored at the time of this inspection. The Littlehampton office premises as described are not suitable for the purposes of an adoption agency and it is recommended that the plans to move to suitable premises are progressed as soon as possible.

The agency has a purpose built, well-organised and secure archive. There were more variable arrangements for adoption files currently in use at the different local offices. It was reported that there was an ongoing programme to install fireproof cupboards for the working files where it was feasible.

The agency provided details of audited accounts. The Chair of Trustees confirmed that adoption work is seen as core work by the CCS, and where necessary will be underwritten by the agency. The ongoing, long-term commitment to providing a counselling and support service to children adopted many years ago remains a continuing challenge to the agency. There were clear financial procedures and a finance officer who is readily available to the managers for advice.

SCORING OF OUTCOMES

This page summarises the assessment of the extent to which the National Minimum Standards for Adoption have been met and uses the following scale.

4 Standard Exceeded (Commendable) **3** Standard Met (No Shortfalls)
2 Standard Almost Met (Minor Shortfalls) **1** Standard Not Met (Major Shortfalls)

“X” in the standard met box denotes standard not assessed on this occasion
 “N/A” in the standard met box denotes standard not applicable

BEING HEALTHY	
Standard No	Score
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION	
Standard No	Score
7	3
8	4
9	3

STAYING SAFE	
Standard No	Score
2	3
4	3
5	4
10	3
11	3
12	2
13	3
15	3
19	3
24	3

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELLBEING	
Standard No	Score
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING	
Standard No	Score
6	4
18	2

MANAGEMENT	
Standard No	Score
1	3
3	3
14	3
16	3
17	3
20	3
21	3
22	3
23	3
25	3
26	3
27	3
28	2
29	2
30	3
31	3

Are there any outstanding requirements from the last inspection? N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

This section sets out the actions, which must be taken so that the registered person/s meets the Care Standards Act 2000, Voluntary Adoption and the Adoption Agencies Regulations 2003 or Local Authority Adoption Service Regulations 2003 and the National Minimum Standards. The Registered Provider(s) must comply with the given timescales.

No.	Standard	Regulation	Requirement	Timescale for action
1	AD29	VAAS 2003 Reg.18	The agency must identify suitable alternative premises for those adoption activities which have been based at the Littlehampton site.	31/03/06
2	AD28	VAAS 2003 Reg 14,17	Comprehensive personnel files must be maintained for each member of the adoption panel, and these must contain evidence of a CRB check obtained by the agency.	31/03/06

RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations relate to National Minimum Standards and are seen as good practice for the Registered Provider/s to consider carrying out.

No.	Refer to Standard	Good Practice Recommendations
1	AD2	The agency should clarify and implement an effective strategy for recruiting adoptive parents from black and ethnic minority groups.

2	AD4	Assessment reports of prospective adopters should more explicitly include the evidence of competence which has been gathered in the process of assessment work.
3	AD12	The format for panel minutes should be revised to more clearly state the reasons for conclusions reached.
4	AD20	The IT systems should be reviewed so that staff all have access to effective systems of communication.
5	AD22	The whistle blowing policy should be made known to all staff.
6	AD24	Plans to revise the complaints procedures should be progressed.

Commission for Social Care Inspection

North West Regional Office

11th Floor

West Point

501 Chester Road

Old Trafford

M16 9HU

National Enquiry Line: 0845 015 0120

Email: enquiries@csci.gsi.gov.uk

Web: www.csci.org.uk

© This report is copyright Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) and may only be used in its entirety. Extracts may not be used or reproduced without the express permission of CSCI