



*Making Social Care  
Better for People*

# inspection report

## ADOPTION SERVICE

### **Hammersmith & Fulham Adoption Service**

**145 King Street  
London  
W6 9XY**

*Lead Inspector*  
**Sean White**

*Announced Inspection*  
**8th August 2006      10:00**

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

<b>Reader Information</b>	
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	<a href="http://www.csci.org.uk">www.csci.org.uk</a>

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](http://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](http://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

<b>Name of service</b>	Hammersmith & Fulham Adoption Service
<b>Address</b>	145 King Street London W6 9XY
<b>Telephone number</b>	020 8748 3020
<b>Fax number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Provider Web address</b>	
<b>Name of registered provider(s)/company (if applicable)</b>	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
<b>Name of registered manager (if applicable)</b>	Steve Miley
<b>Type of registration</b>	Local Auth Adoption Service

# SERVICE INFORMATION

## Conditions of registration: NA

**Date of last inspection** 12 August 2003

## Brief Description of the Service:

The adoption service of Hammersmith and Fulham is managed within the recently created Children's Department and undertakes all statutory duties associated with a local authority adoption agency. There are two team managers who have equal status but each takes different responsibility 'portfolios'. The management structure is to be enhanced in the near future and will create a further tier above the team managers.

The agency undertakes the following:

- Recruitment, preparation, assessment and approval of adopters – both domestic and those wishing to adopt a child from overseas.
- Matching, introduction and placement of children with adopters.
- Adoption placement support.
- Post adoption support.
- Birth parent/family support.
- Contact arrangements, including letterbox management.

There are eight social workers in the assessment team, each undertaking a full range of responsibilities, and two in a recently created adoption support team. The service also has its own administrative staff who support the agency and the adoption panel.

The agency operates from premises in Fulham that are easily accessible by car and public transport; senior managers operate from premises in Hammersmith.

# SUMMARY

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

The managers of the agency prepared well for this inspection; this enabled the process and organisation of the visit to be efficiently executed. Everybody involved in the agency – managers, workers and service users – provided every assistance and courtesy throughout the inspection and the facilities provided were of a good standard. The inspection was carried out concurrently with a fostering service inspection and it is acknowledged that this placed a significant increased workload overall in order to accommodate this.

During the course of the inspection the following was carried out:

- Analysis of pre-inspection material and manager's self-assessment.
- Analysis of pre-inspection questionnaires received as follows:
  - Adopters/prospective adopters - 7
  - Placing social workers - 8
  - Placing authorities - 1
  - Birth parents - 1
  - Professional advisers – 1
- Case file reading
- Policies and procedures reading
- Interviews with
  - Adoption team, including administrators
  - Team managers – adoption team and looked after children team
  - Senior managers
  - Decision maker
  - Children's social workers (as a group)
  - Elected member of the council
  - Independent panel chair
- Visits to three adoptive families
- Telephone interview with one adoptive family.
- Observation of adoption panel
- Analysis of personnel and panel members' files
- Inspection of premises and security

## What the service does well:

The core business of the agency - recruiting, preparing, assessing and approving adopters - was undertaken with due skill, knowledge and commitment by a team of suitably qualified and experienced workers. This was, in most areas, appropriately supported and managed by the team leaders and divisional manager. Preparation groups were presented with appropriate material and respondents said that they were of a very good standard – "Very enlightening, changed my mind in a positive way", said one person. Assessments were thorough and this was reflected in both the quality of the

reports produced and in the comments made by adopters who were either visited, or who returned questionnaires. Typical examples of satisfied respondents' comments being, "We do understand why we are scrutinised so vigorously" and "LBHF have been excellent throughout, we were not an easy couple to match". The introduction of second opinion visits further enhances the thoroughness of the agency's processes. Decision-making was undertaken with due consideration of the information provided by a very experienced manager – and in a timely way.

The matching, introduction and placement of children with adopters was well organised and carefully considered. Adopters were provided with clear, up-to-date information and Permanency Planning Meetings enabled the process to be coherently managed.

A very experienced independent worker chairs the adoption panel; the panel was conducted well, with due rigour and attention to the needs of children being paid, and with members undertaking their roles and responsibilities seriously. Legal, medical and professional advice was of a good standard.

Adopters with children in placement felt well supported and workers were keen to ensure that introductions and placements were well coordinated with colleagues in the looked after children team.

The agency employs skilled and experienced workers who demonstrated knowledge, commitment and a conscientious approach – with best outcomes for children being the driving force behind their endeavours. It was reported that their practices were sensitive, professional and undertaken with an understanding of adoption matters: "...social worker been fantastic all the way along", being a typical comment.

There were some positive initiatives for training opportunities and it was clear that training and staff development was an active part of the agency's operations.

## **What has improved since the last inspection?**

- More regular contact with adopters following approval.
- LAC team managers attend placement planning meetings.
- Panel procedures now include all required information.
- Panel minutes produced in a more timely way.
- Nominated manager is pursuing a DMS.
- Better medical advice.
- More administrative resources.
- Access to records policy improved to include Data Protection.
- Adopters are now made aware that the preparation groups are part of the assessment process.

- More flexibility in the timings of preparation groups has been introduced to ensure a better service to all adopters.
- Managers and panel now monitor more closely whether career histories included in adopters' assessment reports include months as well as years.
- The decision maker's PA verbally notifies all people involved as soon as decision made regarding panel recommendations.
- Written protocols for panel advisers have been produced.

## **What they could do better:**

Although it is anticipated that the reorganisation of the management structure of the department will address many if not all of the difficulties being experienced, the agency needs to be mindful of its continuing responsibilities and must address the issues that are indicated below.

Despite some efforts that have been made to recruit adopters from across the whole community of Hammersmith and Fulham, these have been somewhat limited in scope. The written recruitment strategy is aspirational rather than operational and does not provide an action plan as to how to achieve better outcomes.

Although the panel operates to a good standard overall some practices need further consideration. For instance, the way questions are asked of social workers/adopters, the attendance of two administrators and the attendance of team managers in a faux advisory role.

Adoption support, despite being provided by two very experienced and able workers, is insufficiently resourced to provide the whole range of services required – particularly given that there is only limited input from an adoption support agency.

Similarly, these limited resources also compromise the agency's ability to provide support services to birth parents and manage contact arrangements.

Life story work and direct work with children is also very limited and there are few workers with the skills or capacity to undertake it.

The management of operational detail requires a more sustained input insofar as ensuring the infrastructure supports the core business. This would include, for instance, better file management and monitoring – clearer supervision recording, information placed in the right files, auditing etc.

Recruitment practices need to be improved. Personnel files showed inconsistencies in respect of CRB checks – particularly on foreign workers, and applications not fully completed. Similarly, there continues to be poor

recording of panel members' details; only one was complete – a situation that has not changed since the last inspection and follow-up visit.

Although it was reported following the last visit that an induction programme for new staff had been initiated, it was disclosed at this inspection that induction for recently appointed staff has been informal and driven by workers' determination.

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](mailto: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)
- Adopters 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

Quality in this outcome area is good. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The core business of the service was of a good standard in most areas, although improvements are necessary to ensure that children from every sector of the community have their needs met through securing suitable adopters.

## EVIDENCE:

The agency has sufficient applications and successful approvals of people who wish to adopt babies and very young children from white British backgrounds and there is always a pool of families from which appropriate matches can be made. There is an acknowledgement by the service that it has a need to attract potential adopters from more diverse backgrounds to meet the needs of children from different cultures, for sibling groups and children with particular needs. Although the service has a written strategy that outlines this need, it does not address how this might be achieved. There has been some success in recruiting adopters from the African-Caribbean community in recent times following a targeted strategy but, overall, there is a lack of coherence in the

approach. To meet the needs of children from the cosmopolitan community served by this agency requires a well-structured, organised strategy that can identify and attract suitable people across the board. The fostering service of this authority has a worker in post whose main responsibility is to develop strategies to recruit suitable families; the adoption service would be well served by a similar arrangement.

The processes for preparing, assessing and approving adopters were, nevertheless, of a good standard. It was clear that the agency has a commitment to ensuring that its services are aimed at the best possible outcomes for children in the rigorous and thorough approach it has to assessment. Preparation material is well thought through and comments received demonstrated satisfaction with how information was delivered and groups managed; "Very good information...we learned a lot, made us determined and motivated", said one respondent.

Assessment reports were found to be either good or very good and demonstrated the skills of the workers. There was clear evidence found in reports of careful and thorough analysis of applicants' potential for parenting and it was also evident that great care is taken to undertake all checks and references in a timely and efficient manner. However, although CRB disclosure results were evident in every case inspected, there was no disclosure number or status of the check recorded on files. One issue the managers may wish to look at is the different approach that each worker takes in compiling assessment reports. It was evident, within group discussions, that there was some ignorance about colleagues' styles and how they included information provided by applicants. Whilst it may not be appropriate to have a corporate 'clinical' approach to uniformity, it may be worth considering harmonising the service's approach to producing reports

The recent inclusion of second opinion visits, undertaken by managers following the completion of an assessment and before the case is presented to the adoption panel, is recognised as a positive move by the service to add further quality monitoring – giving a further dimension of thoroughness to the overall process.

The arrangements for, and management of, the matching process were of a good standard; care is taken to ensure that all relevant and up to date information was available to adopters when considerations were being made about potential placements. Adopters said that they felt adoption and children's social workers worked well together to ensure that the information required for careful matching was available and provided in a timely way. It was noted that the agency needs to further develop its working relationships with children's services; this has been addressed and when new management structures are finalised the inclusion of children's social workers in a 'permanence team' will hopefully have a positive impact.

The adoption panel is appropriately constituted, has a very experienced and competent chairperson and is governed by suitable policies, procedures and protocols. It sits at regular intervals and is able to manage the business that is brought before it. In operation it is well managed and ordered with clear boundaries and appropriate approaches to ensure thoroughness and openness. There were several reports, however, of the panel being said to be an intimidating experience for some attendees and the practice of most questions being put to presenting social workers - referring to the applicants (who are present) in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person - may exacerbate this. The agency may wish to consider how the panel experience should be more inclusive; this could be achieved with more joint training, which has not been arranged for some time.

The panel receives good medical and legal advice, and the panel adviser provides a knowledgeable service. The practice, however, of having two team leaders present at the panel to 'assist' the advisor seems somewhat extravagant and could compromise the integrity of what is understood to be its membership and what roles are ascribed.

Decision-making is prompt and efficiently managed; the decision maker was clearly aware of his responsibilities and sufficiently experienced to undertake the role. He receives reports in advance of the panel sitting and apprises himself of all the facts. Administrative arrangements were very good and efficiently managed but the practice of having two people present to take minutes was found to be an extravagant use of resources.

The agency has systems in place to monitor the performance of the service. Although there have been difficulties in recent times in respect of ensuring that an efficient and overarching quality assurance mechanism has been sufficiently robust, there are initiatives in place to improve matters. A recently appointed lead member of the council, who was clearly well-informed about service issues, demonstrated a passionate and committed approach to service improvement; and senior managers have taken the lead in respect of analysing performance shortfalls and developing strategic initiatives to overcome them. Improved financial performance has had a positive effect on the availability and deployment of resources and a soon to be introduced revised management and service structure has addressed the issues of communication and accountability. These proposed changes have also given the adoption and permanence service a more coherent operational structure.

# 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, 18

Quality in this outcome area is adequate. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The service to adopters with a child in placement was suitably resourced and managed. Support services in general, however, are poorly resourced and are not sufficient to meet the growing demand.

## EVIDENCE:

Comments received from people who had experienced the application, assessment and placement process were enthusiastic about the service they had received and said that they had felt supported throughout. One, in particular, said, "We are grateful that we have always received constant support...even more now that our child has been placed". Similar comments were received from other people who either responded to questionnaires or were visited during the inspection. There were also positive comments received about the well-managed working relationships demonstrated by children's social workers and adoption team staff, particularly in respect of matching and introductions.

Enabling approved adopters to retain their assessing social worker after approval and throughout the placement and adoption court proceedings helps confidence and continuity to be established and it was clear that the agency was committed to this principle to support and encourage successful adoptions to be achieved.

Post adoption and adoption support services generally, however, are not well provided. There are only two part-time staff employed to cover the whole remit of adoption support as defined in regulations and this is a very under-resourced aspect of the agency; a contract with a local support agency had been recently finished and this leaves the service with an overwhelming range

of services that need to be provided. Although there are arrangements in place to use the services of a different adoption support agency, these are limited and would not provide sufficient back-up for the shortfalls in provision. Given the range of issues linked to adoption support, including contact arrangements, mediation, intermediary work and the requirement to provide adoption support assessments, it is clear that current resources would be totally insufficient to meet demand – especially as this is a growing aspect of adoption services generally. Serious attention needs to be paid to this area of the agency’s responsibilities – particularly in terms of resources and strategic planning.

The formal arrangements for legal and medical advice, nevertheless, were very satisfactory with comments being made throughout the inspection about access and availability of these resources.

## **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, 9.

Quality in this outcome area is poor. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The services provided for birth parents were underdeveloped and under-resourced; this is an area of the agency's responsibilities that requires serious attention.

### **EVIDENCE:**

Services to birth parents are compromised by the lack of capacity in the agency to work effectively on supporting them, as described in the last section. Discussions are underway with an adoption support agency regarding the possibility of providing local outreach services for people affected by adoption, and this may bring much needed extra resources. However, at this point in time there is no such provision. It was said that children's social workers are the point of contact for support, information and advice prior to an adoption order being made, with responsibility being passed to the adoption team thereafter; this is not in the spirit of the national minimum standards, which expect that all support be provided by someone independent of the child's social worker.

There was only one birth parent that responded to the survey, and although this cannot, therefore, be seen as indicative of any consensus, the response was negative and critical and indicated no support had been provided or suggested.

Life-story work is another aspect of the agency's performance that requires attention. Although there was enthusiasm for, and commitment to, providing adopted children with information about their antecedents and experiences, it

does not occur with consistent application. There is little experience or expertise in the workforce as a whole to undertake this rather specialised task, and despite training being provided by BAAF, workers felt that they were ill equipped to give this necessary aspect of their work the quality of service it deserves. Some adopters said that they had received some information for their children and others said, "Just bits and pieces". The collection of material from which realistic life-story work can be progressed should begin as soon as a child's care episode begins; there is a window of opportunity before the critical conflict of care proceedings sours relationships when social workers may have much better chances of building a store of information than later on.

There was a backlog of letterbox work and it was said that many, if not all cases need reviewing.

# 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, 3, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.

Quality in this outcome area is adequate. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The structure of the department at the time of the inspection was not organised in a way to provide a suitably coherent framework for effective management across the board. Core activities, however, were well managed but there were shortfalls in operational micro-management.

## **EVIDENCE:**

As already described in the Staying Safe section of this report, the core business of the agency – recruiting adopters who were able to provide safe and secure placements for children being adopted – was generally good and managed well in this respect.

The statement of purpose describes the functions and operation of the agency and is a suitable document to underpin the integrity and direction of the service. Policies and procedures were generally satisfactory and gave meaning to the operation of the service.

The manager is a very experienced and able worker who brings knowledge and respect to the agency. Workers were well supported and encouraged in their work, supervision was provided regularly and frequently (more frequently for less experienced workers) and training was said to be easily accessible and reasonably well resourced. However, although new workers felt that they were welcomed into the team there was no coherent induction programme for them to follow.

The staff team was a very experienced group of workers who clearly understood their roles and responsibilities—and undertook them conscientiously and with commitment; children’s needs always being at the forefront of their endeavours. Positive comments were made about their skills and abilities – and about the general performance of the agency as a whole – and it was clear that adopters had had mainly good experiences throughout their association with the agency. “We can rely on the social workers” and “...social worker been fantastic all the way along”, were two typical comments received. It was also clear that their skills and expertise were also appreciated by the children’s social workers, “Excellent support through introductions” being said by one, “Communication excellent” by another.

Although the level of work in the service was quite high, there were sufficient workers in the team to carry out their responsibilities effectively - aided by a sound administrative team who provided a good business support framework. Allocation and caseload management appeared to be managed fairly and with the best interests of the service in mind – including effective use of workers’ individual skills and areas of interest.

Training opportunities were generally good and workers appreciated some positive initiatives - including the Professional Development Panel, which can provide funding for appropriate longer courses – and supportive management. There were some criticisms made of the quality of training in the new legislation and life-story work that the agency should address.

However, the management and organisational structure of the department at the time of the inspection, as outlined earlier in this report, was not meeting the demands of the services to children throughout the organisation. This had been recognised by the council and its senior managers, and steps have been put in place to reorganise the structure into a more coherent model better suited to creating an environment that is more appropriate for the effective running of the department; this change is imminent and is anticipated positively throughout all levels of the department.

Hitherto, however, the management of the agency has been problematic and many issues were found where it was evident that managers had not been able to respond to the demands of the service fully, providing a reactive rather than strategic model.

The areas that were found to be in need of attention, and that need to be addressed, include both departmental matters and micro management issues at service and operational level. It was acknowledged by the managers of the service that early intervention and planning for children needed to be more efficiently organised and they are encouraged in their endeavours to achieve this. As stated earlier in this report, the creation of a permanence team should address some of the difficulties associated with communication and interaction between adoption and children's social workers – which although good in some instances, was not consistent in every case.

Case file management was inconsistent, and although an audit system was in place, this was not administered with any degree of thoroughness and several instances of irregularities were found; for instance, significant instances of mis-filing, panel minutes missing and placement sheets not filled in. Children's adoption files did not meet the requirements of new regulations, contained inappropriate material and were inconsistent re maintaining anonymity.

Staff personnel files did not include all required information in every case and there were some concerns about the inadequate approach to obtaining CRB/Police checks for foreign workers. There was only one complete record of a panel member; all others had some degree of omission of required information.

Comments from various sources stated that the department's approach to diversity and equality was not as robust as it should be. Although there was no direct evidence found of discriminatory practice, the council should endeavour to ensure that everybody can feel confident in the overall infrastructure and how its impact on workers and service users can be recognised as inclusive. Nevertheless, there were very positive comments made about the council as an employer, its approach to support, work-life balance and general employment practices.

Support resources were satisfactory with adequate levels of administrative back-up, office space and facilities. However, although there was a clear protocol in place to protect data and confidentiality when people worked from home, not all workers were aware of this. File storage, security and archives were satisfactorily managed. The premises, which are easily accessible, were satisfactory in most respects but had poor facilities for people with disabilities.

# 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

<b>BEING HEALTHY</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

<b>MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>7</b>	1
<b>8</b>	2
<b>9</b>	1

<b>STAYING SAFE</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>2</b>	2
<b>4</b>	3
<b>5</b>	3
<b>10</b>	3
<b>11</b>	3
<b>12</b>	3
<b>13</b>	3
<b>15</b>	3
<b>19</b>	1
<b>24</b>	N/A

<b>ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELLBEING</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

<b>ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>6</b>	2
<b>18</b>	4

<b>MANAGEMENT</b>	
<b>Standard No</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	3
<b>3</b>	3
<b>14</b>	3
<b>16</b>	2
<b>17</b>	3
<b>20</b>	3
<b>21</b>	3
<b>22</b>	3
<b>23</b>	3
<b>25</b>	2
<b>26</b>	3
<b>27</b>	2
<b>28</b>	1
<b>29</b>	3
<b>30</b>	N/A
<b>31</b>	N/A

Are there any outstanding requirements from the last inspection? YES

**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.	AD19	11 (2003)	All people working for the agency, including foreign workers, must be fully checked prior to appointment.	01/12/06
3.	AD7	14 AAR 2005	The agency must improve its services to birth parents.	01/04/07
4.	AD9	14 AAR 2005	The agency must have a clear strategy for supporting birth parents.	01/04/07
5.	AD28	11 & Sch 3,4 LAAR 2003	All staff personnel files and adoption panel members' files must include all required information. This is outstanding.	01/12/06

**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	There is a basic recruitment strategy, but it is recommended that this is improved and developed. This is outstanding from previous inspections.

2.	AD6	The agency should ensure that it has the capacity to undertake the full range of adoption support services.
3.	AD8	The agency should ensure that life-story work is promoted and achieved for all children placed for adoption.
4.	AD16	The agency should ensure that the management arrangements are sufficient to meet the overall demands of the service, following the restructuring of the department.
5.	AD25	Children's adoption files should only include necessary information.
6.	AD25	Adopters' files should include only relevant and necessary information.
7.	AD27	The auditing of files should be carried out in line with procedures every three months. This is an outstanding recommendation.

## **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](mailto:enquiries@csci.gsi.gov.uk)

Web: [www.csci.org.uk](http://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