****

**Multi-Agency Audit Summary Sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Child / Adult Names:** |  |
| **Auditors:** |  |
| **Identified Agencies:** |  |

**Please note that if no evidence is provided the scoring will be classed as “INADEQUATE”**

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 1:** |
| **Please comment on the OVERALL QUALITY OF THE AUDIT RETURNS for this case** include good examples and any missing information, |
| **Comments:** |
|  |
| **SECTION 2:** |
| **1. CHRONOLOGY**   1. Is the chronology up-to-date? Are there any gaps? Do chronologies match up? 2. Have significant events been appropriately and clearly identified? Has their impact been considered/understood? |
| **Comments:** |
| **2. ASSESSMENT**   1. Have the right agencies been consulted? Has information sharing and communication been timely and appropriate? 2. What type of assessment has been completed? Was it the right assessment? Does it start and end in a timely way? Is it proportionate to the level and complexity of presenting issues? 3. Have appropriate assessment tools been used? Do they take into account the child’s wider social and community context and parental capacity to change? 4. Has the child’s voice and lived experience been listened to and action taken? Have siblings, parents (inc.fathers) and extended family been appropriately involved? 5. Do professionals have a thorough understanding of family’s circumstances and impact on the child/ren? Have they been appropriately challenging and curious to understand and verify why things are the way they are and find out information that may not be offered/volunteered by the child/parents/family? 6. Are conclusions and recommendations sound, evidence based, specific and clear? |
| **Comments:** |
| **3. PLANNING**   1. What plan is in place? Is it appropriate and relevant to the concerns/needs? How does it align to other plans such as the Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP)? 2. Is there evidence of effective and joined-up multi-agency working including timely and appropriate information sharing and communication? 3. Is the plan structured, outcomes-focussed and SMART? Is it clear how and when progress will be reviewed? Are timelines appropriate to the level of need/concern? 4. Is the plan child-centred? Is the child’s voice clear? Is the intended outcome of an action clearly identified in terms of how it meets the needs of the child? |
| **Comments:** |
| **4. DECISION MAKING**   1. Hasthis case been effectively managed at the right levels regarding step up/step down/closure and management oversight? 2. Have the right decisions been made at the right time? Has robust analysis, strong evidence-base and clear rationale been used to support decision making? 3. Has there been appropriate and timely professional challenge and/or escalation of concerns? |
| **Comments:** |
| **5. SUPERVISION**   1. Is there evidence of regular, reflective and effective supervision? How has it helped? |
| **Comments:** |
|  |
| **SECTION 3:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall GRADING** (please tick) | | |
| **Grading** |  | **Criteria** |
| **Outstanding** |  | Consistently meets standard for “good” in all areas with evidence of detailed analysis and child centred focus |
| **Good** |  | Exceeds minimum statutory requirements in most areas but not consistently throughout, does not evidence sufficient level of child centred analysis to meet standard for judgement of “outstanding” |
| **Requires Improvement to be Good** |  | Meets minimum statutory requirements / or minimum standards but does not meet standard required for judgement of “good” |
| **Inadequate** |  | Does not meet minimum statutory requirements / or minimum standards |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please describe the reasons for your grading below:** |
|  |
| **What GOOD PRACTICE has been identified?** |
|  |
| **What AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT have been identified?** |
|  |