

Committee: Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny

Date: 13th February 2019

Wards: All wards

Subject: Performance Report December 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:

- A. 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

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. As such we have refreshed the figures accordingly. The areas that demonstrate change due to a recalibration include
- Assessments, where we have been under-reporting the timeliness of assessments. We reported 82% for November 2018, after a recalibration we can see that the assessments completed on time has been steadily rising, and we are now reporting 86% in time. Whilst not yet at our target it is steadily moving in the right direction.
 - 'NEET' data, we have amended accordingly. Please note we do not have a target for young people who are 'NEET' in Merton. We strive to ensure all young people have suitable education or training. As such the 'target' has been removed.
 - Nos17 and 18: We have reviewed how we collate data as the system is not reporting accurately. Additionally, there is a systems workflow issue that prevents multiple teams recording. Both issues are being addressed.

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

- No.11. The percentage of children that became subject to a child protection plan for the second or subsequent time is now above the national average and significantly above the London average and the Merton acceptable range of variation. Given the monthly increase, the head of QA is undertaking a case review to better understand the underlying issues.
- No 3: Whilst we have a target of 55% for completion of ECHP in time, we were performing at a better rate in previous months, but have dipped over December. The primary reason for this is that therapists are commissioned on term time contracts, as such there is delay in the collation of assessments to formulate the EHC plans. Our expectation is that with the introduction of the portal the issue of timeliness will be addressed and more ambitious targets can be set.

2.3. Movement from November 2018:

- Our timeliness to ICPC has improved and we are now performing at the Merton target level and above national and London averages
- Nos.4 and 5: In November we reported an increase in the number (and rate per 10,000) of children with a child protection plan. The context for this change was two large families entering the system in October 2018 and the number / rate has reverted to a lower level as anticipated.

2.4. New information supplied:

- Nos. 7,15, Caseloads. Please note for Child Protection caseloads, social workers hold both child protection and CIN. Current average caseloads per social worker for child protection is 6, with the remaining children being supported by a CIN Plan.
- No. 1 CASA data.

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

- No. 9. After a dip in performance over September to November we are reporting 98% of child protection reviews completed on time
- Nos. 19 and 20. Our stability measures continue to remain strong.
- No. 39. Our % of agency social workers continues to decrease.

2.6. One area which remains a challenge to report on is:

- No 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

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

3.5. No specific implications for this report

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.5. No specific implications for this report

5 TIMETABLE

5.5. No specific implications for this report

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.5. No specific implications for this report

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.5. No specific implications for this report

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.5. No specific implications for this report

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.5. No specific implications for this report

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

10.5. 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

12.5. None

This page is intentionally left blank