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**Learning from CRPDs**

**May/June 2022**

|  |
| --- |
| **CRPDs – May/June 2022** |
| **Impact for children of virtual Children in Care Reviews** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Context for thematic CRPD** |
| **Internal quality assurance activity guided us to undertake a review of cases where young people had virtual Children in Care Review meetings. This was to support our understanding of the quality of the work we do, and how well young people are engaged in their review process.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **What’s working well?** |
| * Many CRPDs are being written to the child and this often means they are more reflective in nature. * Peer and Thematic scaling show that broadly we are managing risk, care planning, capturing the voice of the child well, leading to a positive picture of overall outcomes for children. * Just under half of young people were asked if they would like to attend their review, and slightly fewer about how their review is held. Young people are usually asked by their social worker or IRO, but there were also instances of them being asked by their parent or carer. * Social workers and IROs use their professional judgement to consider whether it is in the young person’s best interest to attend their review. * A high number of young people attend their reviews regularly. * Most young people stated that they preferred virtual reviews as this meant that they could keep their cameras off if they wanted to. * Moderation Panel feedback to auditors is helping to improve the quality of future CRPDs and managers have reported they appreciate the opportunity for reflection. |
| **Worries** |
| * Management oversight remains an area of most inconsistency. * There is a dip in files that have up to date safety plans, chronologies and genograms. * There appears to be some confusion over the roles and responsibilities of social workers and IROs in relation to arranging how review meetings are held and how care plans are shared. * There could be greater improvement in recording discussions held with the young person about arrangements for their review and fewer assumptions being made about the same format continuing from previous to current review meetings. * There could be greater clarity of recording to explain why IRO visits to young people could not/did not take place. * We need to improve our consultation with young people in how their reviews are held. * Some young people stated that they do not like virtual reviews when professionals have their cameras turned off. |

|  |
| --- |
| **What needs to happen? Agreed actions** |
| Senior managers to continue with supporting their managers to complete CRPDs within timescales. |
| Senior managers to continue to support Team Managers with providing Management Oversight, including timely supervision. |
| Clear guidance to be offered in relation to the shared roles and responsibilities of the social worker and IRO in the care planning and review process. |
| Clarity to be provided on when IRO visits (pre and post review) should take place and where this should be recorded. |
| Promote use of MOMO app in preparation for review meetings. |
| Clearer guidance to be offered in relation to recording the discussions with young people and decision-making process of deciding format of reviews. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Good practice** |
| * **For the majority of young people whose record were reviewed, it is clear that we are managing risk, care planning and capturing the voice of the child well. This is leading to a positive picture of overall outcomes for children.** * **Young people are usually asked by their social worker or IRO about how they want their review to be held but there were examples of them also being asked by their parent or carer.** * **Professional judgement is used to consider whether it is appropriate for ayoung person to attend their review.** |