

## Health & Dental Checks – Children in Care (follow up) Audit

Annex A

Audit	Background to review	Key findings	Audit opinion (1)	Recommendations for improvement (Priority) (2)
Health & Dental Checks – Children in Care (follow up)	<p>As corporate parent for Looked After Children (LAC), SCC has a duty to ensure their well-being. Ensuring that these children have regular health and dental checks is part of the statutory exercise of this duty. Success is measured by a performance indicator which tracks the percentage of LAC who have received a health and dental check each year. In 2012, Internal Audit undertook a review of the quality of the indicator data. The resulting report (audit opinion of Major Improvement Needed) expressed concerns about the robustness of performance management governing the indicator, and concluded that published performance data could not be consistently evidenced.</p>	<p>The Department for Education no longer require reporting on this indicator. The manner in which the indicator is calculated masks a difference in completion rates between health and dental checks.</p> <p>Health checks for 24 of the 86 files tested could not be validated (28%). In the last audit, the result of the same test was 20%. As such, reported health check completion is less evidencible than previously.</p> <p>Significant delays were noted between the time CSS were notified of a completed health check and their receiving the corresponding paperwork. However, the auditor is aware that, once the audit sample list was known, Team Information Officers were able to request and receive summary documents for 14 LAC from the LAC Co-ordinator at short notice. This inclines the auditor to consider that the flow of information in the partnership is not as efficient as it could be.</p>	Major Improvement Needed	<p>CSS should consider reporting performance on LAC health and dental checks separately, rather than exclusively using the existing combined indicator. <b>(M)</b></p> <p>CSS should consider using the current review of health services for LAC being led by the Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (with input from the CSS Commissioning team) to ensure the efficient flow of all information related to health checks. <b>(H)</b></p> <p>CSS should consider revising its reporting of health checks to only indicate a positive once all accompanying documentation has been received. <b>(H)</b></p>

## <sup>1</sup> Audit Opinions

<b>Effective</b>	Controls evaluated are adequate, appropriate, and effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Some Improvement Needed</b>	A few specific control weaknesses were noted; generally however, controls evaluated are adequate, appropriate, and effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Major Improvement Needed</b>	Numerous specific control weaknesses were noted. Controls evaluated are unlikely to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Controls evaluated are not adequate, appropriate, or effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.

## <sup>2</sup> Audit Recommendations

**Priority High (H)** - major control weakness requiring immediate implementation of recommendation

**Priority Medium (M)** - existing procedures have a negative impact on internal control or the efficient use of resources

**Priority Low (L)** - recommendation represents good practice but its implementation is not fundamental to internal control