

Committee: Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 16th January 2019

Wards: All wards

Subject: Performance Report November 2018

Lead officer: Rachael Wardell, Director of Children Schools and Families

Lead members: Cllr Kelly Braund, Cabinet Member for Children Services

Cllr Caroline Cooper-Marbiah, Cabinet Member for Education

Contact officer: Sharon Buckby, Interim Head of Service for Policy, Planning and Performance

Recommendations:

Members of the panel note the contents of the performance report and discuss current performance and the changes proposed to the scrutiny performance framework by the panel's performance leads

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The report provides members of the panel with performance information to the end of November 2018 along with quarterly performance measures where available.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. Work continues with re-establishing performance reporting following implementation of Mosaic. The performance report attached demonstrates further progress made in this regard and the few areas which remain a challenge. The areas in which we are currently unable to report performance remain as last month which are highlighted within the report and summarised below:

- 1: Common and Shared Assessments – this indicator is not currently captured within Mosaic and has a revised approach for which new performance measurement processes have been established. This will complete in January 2019.
- 6: Number of family groups subject to child protection plans – this is not currently captured within Mosaic, but is due to be incorporated early in 2019 with the introduction of group working upgrades within the system. At this point, reports will be developed to enable reporting through Mosaic.
- 8: Quorate attendance at child protection conferences – again, this is not able to be reported through Mosaic. Records maintained separately within the service enable this information to be provided for scrutiny, but this is not ideal.

- 2.2. Performance indicators where the service is currently under-performing are:

- No. 2: The percentage of assessments authorised within the statutory 45 days. We have maintained a consistent rate at or above 80% for the last four months, which is also consistent with the London and national average. However, this is below our Merton target of 93%. There is a systems issue that has been identified in capturing the timeliness of assessments. This will be addressed in January 2019.
- No.9: percentage of reviews completed within timescales for children with a child protection plan. We are reporting 90% which is below the national average of 92% and below the London average and the Merton target of 96%.
- No.11. The percentage of children that became subject to a child protection plan for the second or subsequent time is consistent with the national average but higher than the London average and has increased slightly over the past two months.

2.3. Performance indicators requiring watchful oversight:

- Nos.4 and 5: We have an increase in the number (and rate per 10,000) of children with a child protection plan. The context for this change is two large families entering the system on October 2018 and we would expect this number / rate to revert to a lower level in due course.

2.4. There are a range of performance indicators where we are currently performing particularly well, but of significant note are:

- No. 19. Stability of placements of looked after children- 3 or more moves in 12 months. We are reporting that only 2% of our children experience this level of disruption. This is significantly lower than national and London averages
- No.39. the percentage of agency social workers. At 17% we are demonstrating a consistent level of stability in our social work teams. This indicator is performing much better than the national and London average.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

3.1. No specific implications for this report

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1. No specific implications for this report

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. No specific implications for this report

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. No specific implications for this report

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. No specific implications for this report

- 8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**
- 8.1. No specific implications for this report
- 9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**
- 9.1. No specific implications for this report
- 10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**
- 10.1. No specific implications for this report
- 11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT**
- Appendix 1: Performance report
- 12 BACKGROUND PAPERS**
- 12.1. None

This page is intentionally left blank