



*Making Social Care  
Better for People*

# inspection report

## ADOPTION SERVICE

### **Southampton City Council Adoption Service**

**30A Cedar Road  
Portswood  
Southampton  
SO14 6HL**

*Lead Inspector*  
Sean White

*Announced Inspection*  
13th December 2005      09:00

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>	Southampton City Council Adoption Service
<b>Address</b>	30A Cedar Road Portswood Southampton SO14 6HL
<b>Telephone number</b>	023 8091 5700
<b>Fax number</b>	023 8039 9266
<b>Email address</b>	adoption.services@southampton.gov.uk
<b>Provider Web address</b>	
<b>Name of registered provider(s)/company (if applicable)</b>	Southampton City Council
<b>Name of registered manager (if applicable)</b>	Diane Ferry
<b>Type of registration</b>	Local Auth Adoption Service
<b>No. of places registered (if applicable)</b>	0
<b>Category(ies) of registration, with number of places</b>	

# SERVICE INFORMATION

## Conditions of registration:

**Date of last inspection** This was the first inspection of Southampton's adoption service by the CSCI.

## Brief Description of the Service:

Southampton's adoption service is an agency constituted under current legislation and is managed within the Children's Services and Learning Directorate of the Council. The service operates from premises located in a residential area of the city.

The agency provides all services associated with the adoption of children as follows:

The recruitment, preparation, assessment and approval of people wishing to adopt children either from this country or from abroad.

Matching children with suitable families.

Placing children with families where a suitable match has been found.

Supporting placements both pre and post adoption order.

Support to birth parents and birth family members.

Counselling services for adults who have been affected by adoption.

Indirect and direct contact support.

The agency also assumes case responsibility for children where adoption is the plan once a care order has been made and, thereby, arranges all matters required by legislation regarding children looked after by the local authority.

# SUMMARY

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

The inspection upon which this report is based was carried out over three days by two inspectors. The agency prepared well for the inspection and provided all requested information within agreed time-scales; this was well managed and it was clear that significant effort and commitment had been employed to ensure the inspectors were fully informed prior to the visit taking place. The arrangements made and facilities provided were also of a very good standard and everyone involved offered every assistance and courtesy.

During the course of the fieldwork interviews were held with managers – including the head of service, key staff, the adoption panel chairperson, the medical adviser and an elected member of the council. Visits were made to four adoptive families and one inspector observed the operation of the adoption panel. An inspection of personnel records was undertaken. Case files and other relevant documentation were read, including policies, procedures and management information, including reports to the executive of the council. The premises, including accommodation, resources, storage and security matters were also inspected.

Responses to questionnaires sent out prior to the fieldwork were as follows:

Birth parents/families – 3

Placing authorities - 5

Advisers – 1

Adopters - 26

Information contained in these responses will be included in the body of the report.

## **What the service does well:**

This is a service that does most things well and does many things very well. People who clearly understand adoption manage the agency in a dynamic and efficient way. The adoption manager, although concentrating on development and training issues surrounding new legislation at the time of the inspection, demonstrated a very clear understanding and knowledge of adoption matters; she also demonstrated, as did others involved in leading the service, effective management insight. A conscientious and supportive council, that showed respect and value for its staff, underpinned the operational and structural management of the agency. Workers were well supported in their operational duties by managers and felt that they were provided with the resources required to do their job to the best of their abilities in a caring environment.

Workers involved in the service were skilled, knowledgeable and well trained; the opportunities for training and development were particularly good. The

work they undertook with adopters and applicants was of a very good standard with many reports of appreciation from those interviewed or who responded to questionnaires; "she was brilliant...supportive and always available" being a typical response.

The recruitment, preparation and assessment process was well organised and efficient; information packs are clear and detailed, prioritisation systems are in place and people are welcomed without prejudice. Preparation groups were well structured and held at appropriate intervals; again, these events were found to be positive experiences, "...we learned a lot" and assessments were very thorough (and subject to strict quality control at all levels of management); the agency's practice of obtaining up to eight references and checking with applicants' previous partners showed its thoroughness of approach to ensuring children's prospective safety. The form F assessment reports were well written and enabled the panel to make recommendations in full knowledge of the applicants' backgrounds and circumstances.

Children's assessments (forms E) and matching reports were also of a good standard; this was, in part, because of the active involvement of adoption social workers in the children's cases. Matching children to and placing children with suitable adopters was well managed; information exchange was particularly good and the practice of foster carers providing written information about the children being matched benefited the whole information process.

The adoption panel was effective and was chaired by a well-experienced, independent professional. It had a realistic balance between informality and undertaking its business thoroughly; "the panel was a bit daunting but we were put at our ease and asked appropriate questions" and "we were glad we attended" being typical responses from adopters. Its administration was well managed and recommendations and decision-making were undertaken with due rigour and attention to detail.

Support for adoptive families was of a good standard with assessing social workers maintaining responsibility for cases after approval and throughout placement – and beyond if necessary. Adoption support services are developing well under new legislation.

Birth families are supported by the adoption service, with adoption support services undertaking much of this work. Families are encouraged to participate in the planning for their children and invited to provide material for life-story work. The arrangements for life-story work were particularly well organised with systems in place to ensure all children had their own book once they became adopted. Contact arrangements were organised efficiently.

The overall functioning of the agency (administration, case recording, security) was satisfactorily organised and the premises provide for a comfortable working environment.

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

Not applicable, this was the first inspection of the service by the CSCI.

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

Despite having a good track record recruiting sufficient adopters with the necessary qualities to meet children's needs, a strategic approach is yet to be fully established. The adoption recruitment plan is thin on detail and needs to be expanded to demonstrate how activity is to be established and maintained.

Although the agency has demonstrated successes in placing children with diverse ethnic backgrounds in suitable families, there is a danger that the lack of diversity in the service's staff and panel membership (both are exclusively white) could cloud awareness in this area. The agency needs to ensure that diversity and difference are addressed as permanent themes in training and development.

Most of the assessments of prospective adopters that were inspected demonstrated thoroughness in most areas; there were some issues noted, however, where there were inconsistencies in the recording of information. There were also instances of case file information being poorly recorded. Case file auditing should be improved and a separate protocol for children's adoption files put in place.

The management structure – temporary at the time of the inspection – was not as coherent as it could be; lines of accountability being somewhat over-complicated. The agency managers were aware of this and were considering a better model. This is encouraged as a priority in light of the new legislation that is now in place.

Personnel records for workers and panel members had a few omissions in respect of required information (it was noted, however, that some of this information was available or held elsewhere).

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.

The policies and practices of the agency are such that the safety and welfare of children are paramount considerations when planning for and deciding upon children's futures through adoption.

### EVIDENCE:

The agency had a successful track record of recruiting sufficient adopters with suitable qualities to meet the needs of children placed for adoption. This included successful placements of children with specific needs, older children, large sibling groups and those with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Although the strategic approach to recruiting appropriate people is in its infancy – hitherto the agency's success had been providential rather than focused – it was evident that a more resolute approach was evolving. The service's Adoption Recruitment Plan was somewhat 'thin' on strategic detail although the overall Adoption Policies and Procedures does provide a more targeted approach and indicates that prioritisation of applicants will take place in the right circumstances. The service is encouraged to continue with its plans for greater coherence in its recruitment objectives. It is important to state, nevertheless, that some adopters reported that they applied to Southampton because of the welcoming approach they experienced and the responsive attitude of the agency staff.

The preparation and training of prospective adopters provided by the service was of a good quality and covered all necessary subject areas necessary to ensure people were fully informed about adoption issues and processes. Arrangements for preparation groups are changed from time to time following reviews of attendees feedback; this demonstrates the agency's commitment to working with applicants and taking their views seriously. Comments made by adopters about preparation and training included, " Good training course, learnt a lot – even though we were parents already" and "Gave us lots of insight...well organised".

The approach to assessing applicants was, in the main, very thorough, sensitive and clearly aimed at ensuring that people were able to meet the needs of children requiring adoptive placements. Assessment reports were well presented, had a considered balance between information and analysis, and demonstrated a competent professionalism and understanding. The agency's policy of pursuing up to eight referees and contacting previous partners demonstrates a commitment to thoroughness and the practice of a 'second opinion' visit towards the end of the assessment adds value to the rigour of the process. Adopters found the assessments to be thorough yet managed in a sensitive manner and there was considerable praise for the way the process was conducted. One respondent in a questionnaire said, "Very in-depth process, she [the social worker] was very good" and another reported, "It was all very deep and aimed at finding out everything, but we never felt intimidated". There were some issues noted, however, that the agency needs to act upon to ensure consistent thoroughness in all cases. There were some instances found where applicants' employment histories were not as detailed as they ought to be, CRB information not being recorded in full, and references (in case records) made to child protection matters not being recorded as having been pursued and satisfied.

Matching children with adopters was well managed and the process taken very seriously with due consideration being given to the needs of children and how they would be met. The practice of obtaining written reports from foster carers is viewed as an important aspect of gaining full knowledge about the needs and circumstances of children: these complement the well presented form E assessments and detailed matching reports. The significant contribution made to the matching process by the medical adviser, who provides full and up to date information about both children and adopters, was impressive. The agency encourages full involvement by adopters in the matching process by providing them with all necessary information and inviting them to attend the panel when matching is being considered. The agency has a very, very low disruption rate and there had been none in the twelve months prior to the inspection. Only one instance of inconsistency was noted; this was in respect of a child being matched with adopters with little 'hands on' experience of parenting when the needs had been identified as requiring "experienced adopters with parenting skills".

The adoption panels were suitably constituted and functioned within the parameters of well-constructed policies and procedures. The same independent person – who was a very experienced and able incumbent, chaired both panels. In operation the adoption panel (that was observed during the inspection) was efficiently managed, well organised, and undertook its responsibilities and duties with thoroughness and attention to detail. There was very good advice provided by the panel adviser at crucial junctures that complemented the precision with which the chairperson conducted the proceedings; it was very evident that both these people had considerable knowledge and understanding of adoption matters. Applicants attend panel meetings when their case is being considered and they are also invited to attend for matching. Statements made by adopters about their experiences of panel were generally positive and included, “The chairperson made us feel at ease”, and “They asked us appropriate questions”.

The arrangements for organising the panels, distributing papers, making minutes and managing the processes were of a good standard; the minutes themselves being very full and accurate records of panel business. The location of the panel venue, however, is not particularly easy to find, parking is very limited and public transport not easy to access.

Decision-making was undertaken with great conscientiousness and attention to detail. It was very evident that the agency decision-maker takes this responsibility very seriously indeed and carries out this duty with the needs of children as the paramount consideration. This thoroughness at the end of the process complements the rigour of the quality control throughout. This was highlighted in one particular case that demonstrated the agency’s determination to ensure that decisions in respect of whether or not to enable siblings to be kept together are only taken after full and due consideration of their needs.

The people managing and working in the agency were of a very high calibre in respect of their understanding of the importance of adoption as a means of meeting children’s needs. The adoption manager was suitably qualified and experienced, and demonstrated an impressive knowledge of adoption matters. Social workers were committed and conscientious, and undertook their duties and responsibilities with flair and professionalism. Knowledge, experience and competence was evident in the quality of their assessments, and their level of understanding – and insight into - adoption issues was demonstrated at interview. Comments made by adopters confirmed their appreciation of the social workers efforts through statements such as, “The whole team have been great, without doubt they should be praised”, “...amazing, brilliant social worker, who we cannot commend enough” and “The adoption team perform in a superb fashion, 10/10”.

# 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

The agency's approach to supporting adoptive families was of a good standard in most areas and was clearly aimed at ensuring the viability and permanence of children's futures.

### EVIDENCE:

Discussions with adopters and feedback contained in questionnaires demonstrated a significant level of satisfaction with the support provided for adoptive placements; "...they are always there for us" and "We have received excellent support from our social workers" being typical comments. The agency's practice is to maintain the assessing social worker as the families support throughout matching and placement and thereafter until an adoption order is made; this can be extended beyond this time if it is felt appropriate to do so for reasons of consistency and continuity. Adopters are also provided with opportunities for continued training in a range of areas; one respondent found this particularly beneficial saying, "I have attended all courses run by Southampton and found them very, very useful...".

Support for specific needs was provided through access to specialist services; in general this was satisfactory but it was commented on by social workers that there can be a "bottleneck" in the availability of provision of therapeutic services following assessments of need undertaken by the multi-agency therapeutic panel.

The medical and legal advisers provide a comprehensive service to the agency, both to the adoption panel and to social workers actively involved in support work. The medical adviser's input was particularly impressive, being said to be "the gold standard" by the panel chairperson.

The agency had a comprehensive policy and procedure for the provision of adoption support services as required by recent legislation, all cases had an adoption support plan in place and the adoption support team demonstrated its commitment to fulfilling its obligations in this area.

## **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

The agency is committed to working closely with birth parents, which achieves a positive outcome for children by having their heritage and backgrounds well recorded in life-story books.

### **EVIDENCE:**

The arrangements in Southampton for the adoption agency workers to assume case responsibility for children with a plan for adoption once a care order has been granted also gives the service the duty to work with birth parents and families. This arrangement begins when a plan for adoption is made and before the service assumes case responsibility for the child. The service manager feels that this arrangement enables birth families to have a degree of support independent of the child's initial social worker, with whom they are often in conflict, and anecdotal evidence suggests that, despite a low uptake of counselling opportunities, some have appreciated the support available. Managers are aware of the potential for a lack of total independent support in this model – given that the service becomes the case holder for children – and have taken steps to appoint a worker whose responsibility this will be. The support is provided through the adoption support team who do not hold case responsibility; nevertheless, they are encouraged to continue to maintain an overview of this arrangement to ensure that birth families have a clear opportunity to receive support from a source that can be judged as totally independent.

Although it was clear that the agency makes appropriate efforts to involve birth parents in the planning for their children's futures, there was little evidence of the views of birth parents being recorded – many had not signed the form E assessment, for instance – and no recorded evidence of birth parents being invited to comment on what had been written about them. The agency manager was aware of this and had already addressed it in the current

business plan for action. This should be monitored to ensure future compliance.

The agency's approach to maintaining children's heritages through life-story work was impressive. This important, but often low-priority, aspect of adoption work was well managed through the review process with reviewing officers placing the compilation of life-story books at the centre of planning. The policy of the agency is that reviewing officers will not give permission for an adoption order to be applied for until there is evidence of life-story work; this ensures that all children have a life-story book once they are adopted. There are copies made, often onto CD ROMs to ensure a permanent record is available should the original be damaged/destroyed. Permission was given by one child to view a life-story book, which was well presented, and this was very much appreciated.

# 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.

This is a service that is well managed by competent, enthusiastic and knowledgeable managers who promote and administer adoption services with commitment, conscientiousness with the needs of children as paramount.



## **EVIDENCE:**

The adoption service was well managed in most areas by a highly motivated, knowledgeable and skilled manager. Arrangements were in place at the time of the inspection for her to be released from operational responsibilities to a developmental role in preparation for the implementation of new legislation. An acting manager was undertaking operational duties under these arrangements and was managing the service well. Senior managers provided good support to the service and were actively involved in its undertakings and development. These arrangements, however, were not altogether coherent in terms of structure and accountability – an issue the managers were well aware of – and should be reconsidered in light of the ongoing development of the service.

It was evident that Southampton Council was an employer that valued its staff and the practices noted showed that it promotes equality and fairness in its recruitment and employment practices. Staff were encouraged by the opportunities the Council provided them with such as flexible working, support, resources and access to training and development. The elected members take an active interest in the operations of the service – the lead member was particularly enthusiastic and took corporate parenting responsibilities seriously – and the executive is provided with regular up to date information regarding the agency, in addition to the twice yearly reports that are submitted.

As already indicated earlier in this report, the adoption service assumes case responsibility for children whose plan is adoption and when a care order has been made. It was evident that there were significant benefits to this system, not least of which was a more integrated approach to planning, family finding and matching. There were satisfactory arrangements in place to ensure there were no conflicts of roles or purpose and most people interviewed in the course of the inspection were of the opinion that the system worked well for children. There were, however, some detractors from the view that this was the best possible system – at both operational and senior management level – with suggestions that it created an elitist, over-specialised service that did not, thereby, sit well within the wider children's services. Nevertheless, there was no evidence found to suggest that children were disadvantaged in any way by these arrangements.

A sound statement of purpose, which is supported by a range of policies, procedures and protocols that govern its structure, operations and direction, underpins the service. The children's guide (BAAF publication, with inserts about local information) was satisfactory for older children but there was no guide for those younger or with less capacity for understanding. The agency, nevertheless, uses a range of strategies and practices to assist younger or less able children to understand the adoption process and its implications.

The organisational aspects of the agency, which are aimed at recruiting the best possible people to become adopters, were clear; adopters said that they were provided with all relevant information – the agency has a very good information pack and clear eligibility criteria – and were made very welcome. The agency has a good track record of recruiting a diverse range of people and has made successful placements with families from different ethnic backgrounds, unmarried people and same-sex couples. There was an acknowledgement, however, that diversity is not reflected in the adoption service – it is staffed by an entirely white workforce and the panel is also all white – and that this may affect its ability to be fully informed and aware of difference and its implications. Nevertheless, it was an issue that the managers and panel chair were well aware of and viewed it as a matter that required constant monitoring.

Workers were clear about their roles and responsibilities and said that they were well supported in undertaking their duties. They felt that receiving positive feedback and letters from senior managers complementing them when good work had been recognised were positive indicators of a supportive structure. Supervision was regular and of good quality and it was noted that there is a realistic induction programme for new, less experienced, members of the team. It was said that this induction programme was very supportive and didn't allow people "to be out of our depth". There were also plans to introduce a new starters support group – an initiative that had been successful in the past. The allocation and monitoring of workloads was well managed and equitable. Workers felt that they were actively involved in decision-making about allocation and it was evident that managers were keen to ensure that workers were able to fulfil their duties to the best of their abilities. The agency is well staffed (following a period in recent times when recruitment to vacant posts had been problematic, and some long-term illness) and can call upon experienced sessional workers to undertake work when shortfalls are identified.

The opportunities for training and development were of a high standard and the percentage of staff with Post Qualifying Award was high. The training opportunities were wide-ranging and gave staff the chance to develop their skills and knowledge in a variety of areas. Workers also said that they were given the time and facilities to undertake their own research and knowledge development. This aspect of the agency's work was impressive.

The management of administration, records and personnel matters was, in the main, of a good standard. Case records were comprehensive, contained most required information and were audited by senior managers on a 'rolling programme'. There were some aspects, however, that required some attention to ensure case recording was of the highest standard possible. Children's adoption case files were not subject to their own discrete protocol; it is felt that this is necessary to ensure that adoption records are maintained consistently and to a style that is appropriate for an adoption case record. There were some gaps and inconsistencies in some files that should be

addressed – and should have been noted in any audit carried out. For instance, wrong names being used in reports, no contemporaneous notes of assessment visits, inconsistent recording of supervision and linking reports for siblings not being separate for each child.

Personnel files, whilst demonstrating a reasonable consistency in many areas had gaps in respect of required information and limited information in some instances in respect of CRB disclosures and no records of GSCC registration. Managers of the adoption service made it clear that even if there were gaps in personnel records, those shortfalls could be evidenced from other sources and this was done. Panel members' records were well structured and contained most required information, although there were a few omissions that need to be corrected.

General administration was well managed and record keeping was of a good standard, with satisfactory security and safeguards being in place.

The premises used by the agency were fit for purpose and provided a comfortable working environment. It is not particularly easy to access the premises; public transport is a short walk away and car parking is at a premium with restrictions in place on all surrounding roads. It is also some distance from other children's social work premises, which, in the opinion of managers, has a negative impact on integration across the wider children's services.

# 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>	
<i>Standard No</i>	<i>Score</i>
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

<b>MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION</b>	
<i>Standard No</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>7</b>	2
<b>8</b>	4
<b>9</b>	3

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

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

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

<b>MANAGEMENT</b>	
<i>Standard No</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>1</b>	3
<b>3</b>	3
<b>14</b>	4
<b>16</b>	3
<b>17</b>	3
<b>20</b>	3
<b>21</b>	3
<b>22</b>	3
<b>23</b>	4
<b>25</b>	3
<b>26</b>	3
<b>27</b>	2
<b>28</b>	2
<b>29</b>	3
<b>30</b>	N/A
<b>31</b>	N/A

Are there any outstanding requirements from the last inspection?

N/A

### 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	AD28	11 (2003)	Workers' and panel members' personnel records should include all required information.	31/03/06

### 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	The agency should establish a more strategic approach to recruiting adopters. Its written plan should be more explicit in how it hopes to achieve its objectives.
2	AD7	A more consistent approach to recording birth parents' views should be established.
3	AD27	A protocol for children's adoption files should be established and an audit tool created to monitor them.

## **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