



*Making Social Care  
Better for People*

# inspection report

## ADOPTION SERVICE

### **Haringey Council Adoption Service**

**40 Cumberland Road (4th Floor)  
Wood Green  
London  
N22 7SG**

*Lead Inspector*  
Sean White

*Announced Inspection*  
31st October 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

**Name of service** Haringey Council Adoption Service

**Address** 40 Cumberland Road (4th Floor)  
Wood Green  
London  
N22 7SG

**Telephone number** 0208 489 3635

**Fax number** 0208 489 5917

**Email address**

**Provider Web address**

**Name of registered provider(s)/company (if applicable)** London Borough of Haringey

**Name of registered manager (if applicable)** Rachel Oakley

**Type of registration** Local Auth Adoption Service

**No. of places registered (if applicable)** 0

**Category(ies) of registration, with number of places**

# SERVICE INFORMATION

## Conditions of registration:

**Date of last inspection** N/A, this was the first inspection of the agency.

## Brief Description of the Service:

The services provided by Haringey Council are those of an Adoption Agency constituted under current legislation; they are managed with the Children and Families Branch of the Children's Service. The operations are managed from premises close to the centre of Wood Green and which are well served by public transport; these premises are accessible to the general public and have facilities for people with a disability.

The agency makes provision for the recruitment, preparation, assessment and approval of people wishing to adopt children from this country, and for placing children with them. There are arrangements in place with a Voluntary Adoption Agency to assess those who wish to adopt a child from overseas.

Support services for adoptive families – both parents and children – and adults who have been adopted, are provided, or arranged, by the agency. There are also support facilities provided, or arranged, for birth families.

# SUMMARY

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

The inspection was conducted over three days by two inspectors with an extra half day arranged to observe the adoption panel and interview the chairperson. The preparation for the inspection by the agency was of a very good standard and included a very efficient approach to providing pre-inspection material and a thorough self-assessment. The facilities made available to the inspection team were comfortable and everyone involved was welcoming, courteous and helpful; this enabled the inspection to be carried out efficiently and with the minimum of disruption.

During the course of the fieldwork interviews were conducted with key staff and managers, and an elected member of the council. Visits were undertaken to four adoptive families and their views are incorporated into the body of the report. Questionnaires were sent to all adopters approved in the last twelve months, all prospective adopters currently being assessed, birth parents, placing social workers, placing authorities and professional advisers. Some of the comments made in these questionnaires are quoted in the report.

All relevant policies and procedures were inspected, as were records in respect of service users, staff and panel members. A selection of papers submitted to the adoption panel in recent times was also inspected.

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

The agency's approach to recruiting suitable adopters to meet the needs of children requiring placement was strategically innovative and operationally well managed – particularly in respect of ethnicity and diversity. The adoption team was very skilled and knowledgeable and their work was undertaken to a demonstrably high standard; the assessment reports were well written and constructed, and provided appropriate information from which the adoption panel could make its recommendations. The thoroughness of the assessments was commented on by people who had used the service, one person commenting, "The assessment process was great, very thorough". The qualities and abilities of the workers were also welcomed by adopters who said, for instance, "The social worker was excellent; I'd give her 10/10". There were also positive comments made about the responsiveness of the agency about initial enquiries, such as, "Phenomenal response", and "Very quick, their response made up my mind to apply to Haringey". Other (placing) agencies also made positive comments about the service, "...very helpful, very efficient" being a typical comment.

Matching children with suitable adopters was undertaken with great care and attention to the needs of children. As outlined above, the agency's attention to the ethnic and racial aspects of successful adoption enabled clarity of purpose in meeting these needs in particular.

The knowledge and understanding of adoption throughout the management structure ensured that the workers operated in an informed environment that provided regular supervision, support and encouragement. The opportunities for training, which were particularly impressive, added to the development of workers' skills and, therefore, the operational performance of the service overall. The organisation of allocation and monitoring of workload was equitable and workers said that they felt able to undertake their responsibilities in a way that they felt was fair and equal.

Adoptive placements were well supported – usually by the worker who had assessed them – through regular contact, and people were very appreciative of this, saying in one instance, "I'm always confident that she's there for us". Post adoption support is developing well within a dedicated team and there was a clear sense of optimism that things were moving forward at an appropriate pace.

The general organisation of the systems and administration of the service were generally well managed with a clear infrastructure of policies and procedures that underpinned the structure and practices of the agency. The statement of purpose is the solid foundation of the agency's operations and aims, and provides clarity and guidance of the work of the service.

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

This was the first inspection of the adoption service.

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

To ensure that the positive approach to matching (outlined above) to be given added value the agency should develop a more coherent working arrangement between district teams, the adoption team and foster carers. This would enable the provision and gathering of information – for adopters, the panel and children – to be better organised. Matching reports should be cooperative efforts between district social workers and adoption workers, foster carers should be encouraged to provide full and up to date information on children and life-story work should be a central aspect of the work undertaken with a child whose plan is for adoption. The agency also needs to develop systems and training to improve the quality of Forms E.

Work with birth parents/families needs to be recorded better. There was little information available about their involvement in planning for their children and no records of them being given the opportunity to comment on what has been written about them.

The adoption panel must ensure that, when making its recommendations, it is in receipt of all available information; making recommendations “subject to CRB disclosure” should be discouraged. Better arrangements should be made to ensure that all relevant papers are collected and distributed to panel members in sufficient time for them to read and digest the contents; reports arriving the day before a panel should be discouraged. The records maintained in respect of panel members should be up to date and include all required information.

Arrangements for the quality monitoring of case records should be improved. Despite there being a recording policy and procedure, and a potentially good file audit system, there were still some recording/filing issues that required better management.

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)
- Adoptors 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.

Overall the agency makes provision for the safety and effective matching of children with suitable families, which enables optimistic, lasting adoptions to be realised. There are some issues, however, that have the potential to compromise success that need to be addressed.

## EVIDENCE:

There was a very conscientious approach to making sure that the arrangements for the matching and placing of children with families were as well considered as possible. The agency had a commendable approach to ethnicity and diversity that was evident in the efforts made to place children in the most appropriate settings; this was underpinned and informed by a clear written strategy. A focused targeting of different ethnic groups to raise awareness of adoption issues, and the importance of finding placements for children from very different backgrounds and heritages, was an important aspect of the agency's direction. A worker dedicated to the task of communications and recruitment was a valuable resource to this end. One comment, made by an adopter, supports this view when, "Diversity and difference was addressed really well", was said in respect of preparation groups. Recruitment information was welcoming ("Very welcoming", said one adopter) and informative and made clear who could adopt and what kind of

children required placements; one person commented that the information pack was a little limited in detail but added that the initial visit made to their home more than compensated for this.

The operational arrangements for the planning, introduction and placement of children with families, whilst generally good, were, in some instances, inconsistent. Although all families were informed about effective matching, and some comments stated satisfaction with the placement process, there was evidence found of arrangements going awry and of incomplete information being provided to adoptive families. There appeared to be, in at least two instances, poor communication with foster carers leading to introductions being ill managed and stressful. Foster carers do not routinely provide written information about a child being matched, which also added to concerns about the process overall in some cases. Some good reports from foster carers, however, were seen; greater consistency would alleviate some of the difficulties experienced. Similarly, the assessment reports on children (Forms E) were also not as consistently prepared as they should be; it was clear that, in some instances, the reports were not written with a thorough awareness of their purpose – both as a contemporary document and as a future record of a child's antecedents. Workers also stated that they did not have sufficient time in their workloads to allocate as much effort as they feel is necessary to prepare a good Form E. Attention, therefore, needs to be paid to the preparation of Forms E, including resources and training. Matching reports are written exclusively by the adoption social workers; it is felt that the needs of children would be best understood by their social workers, who should, therefore, make an equal contribution to the compilation of these reports.

The preparation and assessment of potential adopters was of a very thorough standard. The preparation material was thorough and included all relevant information; the groups, it was reported, were well run by people who were able to engage with applicants and impart information in an appropriate way. The groups included experienced adopters and adopted people. "I enjoyed the preparation groups and learned quite a lot", and, "I was impressed" were two comment on its operation and "When I'm in a difficult situation now I think back to the preparation and it puts things in context", demonstrates the lasting impression it had.

Assessment reports (Forms F) were well written, thorough and gave the panel appropriate information from which it could make confident recommendations. The information contained in the reports was comprehensive and the analysis of applicants' parenting capacity, whilst not as full as the management would wish, was sufficiently insightful; "The Form F was pretty spot on", said one adopter, which suggests service user satisfaction. Other comments were, "She was very thorough but it didn't feel intrusive" and "It felt like we were working together to achieve the best results for the children" and "She was tenacious in a sense but the quality she had was that she did it in a sensitive manner".

The qualities of the adoption team were evident across the range of the agencies responsibilities. A well-qualified and experienced group of managers and workers undertook their duties with demonstrable skill and understanding. Less experienced workers were inducted into the team with sensitivity and enabled to develop their abilities in a supportive environment. It became very clear that those who had received a service from the agency were very complementary, not just about the process as described above, but about the workers themselves; " I couldn't have hoped for a better social worker", and "Absolutely amazing social worker" being typical of many comments received.

The operations of the adoption panel were thorough, undertaken with sensitivity and clearly aimed at the best outcomes for children and clear procedures govern its operation and functions. The chairperson, a very experienced person, managed the panel well and enabled a clearly committed membership to undertake their responsibilities in a full and inclusive way. The chair must be mindful, however, of the role of the legal adviser; she is not a member of the adoption panel and should not be encouraged to act as if she were. One matter that the agency should take action to correct is the practice of making recommendations 'subject to satisfactory CRB'; recommendations should only be made in receipt of all information. It was also noted that there had been no joint training with the adoption team in the previous year.

Attending applicants were treated with respect and encouraged to speak openly about any issues raised about their assessment. Applicants have only been attending the panel for a relatively short time (about ten months prior to the inspection) and some comments received from people who had attended were somewhat critical. Although it is accepted that some of these comments would have been in respect of the panel's early experiences of applicants attending (and the agency has canvassed all applicants for their views) issues such as "I felt I had to defend myself" and "We thought we were being asked questions for asking sake" should be noted. There were also critical comments made about the venue – which is conducted in a rather austere committee room, with poor/limited waiting facilities.

The organisational aspects of the panel, whilst effective most of the time, were let down on occasions by poor arrangements for the distribution of papers – some only arriving the day before the panel met – and minutes being produced too late for them to be read at the next meeting; the minutes, nevertheless, were of a good standard. The overall administration, however, was well organised by the panel administrator and decision-making was robust and timely, and made with full information being available.

The only man on the panel had recently resigned his tenure; there appears to have been consistent difficulties appointing men and although it was clear that the agency were making sustained efforts to recruit more men it is reminded that this is a requirement until 30<sup>th</sup> December 2005.

# 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, 8.

The provision of support for adoptive placements and post-order adoptions was arranged and managed in a way that enabled and promoted optimistic and permanent futures for children.

## EVIDENCE:

The provision of support services for adoptive placements were well organised and managed; clear evidence of adoption support plans were in place in every case examined. The assessing social workers continued their involvement with families throughout matching, introductions and placement until the adoption order was made. This enabled adopters to feel that there was continuity in the support available and to know where to seek assistance and advice should they need it. It was clear that support was arranged on a needs basis and that adopters found the active approach to be organised in a way that was suitable for their circumstances; "They put in place quite an impressive action plan which included all professionals and the therapist" was one response that indicated satisfaction with the efforts of the agency. Another source indicated that the agency "...had done a fantastic job", when describing a well-managed handover plan and the continued, well-coordinated support thereafter.

The agency had an adoption support team, with a dedicated manager, which was actively involved in preparing specific plans to enable adoptive families to be helped to overcome any difficulties being experienced. Arrangements with the consortium to provide a more coordinated approach to support services were well underway, and further training for adopters was available through an arrangement with specialist providers.

The arrangements for legal and medical advice were appropriately outlined in procedures. The legal adviser was said to provide both the panel and the agency with satisfactory advice and was very accessible to the service as a

whole. Similarly, the medical adviser operates within the defined procedures and provides specialist advice that is necessary to enable adoptions to be enabled and supported.

# 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.

Although there was some good practice in the agency's approach to working with birth parents to enable them to contribute to their children's futures – and to feel supported in the process – there needs to be a more coordinated and coherent approach to ensure that they are fully integrated into the planning and support networks.

## EVIDENCE:

The agency makes substantial efforts to engage birth parents/families in the plans for their children's adoption and it was clear that the adoption team works closely with children's social workers to enable them to be involved. However, there was some inconsistency in the way that birth families' views were recorded on case files – some were not recorded, or did not indicate that views had been sought – and there was little evidence of birth parents being asked to comment on what was written about them. There was clear evidence, however, of a good approach to making arrangements for contact, be it direct or indirect. The management of the letterbox system was sound and well organised.

Independent support services for birth parents are provided through a recently agreed contract with a voluntary agency. The agreement is robust and clearly outlines the expectations of the service in respect of what should be available. Birth parents are provided with this information as soon as adoption is the plan for their child. It was acknowledged by the agency, however, that when there is opposition to such plans, information provided about support facilities may not be readily heeded and that more innovative ways of bringing this to their attention should be considered. Nevertheless, the agency makes efforts to enable birth parents to have access to support through family group

conferencing, the provision of advocacy for people with a learning disability and facilities for interpreters – a sound practice given the range of diversity in this Borough.

Although there was a clear commitment to gathering information in respect of life-story work – both in the adoption and children’s teams – the results in practice were patchy at best and poor in some circumstances. Social workers said that this work was difficult to prioritise in their caseloads and adoption workers often become involved in pursuing this vital aspect of maintaining children’s heritage. There was also some evidence of a lack of communication with foster carers leaving children placed for adoption with little information about their antecedents. The agency needs a much more coordinated approach in this area to ensure that all children placed for adoption have the background information that they need.



# 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.

The arrangements for the management of the service were, in the main, of a good standard, with some being of a very high standard. This provides for a coherent service that conducts its business and carries out its responsibilities to the advantage of service users.

## **EVIDENCE:**

In most areas the agency was managed well. The statement of purpose provides a comprehensive underpinning for the service and gives clear information about its aims and objectives and how they are to be achieved. A range of appropriately constructed, and informative, policies and procedures supports the statement. The children's guide – a universal one produced by BAAF, with local information as an addendum – whilst being adequate for some children, does not meet the expectations of the NMS, or regulations, in that it is not "...suitable for all children for whom adoption is the plan...". Although it is acknowledged that most of the children placed for adoption in the borough are too young to read or understand a written guide, it is incumbent on the agency to produce a format or system that can reach as many children as possible.

The agency's approach to enabling enquirers to be suitably informed about adoption was achieved through realistically constructed written information that was backed up by an initial visit. This was managed in a timely way, to the advantage of both the enquirer and the agency; "It was their quick response that encouraged me to apply to Haringey" and "The information leaflet was very clear and gave me sufficient detail", were two statements made by adopters.

The operational and strategic management of the service was well coordinated with effective lines of communication, and with clarity of structure and accountability. It was evident that managers at all levels in the organisation had a sound knowledge and understanding of adoption matters with a significant breadth of experience. The executive of the council were provided with regular reports on the activities of the service, including monthly management and performance data, to enable them to monitor its performance and the Children's Services Advisory Committee undertook the corporate parenting responsibility conscientiously. It was clear that, structurally, the agency has a high level of commitment to the adoption of children at all levels, including the executive. The overall approach of the council to providing a realistic and supportive infrastructure demonstrated its competence and commitment as an employer.

The management, allocation and monitoring of workloads within the adoption service was appropriately structured and realistic, enabling social workers to undertake their responsibilities effectively. Staff were suitably supported and encouraged in their endeavours through regular supervision and it was clear that they valued the skills and knowledge of their managers. The skills and knowledge that the staff, therefore, brought to their duties and responsibilities was similarly of a high standard. The quality of the assessment reports that they produced, their competence and understanding demonstrated through interview and the comments made by those who had received a service all provided evidence of a skilled, well managed and conscientious workforce. The

opportunities for training and skill development, enabled through a well-financed cooperative arrangement with the consortium, were impressive and further enhanced the operational effectiveness of the service.

There appeared to be some problems within the district (children's) teams, however, with several reports of high workloads, ad-hoc allocation and poor case hand-over. Although there has been a team set up in recent times whose main responsibility is working with permanency, there were still suggestions that demanding caseloads compromised effective working.

The management of systems was, in the main, of a satisfactory standard and the general administration of the service was well coordinated and appropriate for the service. There were sound policies and procedures governing administration and systems, including arrangements for access to records and confidentiality/data protection. The agency should, however, assess the systems in place for staff using their own IT equipment at home to ensure that written or stored material is kept confidential and, so far as is possible, incorruptible. Other issues that require attention are in respect of case files. Although, in the main, files were well ordered and contained most relevant or required information, there were some instances of inconsistent record management. Adopters' case records were generally good; the file audit tool was appropriately used but there was no evidence of action being taken to address shortfalls outlined in the audit. Children's case records were not as well kept, however, and need to be maintained in a much more ordered and consistent way.

Records in respect of staff were generally well maintained; some omissions were noted that the agency should correct but, overall, the human resources functions appeared to work well – including satisfactory systems for obtaining CRB disclosures and renewing them every three years. The records in respect of panel members, however, were not as comprehensively kept; action needs to be taken to ensure they meet all regulatory requirements.

The premises used by the agency are conveniently located close to the centre of Wood Green and provide for easy access for people with genuine business with the adoption service. They have access for people with a disability and a reception facility for people who have a hearing impairment. The working environment is reasonably comfortable and all workers have ready access to IT equipment and other resources, for instance, mobile 'phones (although workers in the children's district teams do not share this facility).

Arrangements for the protection of data and records were satisfactory, although the agency should satisfy itself that risk assessments have been carried out on all storage and archive facilities.

# 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>	2
<b>9</b>	3

<b>STAYING SAFE</b>	
<i>Standard No</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>2</b>	2
<b>4</b>	3
<b>5</b>	2
<b>10</b>	2
<b>11</b>	3
<b>12</b>	3
<b>13</b>	3
<b>15</b>	3
<b>19</b>	3
<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>	3
<b>18</b>	3

<b>MANAGEMENT</b>	
<i>Standard No</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>1</b>	2
<b>3</b>	3
<b>14</b>	3
<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>	2
<b>26</b>	3
<b>27</b>	3
<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)	All information required by regulations and schedules must be maintained for each member of the adoption panel.	01/02/06

### 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 arrange for better quality Forms E.
2	AD2	Matching reports should be written jointly by children's social workers and adoption workers.
3	AD5	The agency should ensure that all relevant and necessary information about a child is made available to adopters when a match and placement is being considered.
4	AD5	The agency should endeavour to have a more coherent strategy for cooperating with foster carers in order for them to provide all relevant and necessary information.
4	AD10	The agency should arrange at least one training event for

		the panel to be undertaken jointly with the adoption team.
5	AD10	The panel should not make recommendations subject to CRB disclosure.
6	AD10	The agency should ensure that the arrangements for the collection and distribution of panel papers are efficient.
7	AD10	The agency should make all necessary efforts to recruit a man to the adoption panel.
8	AD7	The agency should ensure that a record is kept of birth parents' contribution to the planning for their child's adoption and be given the opportunity to comment on what has been written about them.
9	AD8	Greater efforts should be made to arrange for life-story work to be undertaken.
10	AD1	A children's guide(s) should be developed that can be understood by the widest range of children possible.
11	AD25	The auditing of adopters' case records should have more clarity about what action has been taken to address shortfalls.
12	AD25	Children's case records should be maintained to a more consistent standard.
13	AD28	All people working for the purposes of the agency must have a record of them signing a confidentiality agreement.

## **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