



*Making Social Care  
Better for People*

# inspection report

## ADOPTION SERVICE

### **Wiltshire County Council Adoption Service**

**County Hall  
Bythesea Road  
Trowbridge  
Wilts  
BA14 8LE**

*Lead Inspector*  
**Sean White**

*Announced Inspection*  
**23rd January 2007      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

Reader Information	
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>	Wiltshire County Council Adoption Service
<b>Address</b>	County Hall Bythesea Road Trowbridge Wilts BA14 8LE
<b>Telephone number</b>	01225 713000
<b>Fax number</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Provider Web address</b>	
<b>Name of registered provider(s)/company (if applicable)</b>	Wiltshire County Council
<b>Name of Nominated manager (if applicable)</b>	Shannon Clarke
<b>Type of registration</b>	Local Auth Adoption Service

# **SERVICE INFORMATION**

## **Conditions of registration:**

**Date of last inspection** 22 March 2004

## **Brief Description of the Service:**

Wiltshire Council's adoption service is managed from three locations in the county – Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury, supported by a central management from County Hall. The teams are organised as Fostering and Adoption Teams, with most workers having caseload responsibility in both areas.

The agency operates all statutory adoption work including:

Recruitment, preparation, assessment and approval of prospective adopters; both domestic and inter-country.

Family finding for children whose plan is for adoption.

Matching children with families.

Placement of children with families.

A range of adoption support services, coordinated by two discrete workers.

# SUMMARY

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

The agency prepared well for this inspection. All required documentation was provided in a timely way and a complex programme was arranged well in advance. Everyone involved throughout the duration of the visit offered every assistance and courtesy and this enabled the inspection to be conducted efficiently and with the cooperation of all.

During the course of the visit the following were carried out:

- Analysis of pre-inspection material.
- Interviews with key managers and staff.
- Interview with agency decision maker.
- Interview with independent adoption panel chairperson.
- Interview with an elected member of the Council.
- Reading of case files.
- Reading of policies and procedures.
- Discussions with 4 service users.
- Inspection of administrative systems, security and premises.
- Analysis of survey questionnaires:
  - Adopters/prospective adopters – 10.
  - Placing Authorities – 1.
  - Placing social workers – 4.
  - Advisers – 2.
  - Birth parents – 1.

## What the service does well:

The agency has a conscientious attitude and outlook to adoption and is child centred in its practice and methods. It is generally well managed and provides a thorough and rigorous approach to the recruitment and assessment of adopters through well-packaged preparation groups and detailed assessment reports. Most survey respondents were happy or very happy with their experiences; "We are very fortunate to have had such a wonderful experience," said one.

Managers and workers are very knowledgeable and experienced and undertake their work with confidence and understanding. There were many reports from adopters that were effusively positive about individual workers qualities – for instance, "It has been a pleasure to meet [our social worker]", and "Thorough, thoughtful and sensitive".

There is a careful approach to matching children with families and the family placement team works well in partnership with children's social workers; exchange of necessary information is well managed and coordinated.

The adoption panel, which is well managed and organised, adds quality to the adoption process by undertaking its responsibilities with due rigour and attention to detail; recommendations are made in a sound and thoughtful manner and decision making is timely and well considered.

The adoption support services are developing well and there was evidence of good, innovative practice; complex support packages are well managed (and based on assessments of need), as are contact arrangements (letterbox). There are effective partnership arrangements with other agencies and specialist advice is available from a range of sources.

There are satisfactory arrangements in place to involve birth parents in the planning processes, and their views are seriously sought and considered. Arrangements for independent birth family support are provided by an external agency - and the relationship between partner agencies is monitored through monthly meetings.

The strategic and operational management of the agency is well coordinated with clear lines of communication and accountability. Workers are well supported in their roles and demonstrated high levels of knowledge and expertise. Realistic recruitment processes ensure the workforce is suitable to undertake the range of responsibilities associated with adoption and ensures children are safe.

Monitoring and quality control is taken seriously throughout the organisation and it was clear the department has a clear focus on children - and maintaining their welfare as paramount.

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

A follow up visit was made to the agency in Dec 2005 and many improvements were noted in respect of the findings of the initial inspection of March 2004. Further improvements have been made, and below is an indication of how the service has developed in the intervening period.

- Improved children's guide.
- Better (although not yet fully satisfactory) child protection procedures for children in adoptive placements.
- Improved advice and information during the matching process.
- Appropriately qualified and skilled managers.
- Improved recruitment of workers, including sessional staff.
- Improved annual appraisal system for all staff.
- Children's adoption files now routinely set up.
- Improved file & record security.
- Improved staff and panel members' records.

- Improved approach to recruitment strategy for adopters.
- Improved approach to competence assessment of adopters.
- Improved approach to dealing with initial enquiries.
- Preparation training is now evaluated.
- Adopters better informed about process.
- Clearer recording.
- Improved support systems.

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

There was nothing serious found during this inspection to which the agency must give immediate attention. There were certain issues noted, however, that the agency should attend to in order for the service to develop to a higher standard.

Assessment reports (Forms F) could be more consistent, particularly in respect of the amount of narrative provided by applicants. Children's permanence reports were not of a consistently high quality across the board.

Preparation groups – although in the main good - would have greater depth and dimension if adopted people and birth families were involved.

The agency is not meeting targets for the numbers of children being adopted or for the numbers of adopters being recruited; this needs to improve to ensure that there are sufficient adopters available to aid matching needs.

There were several instances of long timescales in processing applications to be adopters.

The adoption panel does not have an annual planned joint training event with adoption workers.

The child protection policy, while much improved, still does not include procedures to follow if the child is placed in the area of another local authority. CRB checks on staff should be renewed every three years; although the agency said that there is a system in place to ensure this occurs, evidence was found of CRBs having lapsed.

The adoption support services, although developing well in many areas, are stretched and consideration needs to be given to ongoing capacity issues in this area of service growth.

Arrangements with the CAMHS service are not consistent across the county; this needs attention to provide for equal access for all adoptive families.

Life story work, whilst good in some cases, is not given the attention required across the board. A more consistent and concerted approach is needed in this area.

Case file management, whilst very good in many cases, is not consistent in all areas; auditing is regular in some cases but non-existent in others. Administration support is stretched across the whole service. IT training is required to equip social workers with the requisite skills – this would alleviate some of the current responsibilities of the business support workers. Outsourced archiving of adoption files should be subject to closer monitoring.

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. The summary of this inspection report can be made available in other formats on request.

# **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)
- The agency safeguards and promotes the welfare of its service users (NMS 32)

**The Commission considers Standards 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 24 and 32 the key standards to be inspected.**

## **JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):**

2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 32.

Quality in this outcome area is good.

The agency has a positive approach to recruiting, preparing and assessing adopters and a careful approach to matching children with them; this provides for safe placements and optimistic outcomes.

This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

## **EVIDENCE:**

The agency's approach to recruiting adopters is based on a written strategy that acknowledges the need for homes to be found for children with diverse and unique circumstances. A range of recruitment initiatives is used with the emphasis on finding families for those children who are 'traditionally' difficult to

place. Adopters who are able to provide homes for the most challenging of children are prioritised.

Prospective adopters undertake a thorough and appropriately structured preparation course that enables them to understand the process and the reasons for adoption. Information received from adopters was positive about their preparation experiences and comments made suggested that it had been presented in an honest and balanced way; "Preparation sessions very useful and well planned", being a typical comment. A serious evaluation of the preparation groups had been undertaken, the written results of which demonstrated the agency's positive approach to inclusion and 'listening'. It was clear that the results of the evaluation would inform continued practice improvements. The preparation groups are held in various locations in the county to provide for convenience and accessibility. Some survey suggestions were made that indicated the inclusion of adopted people and/or birth family members would add a positive dimension to preparation.

The assessments of applicants were thorough and based on the 'competencies' model. It was evident from the information received from adopters that they felt that great care had been taken to assess their suitability and that workers had been rigorous in the way that they had approached this task; 'Excellent assessment process with confident, considerate personnel' said one respondent. Assessment reports (Forms F) were, overall, of a good or very good standard and demonstrated the thoroughness of approach of the service. The agency should, however, take care to ensure that, when applicants provide significant amounts of their own narrative in assessment reports, the assessing social worker provides a full and clear analysis of this.

There is a sound approach to matching children with the most appropriate families. The agency has had very few disruptions in recent times demonstrating that care is clearly taken in this area. The development of the 'Homefinder' newsletter, which gives details of children with more complex backgrounds, is a fairly new – and worthwhile – addition to the agency's matching strategy. Care is taken to ensure that all up to date information is available to families where a matching being considered. Children's Permanence reports were, however, inconsistent in the way in which they presented information. The agency should endeavour to ensure that all social workers writing CPRs have the training and skills to produce reports of the highest quality, be this through training or mentoring. Staffing issues in children's teams are also having an effect on the preparation of CPRs in that turnover and lack of experience is impacting negatively on the adoption process.

The adoption panel is well administered and arrangements well coordinated. It is appropriately constituted and has a balanced membership; annual appraisals take place, the results of which are clearly recorded. Recruitment and induction to the panel is well managed overall although some benefit would be gained if

new members were able to observe all the types of business it undertakes (at times there may only be, for instance, approval of adopters before it).

The management of the panel was of a good standard with due rigour being brought to bear in its deliberations. The chairperson is very experienced and brings good direction and leadership – ably assisted by an effective adoption advisor and legal adviser. Its recommendations are made on a sound footing, with clear reasons being given; the minutes are presented in a way that captures the proceedings very well. Applicants are made welcome and spoken to with sensitivity and respect.

The decision maker receives all the panel papers at the same time as members and undertakes his responsibility with the care and diligence it requires; decisions are made and people informed in a timely way.

Although the panel has had training events in recent times, and takes opportunities to develop its knowledge whenever time permits, there was no annual joint training event planned with agency workers.

The manager and team managers of the agency are very experienced and knowledgeable workers who have the requisite qualifications and backgrounds to enable them to undertake their responsibilities. The teams have a balanced membership of new and experienced workers, all of which are appropriately qualified. Recruitment and selection procedures were, in the main, robust with all required procedures being followed; all had CRB disclosures. There was an issue noted in respect of the systems in place to ensure that CRBs were repeated every three years; although the agency claimed to have such a system, it evidently was not working because evidence was found of a CRB lapsing and no efforts made to rectify this.

Other issues that the agency should be aware of include:

The Health and Safety checklist on adopters' premises should include reference to the pull cords on blinds – particularly those close to beds and cots.

The child protection policy, whilst improved and includes direct reference to children placed for adoption, does not include children placed for adoption with another agency.

The agency is not meeting targets for the number of adopters being approved – which has a 'knock-on' effect on the range of families available for matching. The agency is not meeting targets for placing children for adoption.

# 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)
- Services are tailored to meet the needs of people affected by adoption (NMS 33)

## **The Commission considers Standards 6 and 33 the key standards to be inspected.**

### **JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):**

6, 18, 33

Quality in this outcome area is good.

The agency has a developing support service that has many dynamic aspects; this enables adoptive families to feel confident about the success of placements – but capacity issues may impact negatively given current resources.

This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

### **EVIDENCE:**

The arrangements for providing families with the necessary support to enable them to develop stable and permanent homes for children were positive and well managed. The family placement team workers provide the main support framework – in partnership with the child's social worker – once a placement has been made and the evidence suggests that this is seen as child-centred and proactive. There is a policy in place that provides guidance on the frequency of contact and survey results found that, overall, people were happy with the support available; "Very satisfied with adoption support, both pre and post adoption", being a typical response.

There are two adoption support coordinators employed to manage the whole range of support provision across the county; they are involved in preparation training, pre and post adoption support packages, coordinating arrangements

with partnership agencies and working across agency boundaries. They are also responsible for Special Guardianship assessments. The quality of the work being undertaken was of a very good standard and evidence was found of well-coordinated support packages in complex cases. Colleagues in children's services spoke highly of the input provided by the adoption support team and service users were pleased with and impressed by the support available.

Case recording was of a very good standard and clearly outlined the assessment of need and support provided. The complexities of some packages of support were impressively managed and it is clear that the adoption support service is dynamic and conscientious.

The agency needs to be mindful, however, of the capacity implications of having only two workers to cover the whole county in an area of growth. Although there are service level agreements with Adoption Support Agencies (ASAs) – and 'spot-purchasing' with another, the range of services needed could overwhelm that which is currently available.

Of the ASAs mentioned above, one provides a 'buddying scheme' throughout the county and another has facilities for more therapeutic input. Plans are in hand to develop adopters' support groups in partnership with one of these agencies.

Other initiatives that have had positive results include an attachment group that ran last year and the 'Piece of Cake' training, a modular programme that promotes understanding and expertise in dealing with issues of attachment and the ongoing effects of early trauma– which was well attended.

The agency enjoys good legal and medical advice and has links with other specialists to enable support to be provided where necessary. However, the arrangements with the CAMHS service are inconsistent and this needs to be drawn together to provide for equal access across the county.

# **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)
- Service users receive good quality services based on their needs (NMS 34)

## **The Commission considers Standards 7, 8, 9 and 34 the key standards to be inspected.**

### **JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):**

7, 8, 9, 34.

Quality in this outcome area is adequate.

Although support to and inclusion of birth parents is good in many areas, the inconsistent approach to developing life story work means that children's histories may be less comprehensive than they should be.

This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

### **EVIDENCE:**

The agency has a service level agreement with an ASA to provide independent support to birth families and the adoption support coordinators meet with representatives once a month. There have been some problems ensuring that birth parents are aware of the support services that are available and it was suggested to the agency that more inventive ways of raising awareness could be used – the availability of leaflets and information in appropriate locations, for instance.

The Independent Reviewing Officers have developed ways of including birth parents in the planning process for children and CPRs showed that every effort is made by social workers to elicit the views of birth parents when adoption is the plan.

Arrangements for contact are well managed and recorded and the 'post-box' system was managed and coordinated to a very high standard.

Although there was some strong evidence found of good life story work being undertaken in a timely way, overall the arrangements for this aspect of the adoption process was not found to be the agency's strong point. Although it is accepted that there are competing priorities in children's teams, it is important that all workers are aware of the need to develop life story work as an integral aspect of planning for children's permanence.

# 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)

**The Commission considers Standards 1, 3, 16, 21, 25 and 27 the key standards to be inspected.**

## **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 good.

The overall management of the service enables the process of adoption to be conducted effectively in most areas; this ensures that workers are able to provide a suitable service.

This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

## **EVIDENCE:**

The agency, overall, is well managed with a sound infrastructure and policy and procedure framework. The statement of purpose is a well-presented document that clearly sets out the aims and objectives of the service and its operational practices. There are two children's guides; one for older children which is an adapted version of the BAAF guide and one for younger children adopted by the consortium - originally developed by another agency. It would be beneficial if a more discrete older children's version were to be developed.

There is an inclusive approach demonstrated by the agency that applicants said was non-judgemental and welcoming. The information provided to prospective applicants is well presented and gives a comprehensive overview of adoption and its processes. There was, however, some evidence of long timescales being experienced in the management of the preparation and assessment process, which frustrated many applicants. This may be due, in some part, to the tensions of balancing the fostering and adoption priorities and responsibilities in the family placement team. Although the workers felt that workloads were manageable – with realistic and fair allocation and workload management – there has clearly been some capacity issues leading to delays in the process.

Nevertheless, the service demonstrated that it is effectively managed by people who are experienced, knowledgeable and skilled in adoption matters - and that they provide support and leadership to the workforce. The lines of communication and accountability are clearly defined and everyone is clear about their roles and responsibilities. Staff felt well supported and supervision was provided regularly. Training opportunities are well resourced and workers felt that they were well supported and encouraged in their personal and professional development. Senior managers keep themselves informed and up to date with the service and communication across children's services is well coordinated. There are quality control/management systems in place and the executive is kept informed of the agency's work through an annual report and six-monthly update. A recently formed corporate parenting group – which has yet to fully establish itself – should add a further dimension to overview monitoring.

There were some inconsistencies found in quality management, however, that the agency needs to address. Case files – which should be subject to an auditing system – were not monitored with the same rigour in all cases, and some did not have evidence of supervision decisions recorded. Nevertheless, case records overall – in respect of adopters' files – were generally very good; but children's adoption files were less well managed and need to be improved.

The results of adopters' survey questionnaires was, overall, positive and included statements such as, "Efficient throughout", "...fully proactive throughout the process" and "...professionally managed". There were some detractors, however who commented, "It would be beneficial for a realistic time limit on responses to initial interest" and "We cannot stress enough how dissatisfied we were with the length of time it took from our initial enquiry to becoming approved". The agency should aim for consistency, particularly in respect of managing timescales.

Other respondents to the survey – placing social workers and agencies - were generally positive and said; "I have been impressed with the service to date" and "Very experienced and thorough service".

Administrative systems were of a good standard but there were capacity issues noted. At the time of the inspection administrators were still providing a typing service for many social workers – a time consuming activity, particularly in respect of Forms F. Business support would be more efficient if training were to be provided for social workers to use IT appropriately and write their own reports. Similarly many workers did not use the IT system in place with confidence - and the adoption service is not linked to the corporate network (Care 1<sup>st</sup>). Record and file storage was appropriately managed – and secure – although a risk assessment against fire and water damage would be beneficial. A private company maintains archived files; it was not possible to ascertain the suitability of this arrangement because no contract compliance documentation was made available. No one in the agency had seen the archive facility.

Personnel files were generally well maintained and included most required information. There were some exceptions to this, however, that the agency should endeavour to make good. Panel members' records were very good.

Premises were generally good in terms of accommodation, security and resources.

# 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

BEING HEALTHY	
Standard No	Score
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION	
Standard No	Score
7	3
8	3
9	2
34	3

STAYING SAFE	
Standard No	Score
2	2
4	3
5	3
10	3
11	3
12	3
13	3
15	3
19	3
24	N/A
32	3

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELLBEING	
Standard No	Score
No NMS are mapped to this outcome	

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING	
Standard No	Score
6	3
18	3
33	3

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

Are there any outstanding requirements from the last inspection? NO

## 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	AD32	9(1)(a) as amended & 9(2)(a) LAA regs 2003	The child protection (safeguarding) procedures must include reference to children receiving adoption support services and those children placed for adoption in the area of another local authority.	01/07/07

## 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	AD4	The agency should consider including adopted people and birth families in its preparation groups.
2	AD2	The agency should endeavour to recruit more adopters to enable more matching possibilities.
3	AD6	The agency should ensure that the adoption support services have sufficient capacity and resources to cope with growth in this area.
4	AD8	Life story work should be given greater priority.
5	AD11	Arrangements should be made for the adoption panel to

		have an annual training event with staff from the agency.
6	AD19	The arrangements for CRB checks to be updated every three years should be improved and monitored.
7	AD20	The effective management of the 'tensions' between fostering and adoption work (allocation and workload management) should be kept under constant review.
8	AD25	Children's adoption files should be maintained in a more consistent manner.
9	AD25	Supervision decisions should be routinely and clearly recorded on all case files.
10	AD27	File auditing should be more consistently managed.

## **Commission for Social Care Inspection**

North West Regional Office

11th Floor

West Point

501 Chester Road

Old Trafford

M16 9HU

National Enquiry Line:

Telephone: 0845 015 0120 or 0191 233 3323

Textphone: 0845 015 2255 or 0191 233 3588

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