

The Independent Foster Care Panel Review

Case IPR18

Case Summary

[REDACTED]

The Findings of the Panel

Was the welfare of the child(ren) paramount in the decisions and actions of NCC?

25. The Panel considers that the actions taken by NCC in this case did not place sufficient importance of the welfare of [REDACTED].

26. [REDACTED]

27. [REDACTED]

28. [REDACTED]

29. [REDACTED]

30. [REDACTED]

31. [REDACTED]

Were the Foster Carers treated fairly and justly?

32. The Panel are of the view, overall, that the Foster Carer has been treated fairly and justly in this case.

- 33. [REDACTED]
- 34. [REDACTED]
- 35. [REDACTED]
- 36. [REDACTED]
- 37. [REDACTED]
- 38. [REDACTED]
- 39. [REDACTED]

Were the Council's Policies and procedures followed properly?

- 40. The Panel is of the view that the Council's policies were followed satisfactorily in this case.
- 41. When the issues arose in June the process for considering allegations was followed. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The Outcomes meeting for this process, however, did not take place until 25th November 2013 which is over four months from the initial meeting and perhaps longer than would be expected.
- 42. Following the meeting on 25th November 2013 the fostering service sought to address the concerns with IPR18 and informed her that they intended to make a recommendation to cease her registration as a Foster Carer.
- 43. A review was then undertaken and presented to the Fostering Panel after which the Agency Decision Maker supported the recommendation of the Fostering Panel and informed IPR18 by letter.
- 44. Although IPR18 referred this to the IRM the decision to deregister her as a Foster Carer was supported by the IRM.

45. [REDACTED]

46. [REDACTED]

47. [REDACTED]

Were the decisions and actions taken consistent with good Social Work practice?

48. The Panel is of the view that there is much good Social Work practice in this case. [REDACTED]

49. Proper processes were then followed to review her registration as a Foster Carer and the decision to deregister her was supported by the IRM. This Panel also supports that decision.

Suggestions for Remedies, Learning Points and Further Actions

Case Remedies

50. The Panel do not consider that there is any remedy necessary in respect of IPR18.

Learning Points

51. The Panel have concerns about the decision to leave the child [REDACTED] in the placement that appears to have been made in the LADO process. The Panel is also concerned that there is no evidence of the voice of the child and input from and consultation with the IRO in the decision for the child to remain in the placement.

52. The Panel recommend that the Director of Children’s Services take appropriate steps to ensure that all relevant staff are clear about where accountabilities rest and where decisions are made about safeguarding issues and care planning in foster placements.

53. The Panel also considered that in the event of allowances [REDACTED] being paid to Foster Carers [REDACTED] that there should be proper documented discussions with the Social Worker for the child agreeing and detailing how the money is spent for the benefit of the child. The Panel has found no evidence of a policy/procedure to cover this eventuality in NCC.
54. The Panel recommends that a policy for accounting [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is implemented and communicated to the appropriate Social Work teams.
55. The Panel recommend that the Director of Children's Services should ensure that IROs are consulted with/advised of any concerns regarding a child's placement.

[REDACTED]
6th July 2016