



Corporate Parenting Board - Performance Scorecard

Data to: 31 December 2018 V1 to Corporate Parenting Board

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 how we made a difference?




Direction of travel based on Nov 18 to Dec 18




<div></div> <div>Walsall Council</div>		PRIORITY THIS MEASURES	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)	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Q2 Sep-18 (ytd)	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Q3 Dec-18 (ytd)	2018-19 R12m										
Looked After Children - Number, Admissions, and Discharges+A136																												
LAC1	Number of Looked After Children at period end (S8)		RISE	627	645	637	638	630	638	638	641	627	621	621	612	612	606	606	606	620	↓	✓	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC2	Rate of Looked After Children per 10,000 at period end (S8)		RISE	96.0	98.0	95.0	94.9	93.7	94.9	94.9	95.4	93.3	92.4	92.4	91.1	91.1	90.2	90.2	90.2	95.2	↓	✓	64	97.9	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC3	Number of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children at period end		RISE	5	8	9	9	9	10	10	9	10	11	11	12	13	13	13	13	n/a	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC4	Number of LAC admissions (S8)		RISE	185	186	211	11	8	18	37	16	10	14	77	7	13	8	105	144	reduce	↑	✗	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC5	Rate of LAC Admissions per 10,000 (S8)		RISE	29.1	28.1	31	19.6	14.3	32.1	22.0	28.6	17.9	25.0	22.9	12.5	23.2	14.3	23.4	21.4	reduce	↑	✗	27.0	37.9	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC6	Number of children ceasing to be looked after (B8)		RISE	164	168	219	10	16	10	36	13	24	20	93	16	13	14	136	193	increase	↑	✓	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC7	Rate of children ceasing to be looked after per 10,000 (B8)		RISE	25.6	25.4	33	17.9	28.6	17.9	21.4	23.2	42.9	35.7	27.7	28.6	23.2	25.0	30.4	28.7	increase	↑	✓	25.2	29.9	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
Looked After Children - Placements																												
LAC7	% LAC 3 or more placements in yr (S8)	☹️		4.0%	7.0%	8.9%	7.8%	8.3%	7.8%	7.8%	7.3%	6.5%	7.1%	7.1%	6.9%	5.7%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	8.5	↓	✓	10	9.2	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC8	Long Term Stability of LAC (% in care 2.5 years in same placement 2 years) (B8)	☹️		72.0%	76.0%	64.1%	64.1%	63.3%	62.7%	62.7%	64.5%	64.2%	67.2%	67.2%	67.2%	68.6%	67.4%	67.4%	67.4%	68.0%	↑	✗	70%	70%	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC9	% placed out of borough and more than 20 miles from where they used to live (S8)			13.6%	14.9%	14.0%	12.6%	12.9%	12.4%	12.4%	12.0%	11.8%	12.5%	12.5%	12.9%	12.3%	12.8%	12.8%	12.8%	13.0%	↑	✓	15%	18%	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC10	% placed out of borough (S8)			47%	48.7%	45.0%	45.3%	46.1%	46.6%	46.6%	46.8%	45.4%	46.8%	46.8%	46.6%	45.6%	47.2%	47.2%	47.2%	45.0%	↑	✗	41%	45%	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC11	Number of children placed at home who are subject of a Full Care Order (B8)		WSCB	49	54	51	56	60	62	62	60	62	62	62	55	56	60	60	60	reduce	↓	✗	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, 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) (B8)	🕒		86.2%	78.5%	87.8%	87.5%	91.6%	89.0%	89.4%	88.7%	83.6%	88.3%	88.0%	87.3%	86.1%	85.6%	87.5%	87.5%	95%	↓	✗	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC15	% Looked After Children reviews carried out within timescales	🕒		90.1%	82.6%	90.0%	90.6%	91.4%	96.8%	92.9%	93.0%	86.3%	84.2%	88.4%	ttbc	ttbc	ttbc	ttbc	ttbc	95%	↑		n/a	n/a	Debbie Silverster			
LAC16	% LAC reviews where child's views recorded (B8)			96.8%	97.6%	100%	100%	100%	99.2%	99.8%	100%	100%	99.3%	99.8%	100%	100%	100%	99.8%	99.5%	98%	→	✓	n/a	n/a	Debbie Silverster			
LAC17	% LAC reviews where the child attended the review (B8)			38.7%	45.6%	49.8%	61.3%	53.3%	59.1%	57.9%	54.9%	72.3%	50.0%	57.5%	62.5%	60.9%	72.7%	59.0%	55.4%	n/a	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a	Debbie Silverster			
LAC19	% Looked after children allocated to a qualified social worker (B8)			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	→	✓	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
Looked After Children - Attainment																												
LAC20	% Looked after children with an up to date PEP (B8)				72%	77.3%				ttbc				ttbc				ttbc		90%	n/a	✗	n/a	n/a	Lorraine Thompson			
LAC21	KS2 combined Reading, writing and maths - working at or above expected standard	☹️		61%	28%	32%		Annual		Annual		Annual		61%		Annual		Annual	Annual	63%	n/a	✗	32%	32%	Lorraine Thompson			
LAC22	KS4 achieving a good GCSE in both English and Maths	☹️		21%	18%	35%		Annual		Annual		Annual		36%		Annual		Annual	Annual	25%	n/a	✓	18%	24%	Lorraine Thompson			
Looked After Children - Health																												
LAC23	Initial Health Assessments in timescale (B8)			80.3%	81.3%	63.1%	70.0%	85.7%	94.4%	85.7%	87.5%	90.0%	90.0%	88.9%	81.8%	92.3%	80.0%	87.6%	81.1%	90%	↓	✗	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC24	Of all children looked after, the % who have had a review health assessments in timescale (B8)	🕒		81.6%	85%	83.4%		Quarterly		74.0%		Quarterly		74.4%		Quarterly		73.1%	73.1%	90%	↑		n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi & Rita Homer			
LAC25	No. LAC receiving CAMHS services			40		n/a		Quarterly		n/a		Quarterly		n/a		Quarterly		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi & Rita Homer			
LAC26	% of Children looked after for 12 months continuously having annual health checks (B8)	🕒		78.6%	85%	n/a		Quarterly		n/a		Quarterly		n/a		Quarterly		n/a	n/a	90%	n/a		n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi & Rita Homer			
LAC27	% children looked after for 12 months continuously with immunisations up to date (B8)	🕒		88.8%	82%	83.0%	86.1%	86.8%	86.7%	86.7%	86.9%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	86.4%	86.2%	86.4%	86.4%	86.4%	90%	↓	✗	85%	84.3%	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC28	% of children looked after continuously for 12 months with teeth checked by a dentist (B8)			86.7%	85%	82.4%		Quarterly		12.2%		Quarterly		40.6%		Quarterly		63.7%	63.7%	90%	↑		n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC29	% of LAC for 12 months+, who have an identified substance misuse problem (S8)			4.6%	5.5%	6.4%		Quarterly		7.0%		Quarterly		7.3%		Quarterly		6.8%	6.8%	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC30	SDQs (% completed & recorded to system) (B8)			60.6%	82.7%	99.0%	6.1%	13.3%	21.1%	21.1%	26.1%	29.1%	30.1%	30.1%	33.6%	36.4%	46.6%	46.6%	46.6%	90.0%	↑		78%	79%	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
LAC31	Average SDQ score (S8)	☹️		14.0	14.2	14.2	14	14.2	13.6	13.6	14.1	14.3	14.5	14.5	14.3	14.3	14.1	14.1	14.1		↓		14.2	13.9	Ivan Sembi, Julie Daley & Rita Homer			
Looked After Children - Offending																												
LAC32	% of children looked after continuously for 12 months who have offended (S8)	☹️		3.1%	1.5%	1.4%		Quarterly		2.0%		Quarterly		1.7%		Quarterly		1.7%	1.7%	low is better	→	✓	4.0%	4.0%	Ivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford			
LAC34	Looked After Children subject to remand (S8)			3	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	→	✗	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford			
LAC35	Looked After Children Discharges - sentenced to custody (S8)			2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	→	n/a	n/a	n/a	Ivan Sembi & Phil Rutherford			
Care Leavers																												
CL1	Number of Care Leavers				new reporting	201	206	202	201	201	200	199	203	203	203	204	205	205	205	n/a	↑		n/a		Ivan Sembi			
CL1	% Care Leavers age 19 to 21 not in suitable accommodation (S8)	☹️		11.0%	9.0%	0.1	5.9	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.6	8.5	7.6	7.6	9.5	9.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	10%	↓	✓	7%	6%	Ivan Sembi			
CL2	% Care Leavers age 19 to 21 not in suitable education, employment or training (S8)	☹️		57.7%	50.0%	0.4	35.6	34.4	35.8	35.8	32.2	36.4	30.3	30.3	32.5	27.6	25.8	25.8	25.8	45%	↓	✓	39%	45%	Ivan Sembi			
Adoption and Permanency																												
AD1	% Ceasing care due to being adopted (in Year) (B8)			19.5%	21.4%	21.5%	20.0%	31.3%	30.0%	27.8%	7.7%	8.3%	20.0%	18.3%	25.0%	30.8%	7.1%	39.1%	18.7%	20%	↑	✓	13%	17%	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD2	Number of children Adopted (ytd) (B8)			32	36	47	2	5	3	10	1	2	4	17	4	4	1	26	36	high is better	↑	✗	3820	286	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD3	Number with a Placement Order			76 (12%)	66 (10%)	45 (7%)	43	42	40	40 (6.3%)	41	41	38	38 (6.1%)	33	31	30	3	33 (5.4%)	33 (5.4%)	→		5360 (7%)	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD4	Number placed for Adoption			31 (5%)	39 (6%)	20 (3.1%)	19	19	18	18 (2.8%)	20	17	20	20 (3.2%)	18	17	18	18 (3.0%)	1883.0%		↓		2230 (3%)	n/a	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD5	Of those adopted, Average time from Entering Care to moving in with adopted family (Days) (A1) (3-year average)(S8)	🕒		528	517	473	491	506	484	484	482	482	475	475	471	471	472	472	472	reduce	↓	✓	486	472	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) (S8)	🕒		200	199	199	222	224	212	212	212	211	210	210	209	214	214	214	214	reduce	↑	✗	201	202	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD7	% Children who wait less than 14 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family (A3) (3-year average) (B8)	🕒		53%	55%	56%	58.1% (61/105)	57.5% (62/108)	57.4% (62/108)	57.4% (62/108)	58.0% (65/112)	58.6% (66/116)	59.0% (69/117)	59.0% (69/117)	59.2% (71/120)	58.7% (71/121)	57.7% (71/123)	57.7% (71/123)	57.7% (71/123)	increase	↓	✓	56%	56%	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD8	Adoptions from care (% leaving care who are adopted) (A4) (3-year average) (B8)			17.0%	18.3%	21.1%	21.3%	21.1%	21.9%	21.9%	21.6%	20.9%	20.8%	20.9%	20.9%	21.1%	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%		↑		14%	19%	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD9	Number of children for whom permanence decisions changed away from adoption (3-year average) (A5)			10 (6%)	20 (10%)	15 (9%)	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16 (9%)	16 (9%)		↔		11%	11%	Elizabeth Gosling			
AD10	Adoptions of children from ethnic minority backgrounds (% of BME children leaving care who are adopted) (3-year average) (A6)			21 (11.6%)	25 (13.9%)	30 (17.0%)	27 (21.4%)	27 (21.1%)	29 (21.0%)	29 (21.0%)	29 (21.0%)	29 (19.8%)	29 (19.8%)	29 (18.3%)	29 (18.3%)	31 (19.0%)	31 (19.0%)	31 (19.0%)	31 (19.0%)									

<div>Walsall Council</div>		PRIORITY THIS MEASURES	WALSALL PERFORMANCE																	TARGET	HOW ARE WE DOING?		LATEST BENCHMARK		RESPONSIBLE GROUP MANAGER			
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19											Q2 Sep-18 (ytd)	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Q3 Dec-18 (ytd)	2018-19 R12m	2017-18	Direction of Travel (vs last period)		Target achieved?	England	SN
						Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Q1 Jun-18 (ytd)	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18																
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	448	498	512	499	499	499	494	501	494	475	476	473	473	473			⬇️			412	409	Elizabeth Gosling		
AD15	Number of approved adoptive families at snapshot date (A11)		5	9	4	Quarterly			7	Quarterly			5	Quarterly			5	5			⬇️			1,600	148	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)		80	30	75	Quarterly			100	Quarterly			67%	Quarterly			67%	66.7%			⬇️			69%	67%	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	21	Quarterly			20	Quarterly			21	Quarterly			21	21			⬆️			1,760	125	Elizabeth Gosling		
AD18	Number of children waiting to be placed for adoption with a placement order (as at period end) (% of LAC) (A14)		40 (6.4%)	25 (3.9%)	19 (3.0%)	21	21	20	20	17	18	18	18	16	14	13	13 (2.1%)	13 (2.1%)			⬇️			2760 (3.7%)	220 (4.2%)	Elizabeth Gosling		
AD19	Number of new ADM decisions in period (A15)		60	34	37	1	1	3	5	1	1	2	9	3	1	1	14	25			⬆️			4,560	365	Elizabeth Gosling		
AD20	Number of new placement orders granted in period (A16)		37	30	29	3	1	2	6	1	3	1	11	1	0	0	12	19			⬇️			3,660	335	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
-  Outcomes for children and young people