

Corporate Parenting Board - Performance Scorecard



This scorecard provides an overview of current performance using high level performance indicators and activity data to support a range of other intelligence, including a summary report finalised after discussion at the relevant meeting. Performance is reported year to date, with comparison to previous year (England, Statistical Neighbours) and target. This intelligence should be used to help us to understand how well we are safeguarding and improving outcomes for children and young people. *How much have we done?, how well have we done it? and have we made a difference?*

Direction of travel based on May 18 to June 18

		WALSALL PERFORMANCE							TARGET	HOW ARE WE DOING?		LATEST BENCHMARK		RESPONSIBLE GROUP MANAGER
		2015 -16	2016 -17	2017-18	2018-19				2017 -18	Direction of Travel (vs last period)	Target achieved?	England	SN	
					Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Q1 Jun 18 (ytd)						
Looked After Children - Number, Admissions, and Discharges														
LAC1	Number of Looked After Children at period end	627	645	637	638	630	638	638	620	⬆️	✖️	72,670	5,065	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC2	Rate of Looked After Children per 10,000 at period end	96.3	97.5	96.3	96.5	95.2	96.5	96.5	95.2	⬆️	✖️	60	86.9	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC3	Number of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children at period end	5	8	9	9	9	10	10	n/a	⬆️	n/a	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC4	Number of LAC admissions (SB)	185	186	213	11	8	18	37	reduce	⬆️	✖️	32,810	1,945	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC5	Rate of LAC Admissions per 10,000 (SB)	29.1	28.1	32	20.0	14.5	32.7	22.4	reduce	⬆️	✖️	27.6	31.7	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC6	Number of children ceasing to be looked after (BB)	164	168	219	10	16	10	36	increase	⬇️	✅	31,250	1,800	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC7	Rate of children ceasing to be looked after per 10,000 (BB)	25.6	25.4	33	18.1	29.0	18.1	21.8	increase	⬇️	✅	27.4	31.6	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
Looked After Children - Placements														
LAC7	% LAC 3 or more placements in yr (SB)	8.5	7.1%	8.9%	7.1%	6.3%	6.1%	6.1%	8.5	⬇️	✅	10	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC8	Long Term Stability of LAC (% in care 2.5 years in same placement 2 years) (BB)	64.8%	62.0%	64.1%	64.1%	63.3%	62.7%	62.7%	68.0%	⬇️	✖️	68%	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC9	% placed out of borough and more than 20 miles from where they used to live (SB)	11.3%	14.9%	12.9%	12.6%	12.9%	12.4%	12.4%	13.0%	⬇️	✅	13%	15%	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC10	% placed out of borough (SB)	47%	48.7%	45.4%	45.3%	46.1%	46.6%	46.1%	45.0%	⬆️	✖️	39%	42%	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC11	Number of children placed at home who are subject of a Full Care Order (SB)	49	54	51	56	60	62	62	reduce	⬆️	✖️	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
Looked After Children - Care Planning, Reviews and Visits														
LAC12	% statutory visits undertaken to timescale in the period (i.e. In accordance with child's plan) (BB)	86.2%	78.5%	87.8%	87.8%	91.4%	89.2%	89.4%	95%	⬇️	✖️	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC15	% Looked After Children reviews carried out within timescales	90.1%	82.6%	90.3%	91.0%	95.3%	95.6%	93.8%	95%	⬆️		n/a	n/a	Debbie Silvester
LAC16	% LAC reviews where child's views recorded (BB)	96.8%	97.6%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	➡️	✅	n/a	n/a	Debbie Silvester
LAC17	% LAC reviews where the child attended the review (BB)	38.7%	45.6%	49.8%	62.8%	47.0%	61.3%	55.4%	n/a	⬆️	n/a	n/a	n/a	Debbie Silvester
LAC19	% Looked after children allocated to a qualified social worker (BB)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	➡️	✅	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
Looked After Children - Attainment														
LAC21	KS2 combined Reading, writing and maths - working at or above expected standard	61%	28%	32%	Annual			Annual	63%	n/a	✖️	n/a	n/a	Lorraine Thompson
LAC22	KS4 achieving a good GCSE in both English and Maths	21%	18%	35%	Annual			Annual	25%	n/a	✅	n/a	n/a	Lorraine Thompson
Looked After Children - Health														
LAC23	Initial Health Assessments in timescale (BB)	80.3%	81.3%	63.1%	70.0%	85.7%	94.4%	85.7%	90%	⬆️	✖️	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC24	Of all children looked after, the % who have had a review health assessments in timescale (BB)	81.6%	85%	71.0%	Quarterly			81.0%	90%	⬆️		n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC25	No. LAC receiving CAMHS services	40		n/a	Quarterly			n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC26	% of Children looked after for 12 months continuously having annual health checks (BB)	78.6%	85%	n/a	Quarterly			n/a	90%	n/a		n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC27	% children looked after for 12 months continuously with immunisations up to date (BB)	88.8%	82%	83.3%	86.1%	86.8%	86.7%	86.7%	90%	⬆️	✖️	n/a	n/a	Jivan Semb, Julie Daley & Rita Homer

		WALSALL PERFORMANCE							TARGET	HOW ARE WE DOING?		LATEST BENCHMARK		RESPONSIBLE GROUP MANAGER
		2015 -16	2016 -17	2017-18	2018-19				2017 -18	Direction of Travel (vs last period)	Target achieved?	England	SN	
					Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Q1 Jun 18 (ytd)						
LAC28	% of children looked after continuously for 12 months with teeth checked by a dentist (BB)	86.7%	85%	82.4%	Quarterly			12.2%	90%	↑		n/a	n/a	Jivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC29	% of LAC for 12 months+, who have an identified substance misuse problem (SB)	4.6%	5.5%	6.4%	Quarterly			7.0%	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	Jivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC30	SDQs (% completed & recorded to system) (BB)	61.8%	84%	95.6%	6.1%	13.3%	21.1%	21.1%	90.0%	↑				Jivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
LAC31	Average SDQ score (SB)	14.0	14.2	14.0	14	14.2	13.6	13.6		↓		14	14.2	Jivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer
Looked After Children - Offending														
LAC32	% of children looked after continuously for 12 months who have offended (SB)	3.1%	1.5%	3.5%	Quarterly			3.4%	low is better	↓		n/a	n/a	Jivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford
LAC34	Looked After Children subject to remand (SB)	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	↓	✖	n/a	n/a	Jivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford
LAC35	Looked After Children Discharges - sentenced to custody (SB)	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	n/a	➡	n/a	n/a	n/a	Jivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford
Care Leavers														
CL1	Number of Care Leavers	new reporting		201	206	202	201	201	n/a	↑				Jivan Sembi
CL1	% Care Leavers age 19 to 21 not in suitable accommodation (SB)	10.2%	7.9	7.4	5.9	7.4	7.3	7.3	10%	↓	✓	7%	9%	Jivan Sembi
CL2	% Care Leavers age 19 to 21 not in suitable education, employment or training (SB)	57.7%	52.5	39.7	35.6	34.4	35.8	35.8	45%	↑	✓	50%	51%	Jivan Sembi
Adoption and Permanency														
AD1	% Ceasing care due to being adopted (in Year)	19.5%	21.4%	21.5%	20.0%	31.3%	30.0%	27.8%	20%	↑	✓	14.8%	20.5%	Elizabeth Gosling
AD2	Number of children Adopted (ytd)	32	36	47	2	5	3	10	high is better	↓	✖			Elizabeth Gosling
AD3	Number with a Placement Order	76	66	45	43	42	40	40		➡			525	Elizabeth Gosling
AD4	Number placed for Adoption	31	39	20	19	19	18	18		↓			230	Elizabeth Gosling
AD5	Of those adopted, Average time from Entering Care to moving in with adopted family (Days) (A1) (3-year average) (SB)	532	510	483	491	506	484	484	reduce	↓	✓	558	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD6	Of those adopted, Average time between receiving court authority to place a child and deciding on a match to a family (Days) (A2) (3 year average) (SB)	200	199	199	222	224	212	212	reduce	↓	✓	226	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD7	% Children who wait less than 14 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family (A3) (3- year average) (BB)	53%	53%	58.4% (78/136)	58.1% (61/105)	57.5% (61/106)	57.4% (62/108)	57.4% (62/108)	increase	↓	✓	47	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD8	Adoptions from care (% leaving care who are adopted) (A4) (3-year average) (BB)	17.0%	18.3%	21.1%	21.3%	21.7%	21.9%	21.9%		↑		16	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD9	Number of children for whom permanence decisions has changed away from adoption (3-year average) (A5)	10 (6%)	25	26	23	23	23	23		↑		3520 (14%)	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD10	Adoptions of children from ethnic minority backgrounds (% of BME children leaving care who are adopted) (3-year average) (A6)	22 (11.6%)	25 (13.9%)	30 (17.0%)	27 (21.4%)	27 (21.1%)	29 (21.0%)	29 (21.0%)		↑		2,330 (9%)	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD11	Adoptions of children aged five or over (% of children aged 5 or over leaving care who are adopted) (3-year average) (A7)	28 (7.9%)	23 (6.6%)	23 (6.6%)	14 (5.4%)	18 (6.6%)	18 (6.5%)	18 (6.5%)		➡		3,180 (5%)	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD12	Average length of care and supervision proceedings (s31) locally (weeks) (3 year average) (A8) (SB)	31	36	31	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc		↓		31	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD13	Number of children waiting to be placed for adoption (A9) (SB)	49	29	27	28	29	26	26		↓		3,960	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD14	Of those adopted, Average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, adjusted for foster care adoptions (3-year average) (A10)	494	501	482	498	512	499	499		↑		490	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD15	Number of approved adoptive families at snapshot date (A11)	5	9	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc		➡		2,530	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD16	Proportion of adoptive families who were matched to a child in the year who waited more than 3 months from approval to being matched to a child (A12) (SB)	80	30	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc		➡		73	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD17	Number of applications to become an adoptive family still being assessed (not yet approved or rejected) as at 31 March (A13)	19	9	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc		➡		1,730	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD18	Number of children waiting to be placed for adoption with a placement order (as at period end) (A14)	40	25	19	21	21	20	20		↑		2,410	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD19	Number of new ADM decisions in period (A15)	60	34	37	1	1	3	5		↓		4,310	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling
AD20	Number of new placement orders granted in period (A16)	37	30	29	3	1	2	6		↓		3,590	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling

KEY TO SYMBOLS AND NOTES

Direction of Travel

- ↑ improved in performance if bigger is better
- ↓ improved in performance if smaller is better
- Static Performance
- ↓ deteriorated in performance if bigger is better
- ↑ deteriorated in performance if smaller is better
- ↑ Black arrows up or down indicate that neither high nor low is good/poor, but there are a range of factors that will determine if an increase or decrease is appropriate. This applies to activity data mainly

Themes – measuring the end to end journey of the child

The following icons are used denote measuring specific elements:

- Measures that indicate timeliness and help to identify Drift and Delay
- Revolving Door – measuring children coming back into the system at key stages
- Needs of children and young people – reasons we are providing services