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Recommendations: That the Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Panel
A. Note the year end performance report 2012-13 and associated commentary.
B. Note the current levels of performance as at April 2013 for the reporting year 2013-14.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
1.1. $\quad$ To provide the Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Panel (CYP panel) with a regular update on the performance of the Children, Schools and Families Department and key partners.
2. DETAILS
2.1. At the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel meeting on $5^{\text {th }}$ June 2007 it was agreed that the Children Schools and Families department would submit a regular performance report on a range of key performance indicators. This performance monitoring report would act as a 'health check' for the panel and would be over and above the more detailed performance reports scheduled to the panel which relate to specific areas of activities such as, the Annual Schools Standards report, Safeguarding performance report etc.
2.2. Appendix One presents a year end performance dashboard 2012-13, commentary for all 'red' indicators is provided in section 3.
2.3. Appendix Two presents the performance framework for 2013-14, commentary for this dashboard is presented in section 4.
3. YEAR END PERFORMANCE 2012-13
3.1. The CYP panel should note that corporate performance monitoring procedures at the 'year end' only report performance as Red or Green. This means that even marginal misses off of targets are reported as Red. Therefore Red ratings should be reviewed with actual outturn figures and within the contextual commentary provided.
3.2. Children's Social Care
3.3. Line $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ Initial and Core Assessment percentage completion rates.
3.4. Initial assessments, $84 \%$ were completed within 10 days this equates to 739 of 885 . We have missed our ambitious target of $90 \%$ however have demonstrated significant improvement from 2011-12 figures of 63\%. Core assessments, $52 \%$ were completed within 35 days this equates to 279 of 536 , last years outturn was 58\%.
3.5. The Munro proposals require a greater focus on quality of assessments and interventions rather than a simplistic focus on completion rates. We have set ambitious targets for initial and core assessments for which managers continue to strive for a balance of quality and timeliness. The new Quality Assurance framework of wide scale case file audits shows a continuous improvement in the quality of assessment practise. CSC has been undertaking an extensive change programme including the restructuring of all social work teams including the establishment of MASH and the establishment of the 14+ team. The reengineering of the social work services and recruitment to vacancies will ultimately strengthen social work expertise and improve timeliness and quality.
3.6. Line 5 Percentage of reviews completed within timescale for Children with Child Protection Plans.
3.7. A performance of $97 \%$ means that 5 out of 140 child protection plan reviews have not been completed on time. This performance indicator records of all reviews taking place through the year, if one is late or missed it is recorded as late/missed for the whole financial period. Our aim is to always conduct reviews within timescale, on 5 occasions these were delayed due to non-quorate or insufficient information from other agencies.
3.8. Line 6 Percentage of Children with Child Protection Plans visits due completed on time

All cases that were reported as not visited have now been visited. The reasons for visits not happening during the year will be for a variety of reasons relating primarily to parental non co operation and families avoiding contact.
3.9. Line 7 Percentage of Children that became the subject of a Child Protection Plan for the second or subsequent time
3.10. We have missed our target by $0.4 \%$ this is the equivalent of one child. 17 of 161 children were subject to a children protection plan for the second or subsequent time. This was due to a large sibling group (family of 6) becoming subject to a plan for a second time in February. This should be green even though the target has been missed, it is within bandings regarded as being good by the DfE.
3.11. Line 10 and $\mathbf{1 1}$ Number of Special Guardianship Orders and Adoptions
3.12. We have been working towards a total of 12 Adoptions or Special Guardianship orders this year, we have secured 8. In our Ofsted Inspection of Adoption Services (January 2013) in which we were rated 'Good', inspectors noted that when there are delays in placing children for adoption this is usually for valid reasons, or due to maters beyond the control of the service such as delays with care proceedings.
3.13. Line $\mathbf{1 2}$ Stability of placements of Children in care, number of moves (3 or more moves in the year)
3.14. Placement stability remains high on our agenda with an increasing pool of internal fostering provision and more effective management of challenging young people we are seeing this improve over time although not yet displayed in this cumulative indicator. $16 \%$ of all children in care had 3 moves or more during 2012-13, this equates to 22 of 140 children.
3.15. Line $\mathbf{1 3}$ Stability of placements of Children in care, length of placement
3.16. This is a small cohort of children and can be skewed as is the case here by sibling groups. Children in this cohort are under the age of 16 , been in care for 2.5 years or more and been in their current placement for 2 years or more. Of the total number of children in care in Merton, only 36 children meet these criteria. Of these, 23 children have not been in their placements for longer than 2 years, with 7 of these children belonging to one of three sibling groups where they are now in permanent placement.
3.17. Line $\mathbf{1 4}$ Children in care cases which were reviewed within required timescales
3.18. $96 \%$ of reviews have been delivered within timescale during the year, in real terms this means 5 children of 124 children in care had reviews which were outside of the required timescales in this financial year. The percentage of missed reviews fluctuates during the year as the performance indicator is calculated against the percentage of the number of Looked After Children as at the specified moment in time. A small number of reviews (5) were cancelled and re-arranged due to varied reasons including serious travel disruption, poor weather or unavailability of young person, carers or parents.
3.19. Line 15 Percentage of Children in care participating in their reviews
3.20. $86 \%$ of children in care participated in their review, of the 19 CYP eligible to participate, 16 did so and 3 did not. Generally we would hope for a $90 \%$ participation level, this allows for 1 in 10 CYP who make a conscious decision not to participate in their review.
3.21. Line 19 Young Offenders NEET rate (Inverse of EET, assuming NEET).
3.22. $16 \%$ Young Offenders NEET outturn against a target of $10 \%$. ETE figures remain consistently higher than our statistical neighbours and the London area. We are working with less Young People than previously but those we work with are a more challenging cohort of YP with more needs particularly around ETE. We retain good relationships with schools and ETE providers and have support workers that encourage attendance and help retain placements.
3.23. Line $\mathbf{2 0}$ Number of Youth Service participation (cumulative figure)
3.24. We have missed our target of by $0.2 \%$ this is equivalent of 2 children of 1800. 1798 of Children have engaged in positive youth activity. As a proportional evaluation this indicator should not be reported as Red.

## Education and Early Years

3.25. Line 33 Percentage of Statements issues within 26 weeks without exceptions
3.26. Ambitious targets were set at $100 \%$ management action has been taken during the year to improve the outturn from 86\% in 2011-12 to 98\% in 2012-13.
3.27. Line 34 Percentage of Statements, issued within 26 weeks with and within exceptions
3.28. Statutory assessment completion with exceptions continues to be challenging due to our reliance on health for reports as part of the statutory deadline. Management action has been taken during the year to improve the outturn from $82 \%$ in 2011-12 to $92 \%$ in 2012-13.
3.29. Line 35 Number of short breaks provided (Cumulative figure)
3.30. Children, young people, their parents and carers can access a short break if they are between 0 and 18 years of age and have a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long term effect on their ability to carry out day-to-day activities. Not all children and families will need the same level of support and short
breaks, some will need more than others because of the nature of their child's disability and its severity. Some families may need more support because of their individual family circumstances. This makes it difficult to profile the numbers of short breaks likely to take place at any given time of the year.
4. PERFORMANCE MONITORING 2013-14
4.1. The 2013-14 performance indicator framework is presented in appendix two. As requested by Members no amendments have been made to the indicator set, except for two indicators. These have been amended only to reflect changes in Children Social Care practice nationally.
4.2. The performance indicators reporting timeliness of completing Initial and Core assessments have been removed in exchange for an equivalent indicator about Single assessments. Similarly the number of CAF's (Common Assessment Framework) indicator has been replaced with a 'number of' CASA (Common and shared assessments) indicator.
4.3. CSF monitor a mixture of output and outcome measures, indicators derive from statutory requirements and local monitoring needs.
4.4. This year performance indicators have been profiled individually based on a review of the 2012/13 actual performance and known 'seasonal' effects. This is a new approach from previous years where by monthly performance indicators were profiled equally over 12 months and quarterly equally over four segments.
4.5. Where appropriate performance indicators have been allocated a deviation allowance, this approach has become a best practice to demonstrate acceptable levels of performance. During 2012/13 all Pl's were allocated a deviation of $0 \%$ with the exception of one indicator. This approach combined with the simple approach to monthly/quarterly performance profiling is likely to have led to undue concern over Amber/Red indicators during the year.
4.6. Each deviation where adopted has been carefully considered taking in to account, previous performance and where relevant national or London wide performance comparisons. It is felt that the deviations and profiles adopted for 2013/14 will provide a challenging yet realistic approach to performance management.
4.7. Where possible London and National benchmarking has been added along side last years outturn. Although performance benchmarking is useful the department will continue to triangulate performance data, quality assurance audit activity to more holistically monitor how the needs of diverse and vulnerable groups are met and target improvements where necessary.
4.8. Performance reporting April 2012-13
4.9. Line $\mathbf{1 2}$ Stability of placements of Children in care, length of placement (Red)
4.10. Children in this cohort are under the age of 16 , been in care for 2.5 years or more and been in their current placement for 2 years or more. Of the total number of children in care in Merton, only 42 children meet these criteria. Of these, 25 children have not been in their placements for longer than 2 years.
5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS
5.1. The panel's scrutiny work programme is determined by the members of the panel.
6. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED
6.1. The panel have agreed to consider the performance report on an annual basis.
7.

TIMETABLE
7.1. None relating to this covering report.
8. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS
8.1. None relating to this covering report.
9. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS
9.1. None relating to this covering report.
10. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS
10.1. None relating to this covering report.
11. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS
11.1. None relating to this covering report.
12. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS
12.1. None relating to this covering report.
13. APPENDICES - THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- Appendix 1: Performance framework year end 2012-13
- Appendix 2: Performance framework 2013-14

14. BACKGROUND PAPERS
14.1. None.
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CYP Overview and Scrutiny Panel - Performance Index April 2013

| No. | Performance Indicators | Frequency | Merton 2012-2013 | Benchmark Nationa Average 2012-2013 | Benchmark London/SN | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013-14 } \\ \text { target } \end{gathered}$ | Polarity | \% Deviation | BRAG Rating <br> (latest Outcome Period) | Apr-13 | May-13 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Q1 }}}{\substack{\text { Jun-13/ }}}$ | Jul-13 | Aug-13 | $\underset{\mathrm{Q} 2}{\mathrm{Sep}-131}$ | Oct-13 | Nov-13 | $\underset{\text { Qec-13I }}{\substack{\text { Q }}}$ | Jan-14 | Feb-14 | $\underset{\mathrm{Q} 4}{\mathrm{Mar}-14 /}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chidrens Social Care |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Number f f cast's | Monthy | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | na | n/a | n/a | na |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monthy |
| 2 | \% of Single Assessments completed wititin the stautury 45 days (Yeart to date) | Monthy | n/a | n/a | n/a | 90\% | High | 9\% | Green | 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | утD |
| 3 | \% of chidren subiect of a CP plan with a n allocated Social Worker | Monthly | 100\% | notav | notav | 100\% | High | 0\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monthy |
| 4 |  | Monthy | 97\% | notav | notav | 100\% | High | 10\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | צTD |
| 5 | \% of Children subject of a Child Protection Plan who had a 4 weekly CP visit in timescale (child seen) | Montrly | 85\% | notav | notav | 95\% | High | \% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monthy |
| 6 | NI 65 - \% of Children that became the subject of a CP Plan for the Second or subsequent time | Montry | 10.56\% | notav | notav | 10\% | Low | 10\% | Bue | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative YTD |
| 7 | \% of Children in Care with an allocated Social Worker | Montly | 100\% | notav | notav | 100\% | High | 0\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | утD |
| 8 | Children in Care rate eer 10,000 | Montly | ${ }^{32.6}$ | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | ${ }^{31.55}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | End of the month snapshot |
| 9 | Number of chidren who ceased to be LAC who were adopted | Montly | 8 | notav | notav | 12 | High | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | Green | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD |
| 10 | Number of agency special guaridiaship orders granted | Montry |  | notav | notav |  | High |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD |
| 11 | NI 62 - Stability of placements of Children in Care - number of moves (3 or move moves in the year) | Monthy | Avainge finisaiaion ot he | notav | notav | 15\% | Low | ${ }^{2 \%}$ | Bue | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | YTD |
| 12 | N1 63 - Stability of placements of Chidren in Care -lenght of placement | Montly | Avaing finisaiaion ot he | notav | notav | 75\% | High | 5\% | Red | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | End of the monts snapshot |
| 13 | N1 66-C Chidren in Care cases which weer ereviewed within required timescales | Montly | Avainge finisaiaion of the | notav | notav | 100\% | High | 10\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | YтD |
| 14 | \% of chidren in Care paricicazaing in their reviews in month | Monthy | Avaing finisiaion of the | notav | notav | 90\% | High | 10\% | Gree | 88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monthly with euarerer $Y$ TD |
| 15 | N161-Timeliness of adopion placements post best interest deecision | Monthy | 100\% | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | утD |
| 16 | N1 19 - Rate of prover re-offending by young people it the youtr justice system | Quarterly | 1.2 | notav | notav | 1.1 | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Quarerly |
| 17 | First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 (Cumulative) | Monthy | 77 | notav | notav | 96 | Low | 0\% | Bue | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | YTD |
| 18 | Young offenders NEEE Tate | Quarerly | notav | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Quarerely |
| 20 | Youth Justice Caseload per worker | Quarerly | notav | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monthy |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% | Youth senice paritipation rate | Annual | 1798 | notav | notav | 2.000 | High | 0\% | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 21 | Seconday School Persisient absence (LA) $15 \%$ trestold | Annual | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 22 | Seconday persisitent absenism (15\% absence) | Annual | 8.2\% | 7.4\% | 6.1\% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| ${ }^{23}$ | Seconday freed tem exclusions (eercentage of pupis on roil) | Annual | 11.89\% | 8.40\% | 8.30\% | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | Low | $2 \%$ | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 24 | \% of BME Pupil Exclusions Fied - Secondary | Annual | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 25 | Primay fixed term exclusions (percentage of pupils on roll) | Annual | 0.64\% | 0.91\% | 0.75\% | 0.6\% | Low | 0.5\% | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 26 | \% of BME Pupil Exclusions Fixed - Primary | Annual | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |
| 27 | Seconday permanent exclusions (Number) | Monthly | 12 | 4370 | 780 | 12 | Low | $\begin{gathered} 4 \text { children per } \\ \text { quarter } \end{gathered}$ | Green | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | August End of Acad. Yr YTD. September start of the new Acad. Yr. |
| 28 | Numberl\% of BME Pupil Exclusions Pemanent- Secondary | Anval | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | na | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | August End of Acad. Yr YTD. September start of the new Acad. Yr. |
| 29 | Primary permanent extusions (Number) | Monthy | 0 | ${ }^{610}$ | 60 | 0 | Low | 1 child | Green | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Numbert\% of BME Pupil Exclusions Pemanent-Primary | Annual | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | August End of Acad. Yr YTD. September start of the new Acad. Yr. the new Acad. Yr. |
| 31 | Number of managed moves - Primary | Quaterly | 4 | notav | notav | n/a | na | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative YTD ACademic Year Arangements made by headteachers not formally noted unless as avoidanco of elclisions YTD 2 under consideration but not route adopted. |
| 32 | All sen satemenst issued in 26 weeks (without excepions) | Montrly | 98\% | 93\% | 90\% | 98\% | High | 2\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD Academic Year |
| 33 | All SEN statements issued in 26 weeks (with and withut exceptions) | Montly | ${ }_{92 \%}$ | ${ }_{86 \%}$ | 79\% | 95\% | High | 5\% | Green | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative YTD Academic Year |
| 34 | Provision of Short Breaks - cumulative | Quarerty | ${ }^{363}$ | notav | notav | 400 | High | 10\% | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD Academic Year |
| 35 | SEN Staements Applied for (No. of Retereral Received tor Assessment Pane) | Quarterly | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD |
| 36 | SEN Statement issued | Quaterty | n/a | notav | notav | n/a | na | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative YTD |
| 37 | \% outcome ofall children Cente Oisted inspecions good or oustanding | Quarerty | 100.0\% | 70\% | 77\% | 100\% | High | \%\% | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulaive YTD |
| 38 | \% of total 0-5 year estimated ACORN estimated population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30\%) whose families have accessed children's centre services | Quarterly | 73.9\% | notav | notav | n/a | na | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cummuative YTD |
| Road Accidents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | CYP Road acicients - repored incidents Fatailseriousslight | Annual | n/a | n/a | na | n/a | na | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Measure |

