|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Child’s/ young person’s Name** |  | **Mosaic No:** |  | **Team Manager:** |  |
| **Team:** |  | **Practitioner** |  | **Date of Audit:** |  |

**Please only review the 6 months prior to the date of this audit!**

**Please note the audit template requires the auditor to give a grading for each domain and the overall grading**

* **Based on evidence on Mosaic**
* **And following the discussion with the Practitioner**

**“Language that cares” – please be mindful when you write your report. Please write to the practitioner, not about them.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What pleased you most about the work undertaken with this child/ young person and their family?** |  |
| **Strategy Discussion/ Section 47 (S47) investigation** | |
| **If no Strategy Discussion/ S47 investigation took place during the audit period, do you consider there should have been one? Please outline your rationale.** |  |
| **What was the reason for the Strategy discussion/ S47 investigation? How did it decrease the level of risk to the child and what was the plan?**  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * Agencies who contributed to the strategy discussion/ S47 investigation and evidence to inform decision making about safeguarding and protection? * How was the child engaged to find out their experience? * How did the practitioner convey their concerns to parents/carers about what needs to change? * The risk analysis and proposed plan is comprehensive and SMART? Does it explore additional/arising risks? |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Did the S47 only take place when there was reasonable cause to suspect the child was suffering or was likely to suffer significant harm?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **If the decision was made to convene a child protection conference was this appropriate?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGEMENT ON STRATEGY/ S47 –**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate**  **N / A** |
| **JUDGEMENT ON STRATEGY/ S47 –**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate**  **N / A** |
| **Recording** | |
| **How is the impact of the support and intervention on the child and family reflected in the recordings?**  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * What were the concerns for this child and family? * How did the practitioner capture the child’s and family’s journey in the assessment/ intervention/ support put in place? * What is the quality of recording, i.e., well argued, focused, jargon free, culturally aware? Use of **“language that cares”** * Does Mosaic tell the child/young person’s story? * Was information sharing with partner agencies appropriate and timely? Where did you find the evidence of this on Mosaic? |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Is demographic and other data up to date? (age, gender, ethnicity, disability, religion, first language, UPN, telephone numbers, relationships etc** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Is there a comprehensive genogram capturing significant family relationships, including new/alternative families to support planning for the child?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Is there an up- to- date chronology of the past two years, that gives an overview of the family’s history, and significant events to inform practice and risk analysis?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGEMENT ON RECORDING –**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate**  **N / A** |
| **JUDGEMENT ON RECORDING –**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate**  **N / A** |
| **Supervision, Decision Making and Management Oversight** | |
| **What evidence is there of reflective, systemic, and culturally informed supervision and management oversight that describes the impact on the child/young person?**  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * How is management oversight and decision making reflected on Mosaic? (Consider S3 of CFA, CFA outcome analysis, S47 outcome analysis, management sign off on assessment, plans, statements etc) * Monitoring and progression of the plan, actions around risk management, and response to arising needs and risks * Is there clear reflection and hypotheses? |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Is supervision taking place within required minimum timescales?**  **Please note in Assessment first analysis and management oversight is in Section 3 of the CFA. Children on CP plans and newly looked after every 4 weeks, children on CiN plans every 8 weeks, children in long term alternative homes every 6-8 weeks.** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Has the embedded supervision document on Mosaic been used?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGMENT ON SUPERVISION AND MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT –**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **JUDGMENT ON SUPERVISON AND MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT–**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **The voice of the child/young person** | |
| **What evidence is there on Mosaic of the voice of the child/young person and does this give clear evidence of their wishes, feelings, and views?**  **Is there evidence the practitioner understands the child’s cultural context and the impact of poverty and deprivation on them?**  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * The child/young person’s wishes and feelings are **explicitly** recorded on Mosaic and in documents * We have acted upon their wishes and feelings * The child/young person’s needs in relation to religion, culture, language, sexual identity etc have been considered in decision making and intervention * Evidence of advocacy where needed * Meaningful direct work during visits and uploaded on Mosaic * Effective communication between the practitioner with the child/young person (including if there are special education needs and disabilities) * Identification of the strengths within the child/young person’s life and aspirations for the future |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Are visits taking place within required timescales?**  **(Child Protection: statutory minimum 2 weekly, Child in Need/ children in care: statutory minimum 6 weekly) but please see child’s individual plan** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGMENT ON THE VOICE OF THE CHILD/YOUNG PERSON –**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **JUDGMENT ON THE VOICE OF THE CHILD/YOUNG PERSON –**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **Assessment** | |
| **How does the assessment analyse the child’s needs, risks and protective factors? Is there evidence the practitioner was able to build collaborative, problems solving relationships with the child/family based on respect?**  *NB: If no Child and Family Assessment (CFA) has been completed within the last 6 months please consider the Social Worker’s report for the review of the plan in place, i.e., Child in Need / child protection / Care / Pathway Plan*  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * The involvement of the child/young person and their family, (including fathers and male partners) in the plan * Strengths within the family * The asking of difficult questions sensitively and respectfully to know what is happening to the child/young person * Use of professional curiosity and critical analysis (including tools and research) to understand and explore the circumstance of the child/young person’s life. (Including awareness of the impact of poverty, deprivation, discrimination, and family stress) * Risks have been identified, responded to, and reduced in a timely way * Effective engagement with other agencies and disciplines, drawing on their expertise and information to enrich assessment and direct work |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Are assessments timely, comprehensive, and analytical?**  **(If no CFA completed, please answer this question for Child in Need Review, Initial/ Review Child Protection Conference, Review for children in care)** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGEMENT ON ASSESSMENT –**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **JUDGEMENT ON ASSESSMENT –**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **Making a Difference – Planning and Review** | |
| **How do we know statutory intervention is making a positive difference to the child/young person?**  **Key lines of enquiry:**   * Evidence the plan is realistic, relevant, been agreed and shared with the child/family/carer * Evidence the family understood the purpose of the intervention * Each child’s needs are prioritised and not just focused on the needs of the adult * Progress is monitored and reviewed -CP Chair, IRO/CiN and core group meetings * Evidence of a multi- agency plan * Evidence of co-ordination between agencies in managing risk, supporting and sustaining wellbeing * Evidence of parallel/ safety/ or contingency planning * Outline of what needs to change and in what timescale   **For children living in alternative homes**   * Evidence the child is living in a stable, loving alternative home * Evidence of good co-working between the child’s social worker, supervising social worker and the carer who review needs, wellbeing, and progress * Evidence of arrangements for the child to maintain relationships with their siblings, family, and friends * IRO input provides challenge and support |  |
| **Compliance** |  |
| **Are meetings taking place within required timescales? (i.e. Child in Need, Initial/ Review Child Protection Conference, Core Groups, Review for children in care)** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Is there an up- to- date outcome -based plan? (The child’s young person “future plan”, such as Child in Need, Child Protection, Care Plan, Pathway Plan?)** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Does the plan have appropriate actions set with SMART timescales?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **Is there evidence contingency planning is considered to minimise drift or delay?** | Yes  No  N/A |
| **JUDGEMENT ON PLANNING AND REVIEW**  **From reading Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **JUDGEMENT ON PLANNING AND REVIEW–**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| As part of completing this audit who did you speak to about any concerns that required escalation? Please comment |  |
| **In giving an overall grading, please weigh up the grading in each domain with the findings in relation to the key lines of enquiry.** | |
| **OVERALL JUDGEMENT –**  **Based on evidence on Mosaic** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |
| **OVERALL JUDGEMENT –**  **Following discussion with the practitioner** | **Outstanding**  **Good**  **Requires Improvement**  **Inadequate** |

**Improvement Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Actions Identified** | **Desired outcome/ impact?** | **Who is responsible?** | **By When?** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection questions for the practitioner (please capture a summary of the reflection here)** |
| What are you most proud of in your work with the child/young person/family? |
| What assisted or prevented you in progressing your work with the child/young person? |
| How is this audit impacting on your thinking, reflection, and way forward to work with this child and family? |
| Any other feedback? |

**Audit completed by:**

|  |
| --- |
| **QA feedback** |
|  |
| **Date** |

**QA completed by:**