



CSSW Themed audit overview report

'Care Leavers and Preparing for Adulthood'

(January – February 2022)

Introduction

This CSSW (Children's Safeguarding and Social Work) themed audit focused on young people aged 16 years and older who are described as 'care leavers' with a particular focus on their preparation into adulthood. The audit focused on the preceding 12 months of practice and considered the following themed lines of enquiry: (for further detail please refer to Appendix 1):

- The young adult's voice/story
- Preparing for independence post 18.
- Safeguarding
- Service provision
- Family and community links

Sample

We randomly selected 29 young people aged 16+ across the Looked After Children & Care Leaving Service (LACCLT) and those known to the Children and Young People Disability Service (CYPDS).

| Case type | Total | % |
|--------------|-------|-----|
| CIN | - | - |
| CP | - | - |
| LAC | 7 | 24% |
| Care Leavers | 18 | 63% |
| CYPDS | 4 | 13% |

Care leavers were identified as those aged 16 and above, who had been in the care system for a minimum of 13 weeks, and therefore eligible for leaving care status. Young people were subject to Full Care Orders and Section 20 arrangements, and included unaccompanied asylum-seeking young people, and young people on remand or detained within young offenders' institutions.

| Gender | Total | % |
|--------|-------|-----|
| Female | 9 | 31% |
| Male | 20 | 69% |

The cohort included 9 females and 20 males.

| Ethnicity summary | Total | % |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Asian or Asian British - Any Other Asian Background | 3 | 10% |
| Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi | 2 | 7% |
| Black or Black British - African Eritrean | 2 | 7% |
| Black or Black British - Any Other African | 3 | 10% |
| Black or Black British - Any Other Black Background | 1 | 3% |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Any other ethnic group | 4 | 14% |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Arab | 2 | 7% |
| Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background | 2 | 7% |
| Mixed - White and Black African | 1 | 3% |
| Mixed - White and Black Caribbean | 3 | 10% |
| White - Any Other White Background | 1 | 3% |
| White - British | 3 | 10% |
| White - Irish | 1 | 3% |
| Not Specified | 1 | 3% |

The biggest ethnic group of young people were identified as ‘any other ethnic group’ and encapsulates unaccompanied asylum-seeking young people who made up 48% of the overall cohort. The next largest cohort were white British, mixed white and black Caribbean, black British and Asian or Asian British.

| Age category at time of audit | Total | % |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| under 1 | 0 | - |
| 1 to 4 | 0 | - |
| 5 to 9 | 0 | - |
| 10 to 15 | 0 | - |
| 16 or 17 | 9 | 31% |
| 18 to 21 | 15 | 52% |
| 22 to 25 | 5 | 17% |

The largest cohort of young people were predominantly aged between 18 and 21, at 52%. This provided an opportunity to better understand the transition process for our care leavers as they move between children and adult services, and between the children looked after and the care leavers service. The next largest cohort were young people aged 16 to 18 at 31% and provided an opportunity to understand how practice prepared and planned for young people reaching adulthood. We also included a smaller cohort of young adults aged between 22 to 25 at 17%. This was to better understand how practice supported young adults who were transitioning out of statutory leaving care services.

Process of Audit

A small team of CSSW colleagues were identified as auditors. This included Heads of Service, Service Managers, Independent Reviewing Officers, Team Managers and independent auditors located within the Quality Assurance Unit. Auditors were allocated to casework on the basis they were not currently involved in direct practice regarding the young person. Auditors reviewed the case files before arranging a reflective case discussion with the allocated Social Worker and/or Personal Advisor. Where possible, the line manager, usually the Senior Practitioner was also invited. The auditor also sought to gain feedback from the young person and their parent/carer where appropriate.

The information gathered was then triangulated and incorporated into the 'CSSW Audit Template' on MOSAIC. Using Ofsted ratings, the auditor determined a judgement on 7 separate areas of practice and a final overall rating. Areas of good or outstanding practice, as well as areas for development were also summarised by the auditor. Where appropriate this was accompanied by a proposed audit action plan. The auditor invited feedback from the practitioner and their line manager on the audit findings and any proposed plan.

Moderation

Changes to our moderation process have sought to increase consistency and strengthen our learning through practice. Moderation continues to be a panel model chaired by the Head of Service for Quality Assurance and includes at least one operational Head of Service and one representative who is independent of the service area. Of the 29 audits completed, 4 (14%) were identified for moderation. This included a selection of audits that were rated as 'Requires Improvement' and 'Good'. Audits that also bordered 'Outstanding' or identified elements of inadequate were also presented.

The allocated social worker/practitioner, their line manager and the auditor were invited to a 20 minute 'practice audit review' where they had the opportunity to reflect on the process and outcome of the collaborative audit and to identify any key strengths and opportunities for individual, team and organisational learning. A brief record of the moderation discussion and confirmation of any changes to the grading were recorded on the audit template, with the final decision resting with the Panel chair. The following outcomes were agreed:

| Ref: | Auditor rating | Moderation outcome |
|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| (1000011) | Good | Good |
| (2067267) | Good | Good |
| (2157963) | Good with features of RI | Good with features of RI |
| (2170214) | Good with Outstanding features | Outstanding |
| (1000097) | Requires Improvement with features of Inadequate | Requires Improvement |

Exceptional and Outstanding practice was recognised through escalation to the Director and consideration given to a Story Board/Appreciative Inquiry.

Contents of Report

1. Overall audit ratings
2. Subcategory of audit findings
3. Analysis and discussion of audit findings
 - Areas of strength
 - Areas for development and learning
4. Recommendations/Action Plan
5. Appendices:
 - Leaving Care – Themed lines of enquiry
 - Table of case references and audit outcomes

1. Overall audit ratings

The data within this report has been drawn from the 'CSSW Audit Template' forms created on MOSAIC during January and February 2022.

Note on percentages: calculations are based on responses entered in the audit forms; where questions have not been completed (or where the question was marked not applicable) these are shown within the summary table but are not included in any percentage calculations/measures.

Auditor judgement on final grading (Following moderation):

| Auditor judgement | Total | % |
|----------------------|-------|-----|
| Outstanding | 1 | 4% |
| Good | 24 | 83% |
| Requires improvement | 4 | 13% |
| Inadequate | 0 | - |

Overall, 83% of the casework audited was rated as 'Good', with 13% rated as 'Required Improvement'. Following the moderating meeting, one audit was upgraded from 'Good' with 'Outstanding' features to 'Outstanding'. This was in recognition of the young person's feedback and evidence the social workers' outstanding practice as going above and beyond in supporting the young person to achieve his outcomes. No casework was rated overall as Inadequate.

2. Subcategory audit ratings:

The audit template consists of 7 subcategories, each covering a specific feature of practice. Findings from the 29 audits across these subcategories are listed below:

| Subcategory | Outstanding | Good | Requires Improvement | Inadequate | Rating not entered |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|
| S2: Referral, Assessment, Plan, Review | 0 (0%) | 17 (59%) | 8 (28%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (14%) |
| S3: Joint working/outcomes | 0 (0%) | 21 (72%) | 5 (17%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (10%) |
| S4: Child/Family engagement | 2 (7%) | 21 (72%) | 4 (14%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (7%) |
| S5: Equalities | 1 (3%) | 20 (69%) | 3 (10%) | 1 (3%) | 4 (14%) |
| S6: Outcomes | 0 (0%) | 23 (79%) | 3 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (10%) |
| S7: Management Oversight | 0 (0%) | 15 (52%) | 11 (38%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (10%) |
| S8: Recording | 1 (3%) | 15 (52%) | 9 (31%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (14%) |

Overall Good/Outstanding practice was identified most prominently in the subcategories of joint working, child and family engagement and achieving outcomes. Areas that identified 'Requires Improvement' were most noticeable in the subcategories of planning and review, management oversight and recording. Where

there was a feature of inadequate, a robust action plan was put in place at an operational level and overseen by the team manager One issue affecting the overall reporting is auditors not fully completing the audit template. This means some ratings have not been entered as evidenced in the final column above.

3. Analysis and discussion of audit findings

The following information provides quantitative and qualitative analysis and discussion of the 29 audits completed. Any findings should be understood in the context of this sample size. Young people seeking asylum (UASC) also account for 48% of the sample, and therefore findings are not typically representative of the wider care leaving cohort.

The identified areas of practice strength and areas for development have been categorised dependant on whether the overall percentage of findings were above or below the range of 75%. Where ratings have not been entered, the author of this report (lead auditor) has reviewed the individual audits to determine any learning found. The findings from each subsection are outlined below.

Section 2: Referrals, Assessment, Decision Making, Planning and Review:

| | |
|----------|---|
| Referral | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% audits judged the response to referral as appropriate - 100% audits found that the response to referral was appropriate to the risk - 100% cases, the auditor judged the child as being kept safe |
|----------|---|

Of the 29 case files audited, only three young people were subject to a referral within the last 12 months. Auditors identified that all three referrals were appropriately responded to in the context of risk and the young people were kept safe as a result of actions taken. Two young people were unaccompanied asylum-seeking young people. The third young person was accommodated with his siblings after disclosing current and historical physical abuse.

| | |
|------------|--|
| Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 23/29 (100%) cases, the auditor could see evidence that the assessment provided clear understanding of child's situation - In 26/29 (92%) cases, the auditor judged the assessment to be timely and proportionate - In 22/29 (73%) audits judged the assessment to be analytical and identified risk and protective factors, including parental capacity |
|------------|--|

Auditors found 23 of the assessments evidenced an understanding of the young person's current situation. In general, Social Workers and Personal Advisors followed a prescribed format to cover areas that included accommodation, finance, health and development, education, employment and training, practical skills and emotional and behavioural needs. Where the young person was seeking asylum, the assessments also provided updates on legal status and immigration.

There is however evidence that a strong focus on immediate needs could reduce the depth and curiosity regarding the young person's lived experiences and how this may have impacted on the young person's sense of identity. This was particularly evident with young people seeking asylum or those on remand/residing in young offender's institutes. Auditors also identified that a change of worker in some instances may lead

to challenges in holding the young person’s story in mind. This identified the importance of good chronologies and handovers/transfers.

Whilst there was evidence of timely and proportionate assessments in the majority of cases, auditors identified some delay in ensuring timely transition assessments and planning prior to the young person’s 18th birthday. Comprehensive Needs Assessments and Pathway Planning were not consistently evident as part of the LAC Review process. And some updated assessments completed prior to pathway plan review meetings appear to be copied over from the previous assessment. Whilst practitioners spoke of ‘nothing changing’. This resulted in some assessments feeling repetitive or lacking focus. This was also reflected in the auditors’ findings that only 73% of assessments were deemed to be analytical. Whilst Social Workers and Personal Advisors could describe risk and protective factors, it was not always routinely evident as to how this impacted on preparing the young person for adulthood or what was different over time.

| | |
|------|---|
| Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 26/29 (92%) cases, the auditor could see clear objectives in place (to reduce risk) - In 26/29 (92%) audits judged that appropriate services were in place - In 23/29 (74%) audits found evidence that a contingency plan had been devised if the plan didn’t work |
|------|---|

Auditors could see clear objectives and appropriate services in place as part of the young person’s plan. Staying Put arrangements for young people who remained in higher education appeared particularly beneficial. As were plans that identified alternative accommodation through the young person’s pathway provision. The need to support the young person’s independence skills, including the need for budgeting and managing finances were also referred to. The need for legal support to assist in progressing asylum applications and securing leave to remain was also a priority for young people seeking asylum.

Plans and objectives were less clear for the small number of young people residing in young offenders’ institutes. Whilst objectives to support needs were clear within the institute itself, transition planning in preparing for their return to the community was not as strong. This was also reflected in the need for better contingency planning with some young people. Whilst plans were in place for many young people, parallel planning, or ‘plan B’ arrangements were at times less evident. The plans often appeared to be written for the young person, rather than with them and thus potentially missing opportunities to explore contingency planning as a collaborative process with the young person and their wider network.

| | |
|--------|--|
| Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 21/29 (96%) found that progress towards meeting objectives was clearly identified, including whether risk has been reduced, and whether desired change has been secured - In 17/29 (88%) cases, audits judged that appropriate actions were taken as a result of the review (e.g., the plan was amended, and consideration given to whether the case should be stepped-up or down) |
|--------|--|

Of the 21 audits completed, there was evidence of progress towards meeting agreed objectives within the young person’s plan. This included reducing risk and/or securing desired change. Ensuring the young person was in a stable and secure placement

was evident. This included Staying Put arrangements whilst they finished education, access to the Young Person’s Pathway (YPP) and specialist residential provision. Meeting objectives also involve making sure the young person had access to the correct benefits, training and or education and support with their asylum applications. The young person’s physical health and emotional wellbeing was also evidenced as being regularly reviewed as part of the plan.

Whilst auditors found that progress towards objectives were being made, there was evidence that transition planning and transferring from a social worker to a personal advisor could be happening sooner. Often the personal advisor was not being allocated until after the young person’s 18th birthday. This meant that opportunities for collaborative support and preparing young people for the realities of adulthood were happening later than expected. Reviews and updates of plans that were written for the young person, rather than collaboratively with them, were more likely to be unachievable or unrealistic. For example, a young adult was choosing to reside outside of London but was reported as missing because this was not part of their plan.

Section 3: Effectiveness of joint working in improving and sustaining outcomes

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Working Together | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 22/29 (100%) cases, the auditor assessment was that services had worked well together to improve outcomes - In 23/29 (96%) cases there was evidence that the network had considered what it is like for the child at home - In 18/29 (72%) audits showed that services had been well coordinated, with no gaps |
|------------------|---|

Auditors found evidence of services working well together in 22 examples. The network around the young person predominately comprised of the social worker/and or personal advisor, education, foster carers and placement key workers. Regular discussions between the network enabled a more rounded picture of the young person’s lived experiences to be shared and thought about. There was also evidence of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) supporting the young person’s emotional and psychological wellbeing. It was recognised however that CAMHS only work with young people up to the age of 18. This meant for some, the trusted relationship had to come to an end. Whilst there was evidence of transfers to adult mental health support such as The Hive, some delay was identified in the support starting. Other service and support included legal representation for those seeking asylum and specialist drug and alcohol support services such as ‘FWD’. Advocacy was also identified within some young people’s network, but this was not consistently applied across the sample.

Young people aged 18+ residing outside of Camden, presented some challenges to services working well together. Consent was required from the young person but not always given to coordinate services. This was also made difficult due to communication with other local authorities not always being reciprocated. As identified earlier, young people residing in young offenders’ institutes also raised some challenges in the way social care and the prison worked effectively together. Young people did not always give consent for the wider network to be present at their Pathway Plan Reviews, and in some instances, the Personal Advisor or social worker did not actively ask or suggest this as a helpful way to conduct the meeting.

At times it was not always clear what the ongoing role of the personal advisor was. This was particularly evident when the young person actively chose not to engage, or when they were reaching the age of 25, or in one example, when they were being supported by a social worker in the Children and Young People Disability Service (CYPDS). This raises questions as to whether the allocation of a Personal Advisor is always necessary and whether young people should in fact close to the leaving care service prior to their 25th birthday where appropriate to do so.

Section 4: Engagement with children and their families

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Family engagement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 20/29 (90%) audits showed good engagement had been achieved with parents/carers - (85%) cases, the auditor assessed that where good engagement had not been achieved, enough had been done to try to achieve it - (95%) the child/YP was seen alone unless not appropriate - In 20/29 (90%) cases, audits show evidence that the child/young person had a consistent and trusting relationship with the social worker and/or other professionals - In 22/29 (100%) audits showed that the child's /young person's views had been sought, and reflected in the plan - In 20/29 (60%) audits showed that direct work carried out with the child has been effective - In 20/29 (75%) cases, audits show that recording evidence the individual work undertaken, including appropriate direct work |
|-------------------|---|

Auditors found evidence of good engagement with parents/carers in 20 of the audits completed. Foster carers in particular formed part of a strong network of support around the young person and worked openly and collaboratively with the social worker or personal advisor. Where the social worker or personal advisor engaged with the young person's wider family network, including parents, this created positive transition experiences. The impact of Covid and reduced face to face meetings was highlighted by one family member:

'...problem is that because of covid all contact been over the phone or video. would like a face to face meeting there are questions I would like to ask. How long can he stay at college? what happens next. discussing things over the phone is hard.

Grandfather

However, parental engagement was inconsistent, particularly for those that had been classified as 'non-engaging', or 'difficult to engage' in the past. Where there was a lack of robust and early planning to explore wider family relationships prior to the young person turning 18, this presented some challenges for practitioners who then needed consent from the young person to approach their family post 18. Many of the young people in the cohort were also seeking asylum (48%) and did not wish for their families to be contacted, despite the offer of Red Cross support.

In two thirds of the case work audited, there was evidence that the young person had a consistent and trusting relationship, either with the social worker or with another professional. The other professionals included the personal advisor, the placement key workers, foster carers and CAMHS workers or in some examples, the staff within the youth offending institutes. Challenges to developing a trusting relationship was

evident when there was a change in allocated worker, or when there was a change in status from child to adult once the young person turned 18. This meant that the network changed from social worker to personal advisor and from CAMHS to adult mental health support. As one young person said:

'I have known [the social worker] for 2 years... When I turn 18 she will go, not good. She involves me with everything she does. I am very happy with her. She is always contacting me, always asking me what I need, she's always working for something I need. She is always positive, when I feel down, when I ask her about my status, she always says positive things and makes me motivated...she is involved, you have someone to help you, it makes life easier...'

Young person

Some practitioners spoke of the disruptions and feelings of loss that may be associated with changes of trusted adults that come about through systems and how this may impact on the young person's level of engagement. This highlights the need for early planning and the possibility of a period of joint working/handover between children and adult services.

Auditors found evidence of young people's views being sought and reflected in their plans. This included their wishes and feelings in relation to their education, employment and training and residence options as well as their likes and interests. One example of good practice included a young person being supported to present a PowerPoint presentation as part of his Pathway Plan Review. There was however evidence in the sample of young people's views being sought at a surface level. Engagement at times appeared to focus on the here and now or on specific presenting issues such as 'mental health' or UASC'. AS one young person said:

I have been supported and they have helped to push me forward...I don't think I could have asked for anything to be changed; things have been smooth. when I went into care, the placement was not appropriate for me. I felt like this was definitely understood by [my personal advisor], but I felt like she didn't know what to do. I've moved now and I'm happy in my placement.

Young person (18yrs old)

Auditors formed a view that more could have been done to explore young people's thoughts, feelings, wishes and views in more depth, which in part could contribute to identity work. This is reflected in a lack of individual and direct work being evidenced within the case files. The meaning of Life Story Work and how this is supported changes over time, particularly for young people that enter care in their adolescence or where they may have had some form of Life Story work when they were much younger. Direct work therefore needs to be considered creatively including the use of cultural genograms and timelines. The application of these approaches and tools were not consistently evidenced within the sample.

Some practitioners spoke of Covid and the impact this had on engaging young people face to face, with many preferring brief texting and messaging as a way of staying in touch. Practitioners also spoke of naturally reduced engagement with young people aged 21 years and over as they settled into adult life. As previously highlighted, where there appeared to be no specific ongoing role for the Personal Advisor, engagement and thus evidence of direct work was also reduced.

Section 5: Equalities

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Equality Issues | - In 25/29 (87%) audits showed that equalities issues had been addressed effectively, and in a sensitive and responsive manner |
|-----------------|--|

Auditors found a high proportion of casework evidenced the social worker or personal advisor effectively and sensitively responding to equality issues for young people. Practitioners drew upon similarities and differences in their work with young people. This was often in the context of cultural differences which included the role of gender and power for those following an Islamic faith. Practitioners also sought connections with young people through their love of sports and music which formed part of their identities. For those seeking asylum (48% of the cohort), the auditors found evidence of the social worker or personal advisor reflecting upon and addressing issues arising from the young person having to adapt to new cultures. Practitioners identified the importance of cultural markers such as food, music, language and religion. The issues of migrating from rural home environments to busy inner-city boroughs were also highlighted. Placements were generally culturally matched to support young people with this transition.

Social workers and personal advisors were able to reflect upon young people's lived experiences and how this may impact on their sense of self, their behaviour and their preparation for adulthood. This included potential discrimination linked to sexuality choices; loss, separation, grief, instability, and experiences of racism for young people fleeing war torn countries; and histories of long-term harm and or neglect for those residing in young offenders' institutes. Practitioners also reflected on young peoples' potential vulnerabilities to exploitation linked to their care status and disabilities. However, this was at times hypothesised rather than being fully understood by seeking the young person's direct views. This finding links with the limited evidence of direct work taking place with young people recorded on the case files and the need to be creative with how 'Life Story Work' is understood and progressed with young people such as the use of cultural genograms, timelines etc.

There were different factors identified by social workers and personal advisors as to why a deeper exploration of the young person's history was not explored. These included concerns of 'retraumatising' the young person or a desire to avoid young people having to 'repeat their stories' and wanting to be young person led and not be seen as 'probing', ie: if they did not raise their past, this was respected by the worker and a sense of wanting to establish trust and a positive working relationship before touching upon something that may have been experienced as traumatic. Whilst practitioners were curious about the young person's lived experiences, auditors felt in some examples, more could have been done to explore professionals use of language and the impact of labels on the young person's sense of self. This included terms such as 'mental health', 'deviant behaviour' 'UASC', 'disability' and 'Violent offender'.

Section 6: Outcomes for the child and the family

| Auditor judgement | Total | % |
|----------------------|-------|-----|
| Outstanding | - | - |
| Good | 25 | 86% |
| Requires improvement | 4 | 14% |

Auditors found evidence of ‘Good’ outcomes for the majority of young people in the sample. Young people seeking asylum were particularly well supported given the challenges Covid-19 brought with delaying asylum applications. These young people were placed in stable and supportive housing, were accessing financial support and higher education opportunities and spoke to positive futures in the UK. Other young people were well supported in Staying Put arrangements so that they could finish their education before moving on to some form of independent living. Other young people with specific disability or mental health needs were also accessing appropriate support, including specialist housing.

Outcomes that required improvement for young people included the small sample that were in youth offending institutes or for one young person who was facing a potential prison sentence. As outlined above, there appeared to be at times, a lack of parallel and coordinated planning for these young people and therefore the long-term trajectory was unclear. Other examples identified by auditors included the need for stability. For one young person, whilst physically safe in a residential placement, it was felt they would be better in a family setting. For another young person, the carers decision to end the placement once the young person turned 18, rather than explore Staying Put arrangements was not thought to be in their best interests.

Section 7: Management oversight and direction

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Support and direction | In 23/29 (78%) cases, audits showed that the front-line worker had been appropriately supported and directed by their line manager |
|-----------------------|--|

Social workers and personal advisors spoke of feeling supported by their direct line managers. Practitioners had the opportunity to discuss their work in both formal supervision and during informal case discussions. More experienced personal advisors spoke of knowing where to get support if needed. For those young people within the Looked After Children Service, the Independent Reviewing Officers provided oversight and midway reviews.

The Looked After Children and Care Leavers Team (LACCLT) service has experienced some structural changes over the last few months, and this appears to have had some impact on the quality of management oversight and direction. Auditors found evidence of gaps in supervision, particularly during a change of worker or line manager or when the young person transfers from a social worker to a personal advisor. Handovers between workers were in some examples described as ad hoc and not always evident on the case files. This appeared to impact on the quality and continuity of care planning case direction with management overviews not being consistently evident on the case files. Auditors also found evidence of repetition in supervision records with limited analysis and reflection, including the emotional and relational impact of the work. Supervision was often very task focused, mirroring the approach taken to many of the pathway plans.

Section 8: Recording

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Case recording | - In 24/29 (83%) cases, case recording is clear, up-to-date, and reflective of work undertaken, shows appropriate level of analysis, and is focused on outcomes for children and young people |
|----------------|---|

Auditors found evidence of clear, up to date and concise case recordings evident on the case files. Most young people had a chronology, but many of these required updating with some benefiting from being more focused and succinct. Although social workers and personal advisors were able to articulate the needs of young people, Needs Assessments and age assessments were not consistently evident on the case files and some pathway plans and reviews were considered to be lacking in depth. Some key documents such as MAPPA meetings also needed to be uploaded by the worker. Visits were taking place with young people, but there was evidence of some gaps and some recorded visits not having corresponding case notes. There was also evidence of repetition in the details of the visits in a small sample. In one example, the role of the personal advisor was not clear due to the young person being open to the Children and Young People's Disability Service (CYPDS) and being regularly seen by a CYPDS social worker. This meant visits and supervision records were absent on the leaving care records.

Comments on the audit process

- Team managers were a new and positive contribution to the auditing team
- Practice level actions plans are now being embedded in the supervision record to support progress on casework within the supervisory relationship.
- There remain ongoing challenges with auditors not completing sections of the audit template. This impacts on data reporting and findings.
- The Audit form embedded within MOSAIC continues to create some challenges in capturing the nuances of the decision making of the auditors. For example, when areas of practice had been partially met. A review of the audit template will form part of the MSAIC health check and refresh in June 2022.

CSSW THEMED PRACTICE AUDIT: *'Care Leavers and Preparing for adulthood'*

What we did:

- During January, February and March 2022, we engaged in reflective case discussions with social workers, senior practitioners, personal advisors, and team managers across the LACCLT and CYPDS. This was to better understand everyday case work with young people who are defined as care leavers and how they are being prepared for adulthood.
- We spoke to families and young people about their experiences of services in Camden.
- We reviewed case files across CSSW to see how practice was reflected in our written records.

Key messages:

Our Strengths

- We have high aspirations for our young people including higher education and university opportunities
- Relationship based practice is our strength, but it is not always evidenced in written records.
- Our Staying Put arrangements are experienced positively by young people and offer security and consistency in relationships.
- Supporting our unaccompanied asylum-seeking young people with practical, financial and educational support is one of our strengths.
- Personal Advisors are adaptive and take on multiple roles: mentor, coach, and advocate for our young people
- We utilise our Camden's Young People Pathways to support young people's transition towards adulthood and independence.
- There has been lots of changes and losses in the LACCLT, but everyone is working hard to keep young people the focus

Our areas for development

- Earlier transition planning through stringent IRO oversight and introducing Personal Advisors before young people turn 18
- The strengthening of young person led and co-created pathway plans.
- Supporting ongoing identity work, through comprehensive chronologies, cultural genograms, later life letters, life story work, lifelong links.
- Building secure networks ready for post leaving care by drawing on Family Group Conferencing and family and community networks
- Considering joint supervision arrangements when a young person is known to both CYPDS and LACCLT
- Stronger parallel/transition planning for young people on remand or in young offenders' institutions
- Reviewing Personal Advisor allocation and ongoing involvement on an individual need's basis.
- Strengthening the systemic and reflective supervision approach in the Care Leaving Service and with Personal Advisors



Action Plan: Themed Audit: 'Care Leavers and Preparing for Adulthood'

Date of this Plan: March 2022

| Area | Actions Required | Timescale | Lead | Outcome /target | Progress |
|---|---|-----------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Increase capacity and focus on practice through dedicated senior role in Leaving Care | Recruit to one-year fixed term Service Manager role | March 2022 | HoS | Additional capacity and expertise | Offer made 13/04/22 |
| Visits to be undertaken and recorded to timescale | Review timescales for all visits for young people of 18-21 and 22-25 in line with the pathway plan | 2 weekly review | SM/TM | 95% with exceptions reported | Visits – 67% at end of March 2022 .Measure range was 56% (August 2021) - 71% (February 2022) over course of 2021/22. |
| Keeping in touch proportionate to needs and level of independence of young person | Review expectations for Keeping in Touch and recording for 21-25 y/o young people requesting /requiring a service | May 2022 | HoS /SM | Refresh guidance and reporting | To be undertaken by new Service Manager |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Visit record to be young person centred and follow best practice address young person directly | Dip sample of visit quality and recording | April 2022 and bimonthly | SM/Practice lead | 90% graded good or better | |
| Good quality and up to date chronology on every file at transfer and updated with significant events whilst PA allocated | Reports to be reviewed monthly in team meetings Chronology workshops in teams and development of cultural genograms | March 2022 and monthly March/April 2022 | SM/TMs HoS/Practice lead | 100% of cases have chronology completed to point of Leaving Care Chronology tells young person's story and helps them to understand their identity | |
| Good quality reflective supervision which supports progress of plan on every file | Monthly dip samples Group supervision/learning sets to support best practice | April 2022 and monthly Bi monthly | HoS/SM/Practice lead Hos SM | 95% completed to timescale | |
| UASC – evidence of triple planning on every case | TM Review – dip sample | Bimonthly | SM/TM/Practice lead | 90% rated Good or better | Guidance circulated 07/03/22 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| UASC –all young people with All Rights Exhausted (ARE) have HRAs | TM Review all cases meeting criteria | Bimonthly | SM/TM/Practice lead | | |
| Appropriate planning and support for young people in custody | TM Review all young people meeting criteria | May/June 2022 | SM/TM | Develop recommendations/ action plan | |
| All plans are SMART purposeful and set out trajectory of work | Increase involvement of young people through coproduced pathway plans Task & Finish group | April-June | SM AC/LC APs | | |
| | Pod based Pathway planning practice development workshops | April-June | Practice lead | | |
| | All young people/carers/providers have copy of last pathway plan Survey/dip sample | April | SM/TM | | |
| Audit activity informs practice | Audit actions to be followed up within 2 weeks of completion of audit and evidenced in supervision record | March 2022 | SM/TM | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|-------|---|
| Learning from good practice through storyboards /AI | Each PA showcases one Good Practice example quarterly | March . Quarterly | SM/TM/Practice lead | | |
| Transition 18+ | Identification of PA at 17.5 PA to be present at last pathway plan review prior to transfer | 1 st March 2022 | SM LACCL | JH/DS | 13/03/22 Guidance produced and shared All YP 17.5 years have an identified PA to joint work |
| | Joint handover not less than 2 weeks prior to transfer | 1 st March 2022 | | | |
| | IRO to ensure meeting with young person 4 weeks prior to transfer | April 2022 | HoS/SM IROs /HoS CLACL | | Meeting with IRO manager TBC |
| | Joint workshops. CLACL/IROs to support best practice in transition | April 2022 | HoS/Practice lead | | |
| Integrated CAMHS service at age 18 | Ensure continued discussion re the LAC CAMHS service being extended to support transition to adulthood. | June 2022 | | | |
| Improved transitioning to adult services | Update on progress of working group including QA, LACCL and Adults | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|---------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Transition 21 + | Review of all young people 21 years + to ensure that they are receiving a level of service in line with their needs and progress towards independence. | March 2022 | HoS/TM | | 18 + panel chaired by HoS LACCL |
| Policy , Procedures ,Local Offer | Refresh Local Offer | May 2022 | HoS/JS/DD | | |
| | Refresh Policies and procedures | May 2022 | HoS/JS/DD | | |
| | Complete review of Young Peoples savings | March 2022 | <u>HoS/JW</u> | | In progress |

Appendix 1: Specific areas of focus

The young adult's voice/story

- In what ways are the young adult's views elicited and how are potential barriers overcome?
- In what way is advocacy explored for the young adult? What difference has it made?
- How is the young adult's behaviour made sense of in terms of telling a story about their lived experiences?
- In what ways do the practitioner and the network challenge their own and others' assumptions about the wishes, needs and wants of the young adult?
- In what way does the records capture the young adults lived experiences to date and how meaningful is this, should the young adult come to read their case files in the future. (including purposeful chronologies).

Preparing for independence post 18.

- In what ways has the pathway plan and needs assessment (or transition assessment, adult assessment and adult review in CYPDS) meaningfully informed ongoing care planning and support for the young adult into adulthood and beyond?
- Is the network clear on roles, responsibilities and expectations in respect of ensuring positive outcomes for young adults?
- Who would you say owns the pathway plan, in what ways has it been co-produced, and does the young adult have a copy?
- What has been the role of the IRO 12 months prior to the young adult's 18th birthday. How has their role critically challenged and supported the network with regards to the young adult's preparation for adulthood?
- How have child and adult services, both statutory, universal and voluntary/community services worked together to ensure seamless services and support for the young adult as they transition into adulthood?

Safeguarding

- In what ways have children and adult safeguarding systems and processes been used to safeguard the young adult and have these been effective?
- In what ways have the views of the young adult been drawn upon to inform safeguarding decision making?

Service provision

- What is the young adult's view on the support offered by care providers, including the suitability of where they live and the support they receive?
- In what ways have CSSW evidenced being 'good enough' corporate parents? How has the young adult experienced this and what impact or difference has it made to them?

Family and community links

- In what way has 'Lifelong links' been considered in supporting the young adult to develop a network of support outside of statutory agencies.
- What is the role of the young adult's family, including any siblings in their lives? How has this been supported and developed by the network?
- Who would the young adult say is their trusted adult and how is this promoted?

4. Appendices: Table of case references and audit outcomes

| Date Of Birth | Gender | Ethnicity Summary | Case type: Care Leaver | Section 2 rating | Section 3 rating | Section 4 rating | Section 5 rating | Section 6 rating | Section 7 rating | Section 8 rating | Auditor judgement |
|---------------|--------|---|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 15/01/1997 | Male | Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good |
| 28/05/1997 | Male | White - British | CYPDS | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Inadequate | Requires improvement | Requires improvement |
| 22/03/2001 | Female | Mixed - White and Black Caribbean | CL | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good |
| 17/06/2003 | Male | White - British | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good |
| 06/09/2003 | Female | Mixed - White and Black Caribbean | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good |
| 07/12/2003 | Male | White - British | CYPDS | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good |
| 30/06/2004 | Male | Black or Black British - Any Other Black Background | LAC | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Inadequate | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement |
| 12/09/2004 | Female | Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi | CYPDS | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good |
| 15/11/2003 | Male | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Any other ethnic group | CYPDS | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good |
| 12/11/2003 | Female | White - Irish | CL | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good |
| 06/02/2004 | Male | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Any | LAC | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | | Good |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------|---|-----|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|-------------|
| | | other ethnic group | | | | | | | | | | |
| 05/01/2005 | Female | Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background | LAC | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good | Good | |
| 01/01/1997 | Male | Asian or Asian British - Any Other Asian Background | CL | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 14/02/1997 | Male | Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 13/05/2002 | Female | Asian or Asian British - Any Other Asian Background | CL | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | |
| 17/02/2005 | Female | Mixed - White and Black African | LAC | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 20/06/2003 | Male | Black or Black British - Any Other African | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 21/11/2003 | Male | Black or Black British - African Eritrean | CL | Good | Good | Outstanding | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Outstanding |
| 30/04/2002 | Male | Black or Black British - African Eritrean | CL | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good | |
| 01/08/2003 | Male | Black or Black British - Any Other African | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 19/08/2003 | Male | Asian or Asian British - Any Other Asian Background | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| 01/06/2003 | Male | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Any other ethnic group | CL | Good | Good | Outstanding | Outstanding | Good | Good | Outstanding | Good | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------|---|-----|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 17/05/2004 | Male | Black or Black British - Any Other African | LAC | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good |
| 01/01/2004 | Male | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Arab | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Good | Good |
| 09/11/2003 | Male | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Any other ethnic group | CL | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Good |
| 02/01/2005 | Female | Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups - Arab | LAC | Requires improvement | | Requires improvement | | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement |
| 10/10/2003 | Male | - | CL | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good |
| 10/11/2004 | Male | White - Any Other White Background | LAC | Requires improvement | Good | Good | Good | Good | Requires improvement | Requires improvement | Requires improvement |