

Targeted Audit Record

NATURE OF AUDIT	Quality of plans audit in the IRO service
NAME OF AUDITOR	Sally Branchflower
TITLE/POSITION	Practice Manager
DATE OF AUDIT	August
NUMBER OF CASES	10
PLANNED AUDIT	Planned
OUTLINE THE PURPOSE OF THE AUDIT	To ensure that the learning from quality of plans audit has been embedded which was shared in April with the IRO service
AUDIT ACTIVITY	10 looked after review reports completed by IROs specific focus on quality of plans and actions from the period June July and August picked randomly so not all IROs work was audited
LEARNING FROM AUDIT (Identify key strengths and areas for development)	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This audit evidenced an overall improvement in SMART planning • Timescales on (5) were succinct and clear • Person responsible for the action was clear in the plan • Actions supported care planning discussion • There was a lot less detail in the actions and the detail was found in the body of the report • Language was child centred and easy to understand in the main • Some actions were written to the child • Some had clear bold headings which was easier to read • New form is much clearer evidencing the childs wishes and feelings and table provides clear guidance to the IRO completing the form. <p>Areas for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timescales were inconsistent in plans some were missing so could not be measured some were in line with next review (is this SMART and does it support priorities in the childs care plan?)

- Actions should be written to the child in each set of minutes for consistency
- Actions to be short and clear as the detail is in the report under specific headings, too much detail can cause confusion for children and families.
- Liked actions in bold suggest this going forward for consistency
- Audit was completed and looked at the old CLA form and the new one so there was a mixture of audits on different forms, next audit needs to be completed where IROs have used new forms with a specific focus on timescales and how they can be measured.
- Learning to be shared at a team meeting and individually.

Quality of/SMART Plans Audit- completed by PM Sally Branchflower, in August 2021

IRO plans audited	Is the plan Specific for the child and specific to the child's care planning	Is the plan measurable ? <i>Can we measure progress for the family?</i>	Is the plan achievable	Is the plan realistic ? <i>Does it use family friendly language and it would be understood by the family?</i>	Is the plan timely ? <i>Does it include time focused/limited actions?</i>
210004321 review date 29/06- IRO CH	Yes - 5 short clear actions which support the care plan discussion at the review	Partly yes - language is simple and clear and all but 2 have clear timescales which were clearly agreed at the child's review. The 2 that don't relate to life story work and when Grandmother will be supervising contact	Yes - the plan is not over complex and very clear re narrative and easy for the Kinship carers to understand	Yes - plan is realistic and as stated very simple	Partly yes -Timescales are clearly given for 3 out of the 5 actions the 2 that have no timescales is with the SW team when they can complete life story work and when Gran feels comfortable to supervise contact
200082159 CE review date 15/06 IRO FW	Yes - only 1 clear recommendation listed as other reccs such as PEP health assessment	Yes - very clear and measurable and who needs to be involved and written to the child about what others will	Yes -1 recommendation which specifically targets education resource	Yes - both children need to be in school with support from the virtual school and GRT	Yes -clear short timescale given of 2 weeks which the Team Manager is in agreement with.

	etc are in the body of the review report	do this outcome linked to identifying a suitable school to include their cultural heritage		team. Language clear and simple	
200112564 CK review 21/07 IRO AB on new CLA form	Yes-6 short recommendations 1 is in relation to the PEP which is a given so could be removed	Partly Yes- they are all measurable with different timescales apart from 1 rec with no timescales, is direct work with the child this says "ASAP" this can not be measured	Yes all recs are achievable and support the care planning discussion	Yes-language is clear and simple and easy to understand	Yes- all apart from 1 which says ASAP
200238608 BH review 10/06 IRO GW	Yes- actions are very specific and relate to Health assessment actions, contact arrangements with Nan and life story work and support care plan discussion	Yes-the 3 actions all have timescales which were discussed in the meeting and agreed and language is clear	Yes- all are achievable in the required timescales specified in the report and actions not complicated but will require focus and pace	Yes- language is simple and actions are realistic no more than 2 lines for each action	Yes- this review was for 3 children all require life story work and the IRO gave 3 months but this was agreed by the TM
200189026 LP review 07/07 IRO JC	Yes partly-actions are specific in the main but some are statements such as continue to support LP with medication and LP wants to live independently and to continue with Asdan	Yes partly-this was a very thorough review with lots of details covered due to the high profile and the actions listed 9 in total but doesn't say for all actions a completion date	Yes- all are achievable some of them are very basic which should be happening anyway such as meds and Asdan continuing TAC meetings every 6 weeks but for the more specific tasks they do have timescales	Yes- language is simple and clear and child's name used which makes actions directly relate to LP	Yes partly- a lot of the actions remain ongoing or expected but the more specific targets do have timescales and list who will do what clearly
200144915 HC review 07/06 IRO LJ	Yes-plan is clear and specific detailed discussion recorded	Yes partly- plan is measurable for those where clear timescales have been given ie SW	Yes-all are achievable and clear good use of language written to the YP	Yes-plan is realistic and supports the discussion at the meeting and	Yes partly-for those actions with timescales a couple of the actions set timescales for the

	and actions support discussion	visits every 12 weeks but less measurable for those actions without timescales such as feedback to parents asap?		highlights what needs to happen by who.	next review in November such as contact with child's Brother which could be sorted before then in my view.
200118874 AD review 15/07 IRO JP	Partly yes - plan is very detailed and there is a lot of text on the box on the new CLA form and covers a lot of the history which isn't needed however if more succinct do support the care plan I think it is style of writing on the new form.	Partly yes -Again to much detail and explanation as to why the action has been listed but there is clear timescales in bold at the bottom of each narrative so actions can be measured. Some are shorter than others which reads better.	Yes - all targets are achievable, but narrative is too long the detail is in the body of the report so some duplication.	Yes - plan is realistic main actions relate to family time and health and leisure but again too much detail	Yes partly - as above for those actions with clear timescales
200204616 CH review 03/08 IRO KS	Yes - very specific in relation to tasks that need to happen to support CH re transition planning NEW CLA pathway plan is very structured and clear	Yes - all targets under each heading are clear and simple written to the YP saying what will happen and by who and when	Yes -clear targets that are achievable broken into smaller steps under what when and who timescales for completion maybe questionable?	Yes - plan is realistic and supports the YP re transition planning and his views are evident throughout.	Yes - most state within 10 days and clarify who will complete the action.
200216844 DC review held 13/12 IRO NE Completed on new CLA form	Yes - specific re tasks that need to happen that came out of the review discussion very clear and easy to understand	Yes - all 5 targets will be reviewed at the next review in November dates clearly recorded and by who and written to the child	Yes - targets are achievable such as updating contact plan completing parenting assessment starting some life story work and exploring play therapy	Yes - plan is realistic and supports the discussion that took place taking into account wishes and feelings of children and family and tasks to support care planning.	Yes - the tasks are expected to be completed by the Permanency review in November it states the date and who will do what

200200337 KM review held 07/07 IRO SS	Yes- specific tasks for each child unique to them 3 children in total.Tasks clear not complicated good language	Yes- clear timescales given for each action and who will complete the action	Yes- targets are achievable each child has 3 -4 targets to support the care planning none are complex. Succinct and clear	Yes- plan is realistic and supports the childrens care plan of what needs to happen more detailed discussion in the body of the record	Yes- Timescales vary depending on the importance and it would appear that timescales have been agreed in the review meeting
---------------------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

Put yourselves in the shoes of a parent or child and young person, read the plan before distributing and ask yourself is this is clear?

Do I understand what is expected by when? and who will support them to get there?

Is the plan written to the child?

Are the child's views evident?

Is the plan SMART?

How have the timescales been agreed? Are they realistic and achievable and how will they be tracked?