

# The Independent Foster Care Panel Review

## Case IPR40

---

### Case Summary

[REDACTED]



there was a lack of effective long term planning for ■ and the placement was allowed to drift.

37. At the time when the placement was clearly fragile there was a lack of effective support and supervision for ■ and supervision of the placement

Were the Foster Carers treated fairly and justly?

38. The Panel consider that the Foster Carers were not treated fairly and justly in this case.

39. The supervision from both the Fostering Team and the Looked After Children team in what was clearly a difficult placement was wholly inadequate throughout much of the placement

40. ■  
■  
■

41. ■  
■  
■

Were the Council's Policies and procedures followed properly?

43. The Panel do not consider that the Council's Policies and Procedures were properly followed in this case.

44. There was a lack long term planning and the placement drifted seriously to the degree that the placement which was meant to last for only 9 months actually lasted for over 3 years.

45. Throughout the case timescales for reviews and supervision were exceeded.

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

46. The Panel do not consider that the decisions taken in this case are consistent with good Social Work practice.

47. Social Workers, their managers and the IRO failed to ensure that there was effective long term planning for ■ This placed an unacceptable strain on the carers.

48. Social Workers and their managers failed to respond effectively to the signs of severe strain on this placement had on the carers ■ when support, supervision and the urgency of finding an alternative and long term placement drifted further.

## Suggestions for Remedies, Learning Points and Further Actions

### Case Remedies

49. Following the IRM decision the Foster Carers have been re-assessed, reconsidered and approved to foster again.

50. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

52. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

53. The Panel consider that the Director of Children's Services on behalf of NCC should ensure that a full and specific written apology is given to the carers for the failures in this case.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### Learning Points

55. The Panel wish to draw attention to requirement for the IRO to ensure that by the second LAC review there is a permanency plan [REDACTED] with a parallel plan identified.

56. The IRO also needs to escalate concern when there appears to be drift in a case [REDACTED]

57. This case raises questions about the matching of children to carers who have the experience and understanding to manage a number of complex problems and challenging behaviours.

58. The Panel recommend the Director of Children's Services should review the matching processes to ensure that proper matching is carried out.

59. Finally the Panel recommends that NCC considers its approach to complaints in fostering cases [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
**6<sup>th</sup> July 2016**