

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Wednesday, 19 May 2010

2.00 pm

Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone





AGENDA

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Wednesday, 19 May 2010 at 2.00 pm
Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone

Ask for: **Theresa Grayell**
Telephone: **01622 694277**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the meeting.

Membership (8)

Conservative (7): Mrs A D Allen (Chairman), Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke,
Mrs V J Dagger, Mr L B Ridings, Mrs P A V Stockell and
Mrs J Whittle

Liberal Democrat (1): Mr M J Vye (Vice-Chairman)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A. BOARD BUSINESS

- A1 Substitutes
- A2 Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's agenda
- A3 Minutes of Meeting held on 10 March 2010 (Pages 1 - 6)
- A4 Chairman's Announcements

B. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- B1 Children In Care Council (CICC) update (oral)
- B2 Housing for Care Leavers (Pages 7 - 14)
- B3 The Placement of Looked After Children in Kent by Other Local Authorities (Pages 15 - 28)
- B4 'Care to Listen' DVD (Discussion about how the Board wishes to use this)
- B5 Kent Safeguarding Children Board (oral update)

C. UPDATES

Information Papers on these issues will be sent to Members separately

NB – Information items are not for consideration at the Meeting

C1 Looked After Children and Children with a Child Protection Plan: Statistics.

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002

Tuesday, 11 May 2010

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers may be inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Children's Champions Board held in the Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 10 March 2010.

PRESENT: Mrs A D Allen (Chairman), Mr M J Vye (Vice-Chairman), Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs V J Dagger and Mr L B Ridings

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Gilroy (Chief Executive), Ms R Turner (Managing Director Children, Families and Education), Ms H Davies (Director For Specialist Children's Services Group), Mrs K Weiss (Head of Policy & Performance), Mr K Arthur (Head of Children's Safeguards Service), Mrs J Doherty (Policy Manager), Ms D Marriott (Acting Safeguarding Policy & Performance Manager), Mr P Thomason (Independent Child Protection Consultant), Mr D Worlock (Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Board) and Miss T Grayell (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**19. Minutes of Meeting held on 2 December 2009**
(Item A3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2009 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

20. Matters Arising from Minutes**Housing for Care Leavers**

1. Mrs Doherty reported that the Children's Trust Executive Board (CTEB) had received a report on housing issues and the Supporting People Draft Strategy at its last meeting. The KCT County Board also now includes representatives from housing in its membership.

2. Mr Ridings added that, although housing was not a KCC responsibility, the KCC needed to do all it could to help District Councils and ensure that they met their responsibility for housing young people, who always seemed to be given the lowest priority. For some District Councils, housing was a particular burden, so KCC would have to give these Councils extra support. Mr Gilroy added a doubt that the Government and District Councils could fully afford all their responsibilities to young care leavers up to the age of 24.

3. In answer to a question, Mr Gilroy clarified that KCC was able to act as a guarantor for rent payments, if it wished to, and Mrs Allen added that some District Councils, e.g., Dartford, guaranteed rent payments, while other District Councils did not. Mr Gilroy said that the Chief Executives' Group in Kent would shortly be considering a paper which would address the issue of rent guarantees by District Councils and the need to reinstate the former 'Crash pad' scheme of emergency accommodation.

Looked After Children placed in Kent by Other Local Authorities

1. Mr Ridings reported that the outcome of the meeting with the Government Office for the South East on 8 December had been disappointing. Mr Gilroy added that further dialogue with Government was necessary to address the issue of LAC being placed in Kent by other local authorities, and a mechanism was needed which would make it impossible, or would at least impose a financial penalty to make it very difficult financially, to place a child in Kent. Kent should be more aggressive in addressing this issue. All Kent Chief Executives and Leaders had recently signed a protocol to state that none of them would place any child in Margate.

2. The Board RESOLVED to place an item on the agenda for its May meeting to address this issue further.

21. Chairman's Announcements

(Item A4)

The Chairman reported that the Board's first informal meeting at County Hall with representatives of the Children In Care Council (CICC) had been enjoyable and useful, and she looked forward to welcoming representatives to the Board's meetings. She stated her intention to write to the CICC's Apprentice, Scott King, to invite him to attend a future meeting of the Board.

22. Oral update on the progress of the Protecting Children in Kent Review

(Item B1)

1. Mr Gilroy and Mr Thomason summarised the content and findings of the earlier two phases of the review and tabled documents, which included letters between Mr Gilroy and Ed Balls, the Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families. They explained that the final report of the review – titled 'Safeguarding Children in Kent: Defending and Developing the Service' - would be reported to the full County Council at its meeting on 1 April 2010.

2. Mr Gilroy set out some of the key findings and areas of recommendation which would appear in the final report, as follows:-

- a) Kent has the lowest child homicide rate in the UK, and the UK as a whole is a safe place in terms of child safeguarding, compared with many other European countries. The serious case review data prepared by Loughborough University, which will be included in the report, generally shows Kent in a good light;
- b) in terms of staffing and training, Kent has a good record of innovation, continuity and low turnover, and gives good quality supervision;
- c) the Integrated Children's System (ICS) is not fit for purpose, as 80% of practitioners' time is tied up in bureaucracy and administration. Given the increase in the number of referrals in the past year (previously reported as 46%, but now 22%, as the way in which they are recorded has changed), and the likelihood that this increase will continue, this is unsustainable. This view is supported by the Local Government Association and researchers at Loughborough University;

- d) Recommendation 19 of Lord Laming's report, that every referral should have a full assessment, is not sustainable or affordable, and money made available to fund these assessments will not directly benefit Kent's children. The level of support for Recommendation 19 among bodies dealing with Children's Social Work has not been clear;
- e) a few Children's Social Work (CSW) teams in Kent have a vacancy rate of 40%, and the recent and ongoing programme of international recruitment will not address this. The report will recommend that Kent rethink its position regarding university trainees. When such trainees have been recruited in the past, they have stayed in the job and been successful;
- f) the report will recommend multi-disciplinary training in Kent, delivered by the Universities in partnership with the Police, Children's Social Services and Health Visitors. Training could be delivered by actors in realistic home settings, and could be used to deliver Child Protection training to a range of final year students, including trainee teachers, GPs, Social Workers, nurses, etc;
- g) physical and sexual abuse is and always has been very difficult to deal with, and shared training will increase practitioners' confidence in dealing with it;
- h) thresholds should be clearly understood by all partners. Although only the Police, Social Services and the NSPCC have the statutory power to investigate Child Protection incidents, other organisations also have a responsibility, but it is difficult to agree among partners where thresholds are;
- i) the report will suggest collective responsibility for verification supervision, where CSW teams are particularly short-staffed; and
- j) the report will recommend a consultant post reporting directly to the Head of Paid Service and the Director of CFE. This post would have a strategic role and give an overview across the whole KCC, allowing an objective check.

3. Mr Gilroy concluded by saying that the future challenges that KCC will face in Child Protection work are unprecedented, but that Kent would approach these from a strong position with a background of good practice.

4. In discussion, and in response to questions, the following points were highlighted:-

- a) issues cited by Social Workers leaving the job were too much bureaucracy and admin work as well as the weight of the workload. Kent at best had had a 4 – 8% vacancy rate, but was now using agency staff to cover, which was not a desirable situation;

- b) Mr Gilroy said he would have reinstated the USA exchange programme, but had not included this as one of his recommendations;
- c) Ms Davies pointed out that, although 10 teams had been identified as having a 40% vacancy rate, the average vacancy rate across CSW teams was 29%, and had reduced since to 26%. Mr Gilroy agreed that the general picture in Kent was good, but that an interim arrangement was needed when the rate was particularly high;
- d) Kent could try other models for its CSW teams, such as the model trialled by Hackney Council. KCC Members and the Director of Specialist Children's Services were to visit Hackney shortly to see if Kent could learn from their experiences;
- e) all the high profile Child Protection cases which Kent had seen had involved families which were already known to Social Services, and the issues involved in these cases were familiar. New Social Workers needed to be familiar with and proficient in the 'sharp end of the job' as well as the preventative agenda; and
- g) Mr Worlock asked that the Kent Safeguarding Children Board (KSCB) receive a copy of Mr Gilroy's final report when it went to the County Council. He added that the KSCB had a very strong quality assurance mechanism in place and would further strengthen this in the next year.

5. RESOLVED that:-

- a) Mr Gilroy and his team be thanked for their work on the review and the preparation of the final report; and
- b) the Children's Champions Board recommends that the final report of the review be considered by the Cabinet on 29 March and the Vulnerable Children and Partnerships CFEPOSC on 31 March, before going to full County Council at its meeting on 1 April.

23. The Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA)

(Item B2)

The Chairman secured the Board's agreement to consider this and the following items as urgent business, as the papers had not been placed in the public domain with the required notice.

1. Mrs Weiss introduced the new ISA, which had been established in October 2009 to fulfil the recommendation of the Bichard report that one overall registration authority should cover all people who work with children and vulnerable people of all ages. Mr Arthur expanded on this by confirming that people need only register once to cover different types of involvement. Registration would be phased in over three years, first targeting staff who are new to the profession, then established staff who change jobs and finally existing staff within the children's workforce.

2. Mr Arthur highlighted a major area of concern; that the new regulations do not include any requirement for a self-employed person (e.g., a music teacher or language tutor) or anyone who might be employed using a direct payment, (e.g., commissioned directly by a parent to work with a disabled child), to register. These concerns had been expressed in writing to the ISA and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) on behalf of the Kent Safeguarding Children Board (KSCB), via the Safe Recruitment and Employment Sub-Group.

3. In discussion, and in Mrs Weiss's and Mr Arthur's responses to questions from Members, the following points were highlighted:-

- a) the implementation and monitoring of registration would be the responsibility of the personnel team within each KCC Directorate;
- b) a frequency test would be applied to identify who would and would not need to register, and the Secretary of State recently wrote to all local authorities clarifying this issue. For instance, a visiting author who goes into a school occasionally to help with a reading scheme would not be required to register, but someone attending more than once a week would be;
- c) the cost of the single, transferable, registration for paid staff is £64, including the CRB check, but volunteers registering would not have to pay this;
- d) the new arrangements applied only within the UK, but the existing CRB checking system, or an equivalent of it, applied in most countries, particularly within the commonwealth. Staff coming to work from abroad would bring with them whatever equivalent criminal record check existed in their home country, and this should be verified;
- e) having a fully-vetted person in charge of a group – e.g., a scout group - would not obviate the need for any other adult involved in that group to be properly CRB checked and registered; and
- f) a public education campaign might be needed, via KSCB, to introduce and clarify the new requirements, so that all sorts of groups and clubs would be clear and confident of their status and what was required of them and their participants.

4. RESOLVED that the report and the information given in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

24. Discussion of how ongoing Child Protection training should be delivered to Members (Item B3)

The Board considered that Child Protection training for Members had been adequately covered in the extensive induction process following the 2009 Elections, and that the training work undertaken by Mr Arthur's team was covered by the content of the Annual Report at item B4 on this agenda.

25. Children's Safeguard Unit Annual Report, for 2008/09 Academic Year
(Item B4)

1. Mr Arthur introduced the report and he and Mrs Weiss answered questions from Members, as follows:-

- a) the report highlighted training provided for Designated Child Protection Teachers but did not mention supervision of staff as advocated by Laming, and these were big issues for schools. Head Teachers and Governing bodies were expected to provide supervision but in reality this was very difficult to do;
- b) training was delivered to all schools and early years settings by the Children's Safeguards Team, but only Academies, Further Education Colleges and Independent Schools were currently charged for this service; Mr Arthur has been asked to present a paper to the Senior Management Team of CFE that considers a charging structure for all training in the future;
- c) Ofsted had recently become more rigorous in assessing the safeguarding policy and practice in a school, and the level required to secure a 'satisfactory' score was now higher. It was also recognised that safeguarding applies a 'limiting judgement' which can impact on the overall inspection outcome for the school;
- d) Over one third of allegations involve a referral to the Police and Children's Social Services but very few proceed to court. Allegations of physical abuse have to have clear evidence before they will be taken forward, but all allegations of sexual abuse will automatically be taken forward. However, very few sexual abuse allegations result in a successful court case, either because the evidence is insufficient or the child does not prove to be a reliable witness, due to communication difficulties. National statistics provided by the DCSF suggest that only 5% of all allegations lead to a conviction;
- e) the Children's Safeguards Team works with schools to improve the quality of information made available to support an allegation, to make cases easier to investigate and to establish a clear record of the outcome of an allegation for the protection of the employer and the individual; and
- f) Mr Warlock commented that in his opinion this was an excellent report that demonstrated a high level of safeguarding activity that any local authority in the country would be proud of.

2. RESOLVED that the report and the information given in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

By: Andrew Hickmott, Head of Children's Services, West Kent
To: Children's Champion Board
Subject: Housing for Care Leavers
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: Report setting out protocols, accommodation strategy, response by Districts

1. Introduction

1.1 Following publication of the Southwark Judgement (see below) work has been in hand to update the joint protocols for homeless young people in Kent. A working party of KCC and Housing Authority representatives (Policy & Performance team CFE, a CFE District manager, Supporting People, Connexions, Youth Offending Service, Catch 22 16plus) was established to revise the joint protocols in light of the judgement. Consultation has taken place with Children & Families Districts, Local Children's Services Partnerships, and local Housing Authorities. The Head of Children's services for West Kent attended the Joint Policy & Planning Board (Housing) (JPBB) in March, and subsequently re-convened a further meeting of the working party. The re-drafted protocols will be presented to the Joint Policy & Planning Board (Housing) on the 6 May, and it is intended to take forward for sign off to the respective senior managers groups after that date. Information leaflets for young people and practice guidance for District social workers and housing officers is being produced jointly between KCC and housing authorities.

2. Background

2.1 The Southwark Judgement (re 'G': 2009) concluded that any homeless 16 or 17 year old who requests assistance to find somewhere to live, will, in the majority of cases, be requiring more support than provision of accommodation only. An assessment of their circumstances must be carried out by a social worker according to the procedures set out in 'Assessment of children in Need and their Families' (DH2000). If mediation with their family fails, or if it is considered unsafe for them to return home, then they will be considered looked after under Section 20 of the Children Act 1989. Where a young person is excluded from home, is sofa surfing among friends, or is sleeping in a car, it is extremely likely that they will be a child in need. Similarly, where a 16 or 17 year old teenage parent is homeless, they are also likely to have significant needs. This means that they will require both accommodation and support. Whilst the local housing authority may be asked to assist in provision of accommodation, the young person will remain the responsibility of the children's social services department, and subsequently become an 'eligible child' under the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000. Only in a minority of cases, for example, where the young person has already been living independently for some time and has now become homeless, or where the young person is assessed to be competent to make a decision, and having been given full information, declined looked after

child status, will the responsibility fall to the housing authority to house under the provisions of the 1996 Homelessness legislation.

- 2.2 Following the judgement a letter was issued by Department for Children, Schools and Families to Directors of Children's Services, and by Communities & Local Government to Directors of Housing authorities setting out the above requirements. At the beginning of April 2010 statutory guidance was issued jointly by the Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under section 7 of the Local Authority Social Services Act 1970 and section 182 of the Housing Act 1996
- 2.3 Since the Southwark Judgement, relationships between Housing Officers and Duty Social Workers, have developed well in some parts of the county, but differential practice remains in others. Examples of best practice have occurred when a young person who initially approached the housing department, and who could not be rehabilitated home, has been found accommodation by the Housing Officer and a referral was made to the Duty Social Work team, who in turn completed the initial assessment of the case within the statutory 10 working days, and worked jointly (with Housing) to find a solution.
- 2.4 Difficulties have arisen where the young person refuses looked after child status having had the implications explained. Some Housing Officers have interpreted this as 'intentional homelessness' and refused to assist with accommodation. Both the judgement and the recent statutory guidance are clear however that looked after child status cannot be a 'coercive intervention', and that the provisions of the Homelessness legislation should be followed if the young person, having been deemed competent, and fully informed, declines such status.
- 2.5 There has been a lack of clarity locally and nationally about how the judgement should be interpreted in cases such as that outlined in paragraph 2.4 above, and also regarding the status of young couples and young parents. Following the issuing of the recent DCSF/CLG guidance these issues can be clarified by KCC legal services with children's services.

3. Policy Framework

- 3.1 Performance regarding provision of suitable housing for care leavers is assessed through National Indicator 147 which measures accommodation outcomes for young adults formerly in care. The indicator is intended to increase the proportion of former care leavers who are in suitable accommodation. The purpose of the indicator is to minimise the risk of care leavers being in unsuitable housing or becoming homeless (DCSF).
- 3.2 (2) The indicator requires the percentage of former care leavers aged 19 who were looked after in the following accommodation categories:
- With parents or relatives
 - Community home or other residential care such as an NHS establishment
 - Semi-independent e.g. supported hostel, trainer flats, self-contained accommodation with specialist personal assistance support (e.g. for young people with disabilities, pregnant young women and single parents); self-contained accommodation with floating support

- Lodgings without formal support (e.g. young people lodging with former foster carers)
 - Foyers and similar supported accommodation combining the accommodation with opportunities for education, training or employment
 - Independent living e.g. tenancy of flat, house or bedsit, including local authority or housing association, or university/college provision of accommodation. Flat sharing is included.
- 3.3 Other types of accommodation (including night shelters or bed & breakfast) would generally be considered unsuitable for care leavers.
- 3.4 The issue of suitability is reinforced in “Journeys to Home: Care leavers’ successful transition to independent accommodation” (National Care Advisory Service 2009); and the Statutory Guidance on Securing Sufficient Accommodation for looked after children (DCSF 2010).
- 3.5 Suitability is covered in the statutory guidance “Provision of Accommodation for 16 and 17 year old young people who may be homeless and/or require accommodation” (DCSF/CLG 2010) which states that bed and breakfast accommodation is not suitable for 16 or 17 year olds, even on an emergency basis. As well as the above, the use of foster care, properties with visiting support tailored to the young person’s needs and other types of supported accommodation are acceptable options. It is identified as particularly important that teenage parents are provided with accommodation which meets their needs for support around parenting and independent living skills, health and well-being, access to education and training.

(3) The 2010 statutory guidance sets out the immediate response to a homeless young person by:

- a. Housing
- b. Children’s social services

a. Where a homeless young person initially approaches the housing department, there is an immediate duty for the authority to secure suitable interim accommodation (section 188(1) of the 1996 Act) pending a decision whether any substantive duty is owed under Part 7.

Housing authorities should make an immediate referral to children’s services for an assessment. This applies to all 16 and 17 year old applicants without exception, including those who are pregnant and/or a parent.

The question whether any substantive duty is owed under Part 7 of the 1996 Act will depend in part on the outcome of the assessment by children’s services, and whether any duty is owed under section 20 of the 1989 Children Act

Housing services should continue to secure accommodation under section 188 (1) until they have notified the young person whether any substantive duty is owed.

Children’s services should complete an initial assessment as soon as possible and no later than the ten days set out in the Framework for the

Assessment of Children in Need and their families. Where children's services have accepted that they have a duty under section 20 and the 16 or 17 year old has accepted the accommodation, the young person will not be homeless and no further duty will be owed under Part 7 of the 1996 Act. The housing services should be notified by children's services immediately. Where accommodation is to be provided under section 20 arrangements for the move to a new placement should be made as quickly as possible

- b. Where a homeless young person initially approaches children's services or is referred to children's services by some other person or agency, then an assessment must be made to determine whether any duty is owed under section 20 of the Children Act 1989 to provide the young person with accommodation
- 3.6 Where the young person has nowhere safe to stay that night, then children's services must secure suitable emergency accommodation. This will mean that the young person will become looked after whilst their needs, including their need for continuing accommodation and support, are further assessed. A young person accommodated under section 20 will not be eligible for welfare benefits, including housing benefit. ⁽²⁾
- 3.7 A young person who is assessed to require accommodation under the provisions of section 20 will require continuing support and accommodation, and will be owed the duties under the Children (Leaving Care) Act when they cease to be looked after.
- 3.8 In some cases it may not be necessary for the young person to be accommodated because their needs can be met by providing support to go home, or to other responsible adults in the extended family. In such cases consideration must be given to providing support under section 17.

4. Implications

- 4.1 The 2010 statutory guidance states that it is good practice for an assessment of the young person's needs to be conducted jointly by both children's and housing services. Where this is not possible assessment and referral processes are to be supported by appropriate information-sharing so that "young people do not have to repeat their stories each time and navigate between offices which may be some way apart". Children's services will be the lead agency. The Joint protocols to address the needs of homeless young people will emphasise the need for joint assessments.
- 4.2 In addition to lone young people, the statutory guidance addresses young people with their partners who are homeless. Some difficult judgements have to be made by district social work teams regarding placement options for young people who could be accommodated under section 20 whilst living with a partner. In these cases (and in those of single young people who are not willing to co-operate with reasonable parents) it will be important not to undermine those parents, who would otherwise be competent to continue to care for the young person. The guidance proposes that placement in a self contained property with visiting support may be appropriate if the assessment concludes that the young person should become looked after.
- 4.3 There are two streams of work being undertaken in KCC regarding placements for 16 & 17 year old parents: Catch 22 16plus are recruiting supported lodgings providers for care leavers; and a review of the fostering service's parent and

child placement scheme in tandem with the launch of the Parenting Capacity Assessment teams, so that where there are safeguarding concerns regarding care of a vulnerable infant by a young parent, this can take place in a supportive foster home. There is a shortage of suitable accommodation for cases where the young parent is competent and does not wish to be looked after, which is currently leading to some young parents living in bed & breakfast accommodation.

- 4.4 Catch 22 16plus are not contracted to take case responsibility for young people in this age range until they meet the criteria for being relevant, eligible or former relevant children under the Leaving Care Act provisions, and therefore would not take on a role with a young person who became looked after due to homelessness until the 13 weeks had passed. However they have, where vacancies allow, been providing supported lodgings in a few cases, to 16/17 year old previously unknown young people.
- 4.5 Catch 22 16plus placed 246 care leavers in supported lodgings in the year 09/10. Monitoring of the expansion of demand for supported lodgings due to the Southwark Judgement will be required.
- 4.6 Kent's performance on N.I. 147 on suitable accommodation for care leavers appears to be slightly below national and statistical neighbours (79.4% in 06/07; 85.8% in 07/08; 82.9% in 08/09). Unaccompanied Asylum seeking young people who go missing due to immigration issues contribute to overall performance negatively. Excluding this group of young people shows performance to be 94.9%.
- 4.7 YOS and 16plus struggle to maintain young people who may have challenging or antisocial behaviour in suitable accommodation.
- 4.8 Before the ruling was made there was variation by housing districts in the number of applications to accommodate homeless young people. Figures for each quarter for the year from June 2008 showed that demand could be generally split into two ranges; those districts receiving a low number of approaches each quarter (between 1 and 5) , which were Sevenoaks, Swale and Thanet; and those receiving a high number (between 5 and 45), which included Gravesham (minimum 19, maximum 45), Ashford (16 to 30), Dover 21 to 27), Shepway (6 to 24), Tonbridge and Malling (12 to 20), Canterbury (10 to 16) and Dartford (5 to 14). Maidstone received between 6 and 8 referrals each quarter, and figures for Tunbridge Wells had not been collected for referrals until June 2009, when 9 young people presented to them as homeless.
- 4.9 Between June 2008 and the end of May 2009, there was a variation between the number of young people who became accommodated by housing in each quarter as follows: Shepway up to 18, Dartford up to 11, Thanet up to 9. Ashford up to 7, Dover up to 6, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Swale, Tunbridge Wells up to 5, Gravesham up to 4, Canterbury 2 and Tonbridge & Malling 1.
- 4.10 Use of bed and breakfast was higher in some housing districts than others, for example in total for each quarter (including previous 'entrants') Dartford used between 6 and 10 places, Dover between 5 and 10, Ashford up to 6, Canterbury and Shepway up to 5 each, Maidstone 4, Thanet and Tonbridge & Malling 2 each, Swale & Sevenoaks 1 place each, Gravesham and Tunbridge Wells were not using any B & B in the period.
- 4.11 From January 2010 data regarding 'Southwark Judgement' cases has been logged on the Integrated Children's System. Figures for March 2010 show 20 cases across the County where initial assessments were undertaken (January and February figures were lower, but it remains to be seen if this was due to gradual implementation of the new system). Initial assessments undertaken

where there was a stated 'housing' issue totalled 377 over the year commencing April 2009, with an average of 31 per month (range 16 – 44)

4.12 A snapshot is being taken to assess the potential hours spent by duty teams in responding to cases which come under the Southwark ruling. This covers the period 22nd March 2010 to the end of April. Full information is not yet available, but will give a view of the work involved.

4.13 Budgetary pressures are influencing:

a) availability of family group conferences for young people presenting as homeless.

b) the ability of Supporting People, to assist young people in the age range.

5. Consultations

5.1 The revision of the joint housing protocol has been developed in consultation with children's services, Catch 22 16plus, the asylum service, Supporting People, Connexions, YOS, District Housing authorities

6. Conclusion

6.1 Revision of the Joint Protocol to address the needs of homeless young people aged 16 to 21 in Kent is underway following the Southwark Judgement. The recent DCSF/CLG statutory guidance has clarified how the judgement should be interpreted and will be helpful in achieving agreement with the 12 housing districts.

6.2 Priority 4 of the Children & Young Person's Plan addresses the housing needs of young people.

7. Recommendations

7.1 That this report is noted, and that the Board seeks further evaluation regarding meeting the accommodation needs of vulnerable young people.

7.2 That the Board supports the review of the contract with Catch 22 16plus by the Contracts Review Group to establish if the service can be extended to work with homeless young people who become Looked After Children after their 16th birthday, so consideration is given to the expertise of the service being used with this group.

7.3 That the Board supports the consideration of the joint protocols for sign off by the respective management groups, following the Joint Policy and Planning Board in May.

Background Documents:

The Children Act 1989

The Children Act 2004

Framework for Assessment of Children in Need and their Families, DH 2000

Homelessness Code of Guidance for Local Authorities CLG 2006

Homelessness(Priority Need for Accommodation) (England) Order 2002

Joint protocol to address the needs of homeless young people aged 16 to 21 in Kent, KCC/JPPB 2009/10 (revision)

Journeys to Home: Care leavers' successful transition to independent accommodation"
NCAS 2009

Provision of Accommodation for 16 & 17 year old young people who may be homeless and/or require accommodation, DCSF, CLG April 2010

R (G) v Southwark (2009) UKHL 26

Statutory Guidance on Securing Sufficient Accommodation for looked after children
DCSF 2010.

Other Useful Information:

(1) Section 7 of the 1970 Act requires local authorities in exercising their social services functions to act under the general guidance of the Secretary of State; unless there are exceptional reasons in individual cases authorities are expected to comply with this guidance. Section 182 of the 1996 Act requires housing authorities and social services authorities, in the exercise of their functions relating to homelessness and the prevention of homelessness, to have regard to such guidance as may from time to time be given by the Secretary of State.

(2) There are exceptions for lone parents and disabled young people who may have established entitlement to non-means tested benefits.

(3) Clarification has been requested from housing regarding the figures for Thanet, where accommodations appear to exceed referrals.

Author Contact Details

Mandy Lowe, Policy & Performance Officer (LAC)

✉ mandy.lowe@kent.gov.uk

☎ 01622 694696

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Paul Brightwell, Policy and Performance Manager – Looked After Children/leaving Care

To: Children’s Champions Board – 19 May 2010

Subject: The placement of Looked After Children by other local authorities in Kent

Classification: Unrestricted/Exempt

Summary: An update report on young people placed in Kent by other local authorities.

Introduction

1. (1) The report provides an update on children and young people placed into Kent by other local authorities (OLA LAC) since the previous report presented to the Children’s Champion Board in November 2009).
- (2) The report does not focus on issues relating to KCC Citizen LAC placed out of authority or unaccompanied asylum seeking children and the pressures this places on Kent as a gateway authority in securing sufficient and appropriate placements for them.

Background

2. (1) A number of local authorities, particularly London Boroughs, place large numbers of their Looked After Children outside their local authority areas. Inevitably, distance from home and community makes it difficult to meet these children’s needs by the placing authority alone, which has led schools and other agencies to express concern that these children are disadvantaged in comparison with KCC LAC.
- (2) Kent as an authority has been adversely affected by this practice – it is a net importer of OLA LAC, while the placement of KCC LAC out of area is relatively modest, being determined on the needs of individual children with respect to their permanency plans.
- (3) The responsible local authority placing the child out of area remains legally responsible for ensuring that the child’s needs are being met and their welfare is promoted. This includes ensuring that the child has a named social worker, Independent Reviewing Officer, an up to date Care Plan (including a PEP, Health Plan and Permanency Plan) and a suitable placement. Host authorities have limited responsibilities (or rights) in relation to OLA LAC. These are:
 - (a) Identification of provision of a school place (if statutory school age)
 - (b) Assessment and provision of education support
 - (c) Child Protection investigation arising out of the child’s placement in the host authority area
 - (d) Primary and other free health services
 - (e) Connexions Service

- (4) The negative impact upon both children and the host authority of the practice of placing LAC long distances from their home has been well documented in the inquiries led by Utting and Warner in the 80's and 90's and locally in KCC's Thanet Report (2004). The government recognises the problem and has in the past:
- (a) Reminded authorities of the legal requirement to notify/seek agreement from the proposed host
 - (b) Introduced the less than 20 miles from the family home performance indicator (which is not part of the current National Indicator System)
 - (c) Set up a LAC Taskforce to help authorities develop a more robust commissioning process.
- (5) Kent has worked hard to bring this matter to government attention, which has included:
- (a) Lobbying government to introduce national protocols on placing LAC out of authority – including a requirement that money should follow the child (a proposal which so far has been rejected)
 - (b) Work directly with authorities to encourage them to develop local placement strategies
 - (c) Work with Independent Fostering Agencies (IFAs) and P&V Sector to persuade them to take their services to the authorities that need them rather than making the child move.
 - (d) Encourage authorities not to place in particular parts of Kent (i.e. Thanet)
- (6) None of these measures has had any significant impact on reducing the numbers of OLA LAC in Kent. Since the introduction of Care Matters in 2007, the number of OLA LAC in Kent has shown an upward trend, increasing by approximately 200 children.
- (7) There are ongoing concerns that the large number of OLA LAC is impacting on the ability of KCC to undertake its corporate parenting responsibilities. The most recent education performance figures on National Indicators (NIs) 99 to 101 (September 2009) suggest that KCC LAC are underperforming in relation to predicted targets on these NIs. With respect to the health of LAC, while performance on health assessments and dental checks is now equivalent to the national average, Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) are reporting that in the majority of cases KCC LAC are failing to receive an initial health assessment within 28 days of becoming looked after. This statutory requirement is an important baseline for monitoring health needs from the point children become looked after.
- (8) CFE SMT has recently (March 2010) decided that the role of Kent's Headteacher for LAC and Care Leavers should focus primarily on promoting better outcomes for KCC LAC, with the benefits for OLA LAC being indirect through the role that the Head Teacher for LAC has in driving up standards for LAC generally within Kent Schools and their support services and in networking with other Virtual School Headteachers.
- (9) The Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations Volume 2: Care Planning, Placement, and Case Review (DCSF, April 2010) sets out specific measures to reduce the number of children being placed out of authority through the Sufficiency Duty and Regulation 11 (see briefing at Appendix 1).

- (10) With respect to funding of OLA LAC, there is no measure (either current or to be introduced) that forces responsible authorities to reimburse host authorities/partner agencies for the full cost of services provided by them to these children except in very narrow circumstances:
- (a) Where a Local Authority places a looked after child with a Statement of SEN in another Local Authority the placing authority is financially responsible for the special educational provision (as determined by reference to regulation 7 of the 'Belonging Regulations'). The receiving authority will be able to recoup the cost of the statement through the normal recoupment process as determined by the Education (Inter-authority Recoupment) Regulations 1994. Where an assessment of SEN of a looked after child placed by another Local Authority results in a statement the cost of the statement will also be recouped under the same regulations.
 - (b) As set out in the NHS Responsible Commissioner Guidance

Key Details – Looked after children placed in Kent by other local authorities

3. (1) As at 28/02/2010 KCC records show that there were 1383 children/young people looked after by another authority placed in Kent. This is a decrease of 42 since 2/11/2009, although it is 56 higher than numbers at March 2009 and 159 higher since March 2007. A detailed breakdown of OLA LAC by placing authority is presented in the 4 tables presented at Appendix 2.
- (2) With respect to age breakdown, the November 2009 report highlighted that the majority of OLA LAC placed in Kent are aged between 11 years and 17 years (approximately 67%), with 14 and 15 years being the largest age groups. Based on January 2008 data it would be expected that the majority of these children/young people are male (62%). This is a slightly higher proportion when compared to KCC LAC (55% male) and national average (55%).
- (3) The data shows that, excluding Medway, there are 11 authorities (all London Boroughs) that place 10% or more of their LAC in Kent:
- Bexley (28.8%)
 - Greenwich (21.5%)
 - Havering (16.5%)
 - Lewisham (14.3%)
 - Waltham Forest (12.1%)
 - Newham (11.3%)
 - Sutton (11.2%)
 - Hounslow (10.9%)
 - Islington (10.5%)
 - Merton (10.4%)
 - Bromley (10%)
- (4) Based on the 28/02/2010 data there are 89 authorities who have one or more of their looked after children placed in Kent – a reduction of 5 authorities since November 2009.

Background Documents:

Appendix 1:

Briefing 3: Sufficiency – statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for looked after children

Appendix 2:

Breakdown of OLA LAC placed in Kent

Author Contact Details

Paul Brightwell, Policy and Performance Manager, Looked After Children/Leaving Care

✉ paul.brightwell@kent.gov.uk

☎ 01622 694308

Appendix 1:
Briefing 3: Sufficiency - statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for looked after children

Introduction

The briefing is one of a series of briefings on the revised Children Act 1989 regulations and statutory guidance, based on the proposals in the Government White Paper (Care Matters) (DCSF 2007) and the resulting legislative changes outlined in the Children and Young Person's Act 2008.

The other briefings are:

Briefing 1: The Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations, Volume 2: Care Planning, Placement and Case Review – sets out the main functions and responsibilities of local authorities and partner agencies under part 3 of the Children Act 1989 with respect to looked after children – including eligible children (young people looked after aged over 16 years of age).

The guidance on sufficiency is one of three supporting pieces of guidance that accompany The Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations, Volume 2. The other two are described in other briefings, which are:

Briefing 2: IRO Handbook (statutory guidance for independent reviewing officers and local authorities on their functions in relation to case management and review for looked after children)

Briefing 4: Short Breaks (statutory guidance on how to safeguard and promote the welfare of disabled children using short breaks).

Briefing 5 focuses on the Transition Planning to Adulthood 2010 Regulations and Statutory Guidance, which update the Children (leaving care) (England) Act 2000 - which focus on promoting the needs of care leavers (relevant and former relevant children).

A full copy of the Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations, Volume 2: Care Planning, Placement and Case Review; IRO Handbook; Guidance on the Sufficiency duty and Short breaks (relating to briefings 1 to 4) can be found out:

<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/everychildmatters/safeguardingandsocialcare/childrenincare/careplanning/careplanning/>

* A full copy of the draft guidance on Transition Planning to Adulthood 2010 and the Children leaving care Regulations 2010 (briefing 5) can be found at:

<http://leavingcareconsultation.dcsf.gov.uk/downloads>

Sufficiency

Briefing 3 focuses on the 'sufficiency duty', which requires local authorities to take steps that secure, so far as reasonably practicable, sufficient accommodation within the authority's area which meets the needs of children that the local authority are looking after, and whose circumstances are such that it would be consistent with their welfare for them to be provided with accommodation that is in the local authority's area.

Reference to the sufficiency duty is also made in the Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations, Volume 2 (*referred to in the briefing as the main guidance*) (see pages 78 to 80, paragraphs 3.177 to 3.183).

Chapter 1: Introduction (pages 3 to 7) sets out aims and status, clarifies those involved, and describes the context and timescales for implementation of the sufficiency duty. Two issues are outlined in detail:

- Paragraphs 1.1 to 1.6 set out the legal context for the sufficiency duty – under Section 22G of the Revised Children Act 1989. See also Annex 1 (page 34) and main guidance (paragraphs 3.180 and 3.181).
- Regulation 11 (together with Regulation 13, which applies to all LAC) (see main guidance, page 157) sets out requirements on local authorities placing children out of area to ensure proper planning, consultation and notification has taken place. It is expected that local authorities will undertake these tasks prior to placement in planned placements and within 5 working days for emergency placements.
- The implementation of the sufficiency duty is to be phased (see paragraphs 1.16 to 1.17).
 - From April 2010 local authorities are required to include in relevant commissioning strategies their plans for meeting the sufficiency duty.
 - From April 2011 – working with their children's trust partners – local authorities must be in a position to secure, where reasonably practical, sufficient accommodation for LAC in their LA area.

Chapter 2: About the sufficiency duty (pages 8 to 15) explains:

- Why the sufficiency duty is being introduced (paragraphs 2.4 to 2.8) (i.e. as part of a range of measures to improve outcomes)
- What is meant by 'sufficiency' (see paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and main guidance, paragraphs 3.179 and 3.180). This includes not only ensuring sufficient numbers of placements but must also have regard to:
 - The benefits of securing a range of accommodation through a number of providers that can meet the wide ranging needs of the authorities LAC population including children on the edge of care (paragraph 2.10)
 - The role that different placement types play in securing provision (i.e. short breaks, emergency placements, adoption, fostering, residential care and secure accommodation)
 - The skills, expertise and characteristics needed by carers

- Accessible housing for disabled children
- The needs of care leavers – including arrangements for young people to remain with their foster carers and supported accommodators, the range of additional services needed to meet the needs of LAC and promote placement stability (see paragraph 2.11).
- Paragraph 2.12 highlights that local authorities should not move children out of established out of authority placements that are meeting the needs of the child for the sole reason of meeting the sufficiency duty.
- Paragraphs 2.14 to 2.21 describe what is meant by the term 'reasonably practicable' (see also main guidance, paragraphs 3.181 to 3.183). This section highlights that local authorities should not assume that it is not reasonably practical to secure sufficient accommodation simply because it is difficult to do so – any constraining factors should not be taken as permanent constraints (paragraph 2.16). However – the overriding aim is to secure the most appropriate placement for the child rather than a narrow focus on whether the placement is out of area or not.
- Paragraph 2.22 states how the sufficiency duty will be monitored – under the current arrangements for Comprehensive Area Assessment.

Chapter 3: Using Commissioning to deliver efficiency (pages 16 to 17) sets out the process for commissioning (paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4), which is expanded upon in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Standard for commissioning practice (pages 18 to 29) (see also main guidance page 80, paragraphs 3.182 and 3.183) requires local authorities to work with trust partners to demonstrate an effective level of commissioning, based on a standard covering 6 areas:

- Individual assessment and care planning – setting out the needs of the child and the planned outcomes (paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3)
- Commissioning decision – to secure the right decision, the first time and thereby promoting placement stability, service efficiency and effectiveness (paragraphs 4.4 to 4.6)
- Strategic needs assessment – based upon comprehensive aggregate data about the needs of LAC and which should inform the CYPP and commissioning strategies for a range of services (paragraphs 4.7 to 4.9)
- Market management – focuses on resource analysis and workforce development, with an emphasis on the leadership role of commissioners in establishing incentivised markets and securing sufficient provision (paragraphs 4.10 to 4.13)
- Collaboration – refers to the extent to which partners work together to secure outcomes through commissioning (paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15), and
- Securing Services – requires commissioners to be familiar with and to employ sophisticated commissioning mechanisms and approaches to

performance management to secure efficient and effective services
(paragraphs 4.16 to 4.18)

Chapter 5: Further Information and next steps (pages 30 to 32) provides a signpost to sources of information relevant to the tasks required to meet the sufficiency duty. This includes:

- Policy - page 30
- Commissioning practice - page 31
- Tools – pages 31 and 32

References – a list of articles and publications used in the guidance can be found on page 33.

Annex 1: Excerpt from the Children Act 1989 (page 34) outlines section 22G General duty of local authority to secure sufficient accommodation for looked after children.

Annex 2: Overview of statutory framework for care planning (page 35)

Paul Brightwell – Performance and Quality Assurance Manager – Looked After Children/Leaving Care

Email; paul.brightwell@kent.gov.uk

Tel: 01622 694308

14 April 2010

Other Local Authority Looked After Children Placed In KCC, as at 28/2/2010

Source: ICS

All London Boroughs, in descending order of Total

LA	District Placed In													Total	In EK	%	
	Ash	Can	Dar	Dov	Gra	Mail	Sev	She	Swa	Tha	T&M	Tun	n/k				NTBD
Greenwich	5	12	34	4	9	7	21		13	7	2		1	1	116	32	27.6%
Lewisham	2	5	5	1	7	7	23		9	7	1				67	21	31.3%
Newham	3	7	3	3	10	2	5	2	7	21					63	35	55.6%
Bexley	2	1	25	1	12	1	9		1	5	2		3		62	7	11.3%
Lambeth	4	9	1	1	7	1	4		6	10	3				46	25	54.3%
Southwark	4	3	7	1	1	2	13	2	3	7	2				45	13	28.9%
Waltham Forest	4	3	2	4	7		1	1	11	5	1		2		41	19	46.3%
Hounslow	3	3	3	2	2	6	1	4	4	16					37	23	62.2%
Havering	3	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	5	5	5		1	2	33	13	39.4%
Islington	3	4	1	4	1		4	2	1	11			1		32	16	50.0%
Haringey	3	2	6		5			4	5	6					31	13	41.9%
Barnet	1	2	2	1	1	3		4	8	5		2	1		29	15	51.7%
Hillingdon	3	6	3	1	1			2	6	6			1		29	18	62.1%
Tower Hamlets	1	1	3		5	5		4	4	5	3				28	10	35.7%
Barking and Dagenham	1	3		8	2		1	1	5	4			1		26	12	46.2%
Bromley	1	3			2		7	3	1	3	1	3	2		25	6	24.0%
Croydon	3	3		1	1		4		1	8	3				24	12	50.0%
Hackney	4	1		6			3	1	1	3			1	2	22	5	22.7%
Ealing	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	6			1		18	10	55.6%
Enfield	4	4	2		2	3	1	1	1	2					16	7	43.8%
Westminster	3	1		1	1	2			4	3		1	1		16	8	50.0%
Redbridge	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	3	5					15	9	60.0%
Rushmore	2	2		2	2			2	2	4					14	8	57.1%
Sutton	4	4		1	1			1	1	3			1		12	8	66.7%
Wandsworth	1	1		1	1				5	3	1				12	9	75.0%
Merton	5			1	4		4		1	1	1				12	6	50.0%
Wandsworth	2	2	1	2	1				5	5					11	7	63.6%
Hammersmith and Fulham	2				1				1	3	3		1		11	4	36.4%
Harrow	1	1		1	1		1	3	1	3					10	2	20.0%
Kingston Upon Thames	1	1	1	2		1	1	2	1	1	1				10	4	50.0%
Brent	3							1		4					8	6	85.7%
Richmond Upon Thames	1								1	6					7	3	50.0%
Camden								1	1	2	2				6	3	50.0%
Total	66	93	97	54	88	43	98	35	111	182	27	6	19	5	924	386	41.8%

Non London Boroughs, with 10 placements or above within KCC, in descending order of Total

LA	District Placed In													Total	In EK	%	
	Ash	Can	Dar	Dov	Gra	Mail	Sev	She	Swa	Tha	T&M	Tun	n/k				NTBD
Medway	4	13	2	1	3	3	1		47	5	4		6		89	65	73.0%
Surrey	5	3	1	1	2	1	8	6	3	2	1	2		1	36	8	22.2%
Essex	4	3	2	4	2		2	7	2	5	1	1		1	34	10	29.4%
Hertfordshire	1	3		1	3		1	5	3	4			7	1	29	10	34.5%
East Sussex	4	1				1	2	5	2	3		2	1		21	6	28.6%
Cambridgeshire	3	4		1	1			4	3	4	1				20	11	55.0%
Birmingham	3		2	1	1			1	1	3				2	14	4	28.6%
Northamptonshire	3	1						3	4	3					14	8	57.1%
West Sussex	1	2	3			1	5		1	1	1		1		14	3	21.4%
Brighton & Hove	4	2		1					3			1			12	5	41.7%
Thurrock	1	1	2		1				1	1	4		2		12	2	16.7%
Hampshire	1	1				1		3	2	1	1		1		11	4	36.4%
Suffolk	3							1	1	6					11	7	63.6%
Total	37	33	12	10	12	7	19	35	73	37	13	6	18	5	317	143	45.1%

Note: NTBD = Not to be disclosed
Management Information Unit
KCC CFE Commissioning and Partnerships

Other Local Authority Looked After Children Placed In KCC, as at 28/2/2010

All London Boroughs, in descending order of Percentage

LA	Total LAC	Total Recorded as	% Recorded as
	31/3/2009	Placed in KCC	
	Source: SSDA 903	Source: KCC ICS	Being Placed in KCC
Bexley	215	62	28.8%
Greenwich	540	116	21.5%
Havering	200	33	16.5%
Lewisham	470	67	14.3%
Waltham Forest	340	41	12.1%
Newham	560	63	11.3%
Sutton	125	14	11.2%
Hounslow	340	37	10.9%
Islington	305	32	10.5%
Merton	115	12	10.4%
Bromley	250	25	10.0%
Kingston Upon Thames	110	10	9.1%
Barnet	330	29	8.8%
Lambeth	545	46	8.4%
Southwark	535	45	8.4%
Tower Hamlets	345	28	8.1%
Richmond Upon Thames	90	7	7.8%
Westminster	215	16	7.4%
Harrow	150	11	7.3%
Kensington and Chelsea	165	12	7.3%
Redbridge	215	15	7.0%
Hackney	325	22	6.8%
Barking and Dagenham	385	26	6.8%
Hillingdon	450	29	6.4%
Haringey	490	31	6.3%
Enfield	260	16	6.2%
Wandsworth	230	12	5.2%
Ealing	400	18	4.5%
Hammersmith and Fulham	280	11	3.9%
Croydon	1,075	24	2.2%
Brent	360	8	2.2%
Camden	270	6	2.2%
Total	10,685	924	8.6%

Non London Boroughs, with 10 placements or above within KCC, in descending order of percentage

LA	Total LAC	Total Recorded as	% Recorded as
	31/3/2009	Placed in KCC	
	Source: SSDA 903	Source: KCC ICS	Being Placed in KCC
Medway	310	89	28.7%
Thurrock	220	12	5.5%
East Sussex	470	21	4.5%
Cambridgeshire	450	20	4.4%
Surrey	820	36	4.4%
Brighton & Hove	405	12	3.0%
Hertfordshire	995	29	2.9%
Essex	1,325	34	2.6%
Northamptonshire	655	14	2.1%
West Sussex	745	14	1.9%
Suffolk	710	11	1.5%
Hampshire	1,085	11	1.0%
Birmingham	2,090	14	0.7%
Total	10,280	317	3.1%

Children Placed In KCC by OLAs

London Boroughs

In descending order of changes since 31/01/2004

	Change since...								
	30/09/03	31/01/04	31/03/05	31/03/08	23/03/09	28/02/10			
Greenwich	44	51	69	81	81	116	increase of 65	increase of 47	increase of 35
Newham	33	29	52	48	61	63	increase of 34	increase of 11	increase of 2
Bexley	72	37	44	54	61	62	increase of 25	increase of 18	increase of 1
Waltham Forest	21	24	41	32	38	41	increase of 17	no change	increase of 3
Lewisham	50	55	49	48	54	67	increase of 12	increase of 18	increase of 13
Barnet	26	21	22	19	28	29	increase of 8	increase of 7	increase of 1
Richmond Upon Thames	2	0	1	5	6	7	increase of 7	increase of 6	increase of 1
Harrow	4	4	9	8	12	11	increase of 7	increase of 2	decrease of 1
Havering	33	27	29	28	30	33	increase of 6	increase of 4	increase of 3
Wandsworth	6	6	9	11	9	12	increase of 6	increase of 3	increase of 3
Westminster	9	10	14	14	14	16	increase of 6	increase of 2	increase of 2
Kingston Upon Thames	5	5	3	11	9	10	increase of 5	increase of 7	increase of 1
Redbridge	8	11	11	11	15	15	increase of 4	increase of 4	no change
Southwark	46	43	40	50	43	45	increase of 2	increase of 5	increase of 2
Barking and Dagenham	17	24	30	16	27	26	increase of 2	decrease of 4	decrease of 1
Ealing	19	17	20	22	15	18	increase of 1	decrease of 2	increase of 3
Kensington and Chelsea	7	12	11	19	14	12	no change	increase of 1	decrease of 2
Merton	12	13	8	8	11	12	decrease of 1	increase of 4	increase of 1
Haringey	40	35	36	33	24	31	decrease of 4	decrease of 5	increase of 7
Sutton	18	19	19	15	16	14	decrease of 5	decrease of 5	decrease of 2
Hounslow	47	43	35	36	32	37	decrease of 6	increase of 2	increase of 5
Hammersmith and Fulham	19	17	18	10	11	11	decrease of 6	decrease of 7	no change
Lambeth	52	54	42	52	41	46	decrease of 8	increase of 4	increase of 5
Hackney	32	32	37	31	25	22	decrease of 10	decrease of 15	decrease of 3
Enfield	20	27	18	14	17	16	decrease of 11	decrease of 2	decrease of 1
Hillingdon	39	44	45	33	33	29	decrease of 15	decrease of 16	decrease of 4
Brent	22	26	19	10	11	8	decrease of 18	decrease of 11	decrease of 3
Islington	38	57	43	30	36	32	decrease of 25	decrease of 11	decrease of 4
Croydon	55	52	40	26	26	24	decrease of 28	decrease of 16	decrease of 2
Tower Hamlets	52	56	51	28	35	28	decrease of 28	decrease of 23	decrease of 7
Bromley	51	54	36	25	31	25	decrease of 29	decrease of 11	decrease of 6
Camden	38	36	12	6	5	6	decrease of 30	decrease of 6	increase of 1

Children Placed In EK (Canterbury, Swale and Thanet) by OLAs

London Boroughs only

In descending order of changes since 31/01/2004

	In descending order of changes since 31/01/2004					Change since..		
	30/09/03	31/01/04	31/03/05	23/03/09	28/02/10	31/01/04	31/03/05	23/03/09
Newham	24	22	33	32	35	increase of 13	increase of 2	increase of 3
Waltham Forest	6	8	17	14	19	increase of 11	increase of 2	increase of 5
Greenwich	21	22	27	29	32	increase of 10	increase of 5	increase of 3
Richmond Upon Thames	0	0	0	6	6	increase of 6	increase of 6	no change
Westminster	6	5	10	7	8	increase of 3	decrease of 2	increase of 1
Ealing	11	8	13	9	10	increase of 2	decrease of 3	increase of 1
Harrow	2	2	5	2	4	increase of 2	decrease of 1	increase of 2
Wandsworth	4	4	5	6	6	increase of 2	increase of 1	no change
Barnet	19	14	15	14	15	increase of 1	no change	increase of 1
Kensington and Chelsea	7	8	8	9	8	no change	no change	decrease of 1
Kingston Upon Thames	2	2	1	4	2	no change	increase of 1	decrease of 2
Merton	9	10	6	8	9	decrease of 1	increase of 3	increase of 1
Redbridge	7	10	10	8	9	decrease of 1	decrease of 1	increase of 1
Bromley	6	8	4	3	6	decrease of 2	increase of 2	increase of 3
Lewisham	23	24	19	17	21	decrease of 3	increase of 2	increase of 4
Sutton	11	11	11	6	8	decrease of 3	decrease of 3	increase of 2
Hammersmith and Fulham	12	11	13	7	7	decrease of 4	decrease of 6	no change
Lambeth	28	29	20	18	25	decrease of 4	increase of 5	increase of 7
Bexley	23	13	16	10	7	decrease of 6	decrease of 9	decrease of 3
Havering	23	19	21	18	13	decrease of 6	decrease of 8	decrease of 5
Barking and Dagenham	13	19	23	8	12	decrease of 7	decrease of 11	increase of 4
Enfield	8	14	10	7	7	decrease of 7	decrease of 3	no change
Hounslow	35	30	26	19	23	decrease of 7	decrease of 3	increase of 4
Croydon	25	21	22	11	12	decrease of 9	decrease of 10	increase of 1
Brent	10	15	12	6	4	decrease of 11	decrease of 8	decrease of 2
Haringey	26	24	22	13	13	decrease of 11	decrease of 9	no change
Hillingdon	25	29	35	19	18	decrease of 11	decrease of 17	decrease of 1
Southwark	30	26	25	10	13	decrease of 13	decrease of 12	increase of 3
Tower Hamlets	25	25	24	13	10	decrease of 15	decrease of 14	decrease of 3
Islington	19	32	25	18	16	decrease of 16	decrease of 9	decrease of 2
Camden	23	20	9	2	3	decrease of 17	decrease of 6	increase of 1
Hackney	27	25	25	8	5	decrease of 20	decrease of 20	decrease of 3

Non London Boroughs

In descending order of changes since 31/01/2004

	30/09/03	31/01/04	31/03/05	23/03/09	28/02/10	Change since...	31/01/04	31/03/05	23/03/09
Medway	13	13	15	40	65	increase of 52	increase of 50	increase of 25	
Cambridgeshire	2	3	8	11	11	increase of 8	increase of 3	no change	
Hertfordshire	3	3	7	12	10	increase of 7	increase of 3	decrease of 2	
Suffolk	6	2	2	4	7	increase of 5	increase of 5	increase of 3	
Manchester			2	4	4	increase of 4	increase of 2	no change	
Bracknell Forest				1	3	increase of 3	increase of 3	increase of 2	
Dudley		3	3	5	6	increase of 3	increase of 3	increase of 1	
Surrey	7	5	17	13	8	increase of 3	decrease of 9	decrease of 5	
Walsall			3	3	3	increase of 3	no change	no change	
Warwickshire				3	3	increase of 3	increase of 3	no change	
Bridgend				1	2	increase of 2	increase of 2	increase of 1	
Buckinghamshire		1		1	3	increase of 2	increase of 3	increase of 2	
East Sussex	5	5	2	7	7	increase of 2	increase of 5	no change	
Oxfordshire	3	2	1	2	4	increase of 2	increase of 3	increase of 2	
Peterborough	4	1	1	2	3	increase of 2	increase of 2	increase of 1	
Worcestershire					2	increase of 2	increase of 2	increase of 2	
Derbyshire					1	increase of 1	increase of 1	increase of 1	
Middlesborough	4	1	3	2	2	increase of 1	decrease of 1	no change	
Milton Keynes	2		3	2	1	increase of 1	decrease of 2	decrease of 1	
Neath & Port Talbot					1	increase of 1	increase of 1	increase of 1	
Norfolk	3	3		2	4	increase of 1	increase of 4	increase of 2	
Nottingham City	1	1	2		2	increase of 1	no change	increase of 2	
Reading	3	3	3	3	4	increase of 1	increase of 1	increase of 1	
Solihull			2	1	1	increase of 1	decrease of 1	no change	
Telford and Wrekin			1	1	1	increase of 1	no change	no change	
West Sussex	2	2	3	8	3	increase of 1	no change	decrease of 5	
Windsor and Maidenhead					1	increase of 1	increase of 1	increase of 1	
Wokingham					1	increase of 1	increase of 1	increase of 1	
Berkshire	1	1	1		1	no change	no change	increase of 1	
Bournemouth				2		no change	no change	decrease of 2	
Brighton and Hove	4	5	5	4	5	no change	no change	increase of 1	
Bristol			1			no change	decrease of 1	no change	
Kingston	1					no change	no change	no change	
Poole			1			no change	decrease of 1	no change	
Rotherham			1			no change	decrease of 1	no change	
Sandwell	2	2	2	2	2	no change	no change	no change	
South Glamorgan			2			no change	decrease of 2	no change	
South Gloucestershire			1			no change	decrease of 1	no change	
Southampton	1	2			2	no change	increase of 2	increase of 2	
Swansea				1		no change	no change	decrease of 1	
West Berkshire				1		no change	no change	decrease of 1	
Cardiff	1	1				decrease of 1	no change	no change	
Flintshire	1	1				decrease of 1	no change	no change	
Gloucestershire	1	1				decrease of 1	no change	no change	
Lincolnshire	1	1				decrease of 1	no change	no change	
North Tyneside	1	1				decrease of 1	no change	no change	
Northamptonshire	8	9	11	8	8	decrease of 1	decrease of 3	no change	
Slough	3	3	3	1	2	decrease of 1	decrease of 1	increase of 1	
Swindon	3	2		1	1	decrease of 1	increase of 1	no change	
Tameside	1	1	1	1		decrease of 1	decrease of 1	decrease of 1	
Wiltshire	1	1		1		decrease of 1	no change	decrease of 1	
Dorset	2	2	2	1		decrease of 2	decrease of 2	decrease of 1	
Kingston-Upon-Hull	2	2	3			decrease of 2	decrease of 3	no change	
Southend	8	8	24	11	6	decrease of 2	decrease of 18	decrease of 5	
Hampshire	7	7	8	3	4	decrease of 3	decrease of 4	increase of 1	
Nottinghamshire	4	3	1	1		decrease of 3	decrease of 1	decrease of 1	
Birmingham	7	9	5	6	4	decrease of 5	decrease of 1	decrease of 2	
Luton	7	8	5	3	3	decrease of 5	decrease of 2	no change	
Coventry	10	9	9	1	2	decrease of 7	decrease of 7	increase of 1	
Thurrock	8	9	1	4	2	decrease of 7	increase of 1	decrease of 2	
Bedfordshire	13	13	13	5	4	decrease of 9	decrease of 9	decrease of 1	
Essex	25	27	29	8	10	decrease of 17	decrease of 19	increase of 2	