



MULTI AGENCY CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING AUDIT PACK

EARLY INTERVENTION - GRADING GUIDANCE



EARLY INTERVENTION – GRADING GUIDANCE

Area of Analysis	Outstanding = 1	Good = 2	Adequate = 3	Inadequate = 4
Early Identification	If every area of analysis on a case is consistently good or better, the case can be judged outstanding overall.	The child's needs were identified accurately, included gathering of information on previous concerns or involvements and were identified in a timely way.	The child's needs were identified, awareness of previous concerns or involvements and there was no undue delay in identifying the child's needs.	The child's needs were not fully identified or without the benefit of knowledge of previous concerns or involvements or there was delay in identifying the child's needs.
Assessment		Appropriate to undertake a Common Assessment, the time was right, checks on whether a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process was in place or known to children's social care were made and appropriate professionals involved. Assessment covers all Assessment Framework domains, details strengths and what needs to change, is child-centred and process fully involves child and parents. Clear evidence that any risks to the child were actively considered in the process. Parents (and child) gave agency specific consent to sharing information (over-ridden if necessary due to child protection concerns).	Appropriate to undertake a Common Assessment, it was undertaken within a reasonable timescale, checks on whether a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process was in place or known to children's social care were made and most relevant professionals involved. Assessment relates to Assessment Framework domains, details basic strengths and what needs to change, some indication that child and parent involved in process. Evidence that risks to the child were considered in the process. Parents (and child) gave agency specific consent to sharing information (over-ridden if necessary due to child protection concerns).	A Common Assessment may not have been needed or higher level of involvement may have been needed; or delay in undertaking a Common Assessment or appropriate checks not made accurately; or some relevant professionals not involved. Some gaps in assessment or not all domains covered; lack of clarity about what needs to change or strengths not sufficiently included, assessment not child-centred or lack of indication that child and parent involved in process. No evidence that risks to the child were considered in the process or risks were overlooked. Consent given but general, not specific; or parent or child of appropriate age not asked for consent; or child protection concerns not passed on due to parent not giving consent.
Planning and Implementing Plan		Action plan addresses needs identified in body of assessment, evidences good cross-borough working where needed, includes indicators for success, which are focused on impact on child/young person.	Action plan addresses main needs identified in body of assessment, cross-borough working in place, some success indicators included; most but not all focus on impact on child.	Gaps in how some of the identified needs will be met; cross-borough arrangements not working effectively; not all objectives include success indicators or they are not sufficiently focused on impact on child.

Continued on next page.

EARLY INTERVENTION – GRADING GUIDANCE

Area of Analysis	Outstanding = 1	Good = 2	Adequate = 3	Inadequate = 4
Planning and Implementing Plan (cont'd)		Agency being audited is fulfilling its responsibilities effectively; lead professional in place and effective; Team Around Child in place and effective; any differences resolved; appropriate services in place and good partnership with family.	Agency being audited is fulfilling its key responsibilities; lead professional in place; Team Around Child in place; any differences of view discussed; main services in place and engagement with family.	Agency being audited is not fulfilling all its key responsibilities; lead professional not clear or in place but not effective; Team Around Child not clear or in place but not effective; differences of view not resolved; some key services not in place; or inadequate partnership with family.
Review		The plan is reviewed at regular intervals and actions evaluated and amended. Partners continue to engage and parental consent to sharing information is revisited at each review. The plan as reviewed continues to have a positive impact on safeguarding the child and promoting their welfare and the issues of risk is considered at each review.	The plan is reviewed, and most actions evaluated and amended. Most partners continue to engage and parental consent to sharing information is usually revisited at each review. The plan as reviewed continues to safeguard the child and has some impact on promoting their welfare, and the child does not appear to be at risk.	The plan is not or not regularly reviewed or some key actions not evaluated and amended. Some partners have not continued to engage. Parental consent to sharing information was sought at the outset but not revisited. Opportunity to safeguard child and promote their welfare is not being grasped. Risk to the child is not regularly reassessed.
Management Oversight and Recording		The front-line worker is appropriately supported and directed. All records up-to-date and fit for purpose. Evidence of quality assurance activity on records.	The front-line worker receives some support and direction. All records mainly up-to-date and fit for purpose. Evidence of quality assurance activity on records.	The front-line worker does not receive sufficient support and direction. Gaps in records or not up-to-date or fit for purpose. Lack of evidence of quality assurance activity on records.
Overall judgement	The case can only be judged as outstanding overall if every area of analysis has been judged good or better.	The case should be judged as good if at least 75% of the features above are evident; providing the child has been effectively safeguarded and their welfare promoted throughout the work.	The case should be judged as adequate if at least 75% of the features above are evident (or better); providing the child has been safeguarded and their welfare generally promoted throughout the work. However, any significant failings will render the case inadequate.	If 25% or more of the features above are evident, or if there is a significant failure which has impacted on the safety of the child, the case should be considered inadequate.



CONTACT INFORMATION

Government Office For London
Riverwalk House
157-161 Millbank
London
SW1P 4RR

www.younglondonmatters.org

OUR PARTNERS

MAYOR OF LONDON

 department for
children, schools and families

London
development
centre

DH Department
of Health

VB

ALDCS
Association of London
Directors of Children's
Services

LONDON
COUNCILS


Healthy Schools

NHS
London

YOUR
Rights!
Your say
www.rightsline.org

capital
ambition