


## D2N2 Placements Report Quarter 2 July-September 2020

### Data Analysis

#### Total Placements

Authorities	No. Placements	%
Derby City	60	25%
Derbyshire	89	37%
Nottingham City	40	16%
Nottinghamshire	53	22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>




During Quarter 2 July-September 2020 the four authorities as a collective made 242 fostering and residential placements on the D2N2 Children in Care Framework.\*

Derbyshire made the most framework placements overall at 89, 37% of the total.

D2N2 Framework	No. Placements
Quarter 1 April- June 2020	173
Quarter 2 July- September 2020	242
<b>Total</b>	<b>415</b>


\*Any placement retainers were included within the placement totals, as they were available placements that were being held, they were removed from price analysis however as fees are reduced they are not reflective of genuine weekly placement prices.



There has been an increase in placements made on the framework since Quarter 1 April- June 2020 when 173 placements were made, up to 242 placements made in Quarter 2 July-September 2020, a rise of 69.

**Placement Type**


Placement Type	No. Placements	%
Residential	46	19%
Fostering	196	81%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>



As to be expected due to our commitment to placing children in a family placement wherever possible, significantly more fostering placements were made on the framework during Quarter 2, at 196 fostering placements, 81% of the total.

### Placement Specialism


Placement Specialism	No. Placements	%
Fostering Specialist	5	2%
Fostering Standard	184	76%
Fostering Standard Parent and Child	7	3%
Residential Specialist	13	5%
Residential Standard	33	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>



The most common framework placement specialism was Fostering Standard at 184 placements, 76% of the total.

### Fostering Placements


Authorities	Fostering	%
Derby City	52	27%
Derbyshire	76	39%
Nottingham City	26	13%
Nottinghamshire	42	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



Derbyshire made the most framework fostering placements at 76, 39% of the total.

### Residential Placements


Authorities	Residential	%
Derby City	8	17.5%
Derbyshire	13	28%
Nottingham City	14	30.5%
Nottinghamshire	11	24%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>



Nottingham City made the most framework residential placements at 14, 30.5% of the total; this was only marginally higher than Derbyshire at 13, 28% of the total.

**D2N2 Boundary All Placements**

D2N2 Boundary	No. Placements	%
Outside	110	45.5%
Inside	132	54.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>



Just over half of all framework fostering and residential placements 132, 54.5% of the total, were made inside the D2N2 Boundary.


Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	24	36	60
Derbyshire	57	32	89
Nottingham City	21	19	40
Nottinghamshire	30	23	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>242</b>

Three authorities were in line with this trajectory with Derbyshire, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire having all made more framework placements inside the D2N2 Boundary.

Derby City was the only authority that made more framework placements outside the D2N2 Boundary.


D2N2 Boundary Fostering Placements

D2N2 Boundary	Fostering Placements	%
Outside	83	42%
Inside	113	58%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



More than half of framework fostering placements were made inside the D2N2 Boundary at 113, 58% of the total.

Fostering Placements			
Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	24	28	52
Derbyshire	49	27	76
Nottingham City	16	10	26
Nottinghamshire	24	18	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>196</b>




Derbyshire, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire, all followed this trajectory having made more framework fostering placements inside the D2N2 boundary.

However, Derby City made more framework fostering placements outside the D2N2 boundary.


#### D2N2 Boundary Residential Placements

D2N2 Boundary	Residential Placements	%
Inside	19	41%
Outside	27	59%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>



More than half of framework residential placements were made outside the D2N2 Boundary at 27, 59% of the total. This shows that we particularly need to work with framework providers on developing local provision, and ensuring D2N2 placements are prioritised for D2N2 children.

Residential Placements			
Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	0	8	8
Derbyshire	8	5	13
Nottingham City	5	9	14
Nottinghamshire	6	5	11
<b>Total</b>	19	27	46




The two cities Derby City and Nottingham City, followed the trajectory both making more residential placements outside the D2N2 Boundary, whereas the two counties, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, both made more residential placements inside the D2N2 Boundary.

#### Placing Authority Boundary All Placements


Placing Authority Boundary	No. Placements	%
Inside	79	33%
Outside	163	67%
<b>Total</b>	242	100%





The majority of framework fostering and residential placements were made outside of the Placing Authority Boundary at 163, 67% of the total.


Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	24	36	60
Derbyshire	20	69	89
Nottingham City	14	26	40
Nottinghamshire	21	32	53
<b>Total</b>	79	163	242



All four authorities followed this trajectory, with all having made more framework placements outside the Placing Authority Boundary.

#### Placing Authority Boundary Fostering Placements


Placing Authority Boundary	Fostering Placements	%
Inside	70	36%
Outside	126	64%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



The majority of framework fostering placements were made outside the Placing Authority Boundary at 126, 64% of the total.

#### Fostering Placements


Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	24	28	52
Derbyshire	15	61	76
Nottingham City	12	14	26
Nottinghamshire	19	23	42
<b>Total</b>	70	126	196



All four authorities were in line with this trend, having each made more framework fostering placements outside of the Placing Authority Boundary.


#### Placing Authority Boundary Residential Placements

Placing Authority Boundary	Residential Placements	%
Inside	9	20%
Outside	37	80%
<b>Total</b>	46	100%



The majority of framework residential placements were made outside of the Placing Authority Boundary at 37, 80% of the total.


Residential Placements			
Authorities	Inside	Outside	Total
Derby City	0	8	8
Derbyshire	5	8	13
Nottingham City	2	12	14
Nottinghamshire	2	9	11
<b>Total</b>	9	37	46



All four authorities followed this trajectory making more framework residential placements outside the Placing Authority Boundary.


**Gender All Placements**

Gender	No. Placements	%
Female	100	41%
Male	142	59%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>



There were more males placed on the framework at 142, 59% of the total.


Authorities	Female	Male	Total
Derby City	26	34	60
Derbyshire	35	54	89
Nottingham City	18	22	40
Nottinghamshire	21	32	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>242</b>



This trend of more males being placed on the framework than females was seen across all four authorities.


**Gender Residential Placements**

Gender	Residential Placements	%
Female	16	35%
Male	30	65%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>



More framework residential placements were made for males at 30, 65% of the total.


Residential Placements			
Authorities	Female	Male	Total
Derby City	0	8	8
Derbyshire	6	7	13
Nottingham City	7	7	14
Nottinghamshire	3	8	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>46</b>



More framework residential placements were made for males at three local authorities: Derby City, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire; however Nottingham City made an equal number of framework residential placements for males and females.

**Gender Fostering Placements**


Gender	Fostering Placements	%
Female	84	43%
Male	112	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



More framework fostering placements were made for males at 112 placements, 57% of the total.

Authorities	Female	Male	Total
Derby City	26	26	52

Derbyshire	29	47	76
Nottingham City	11	15	26
Nottinghamshire	18	24	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>196</b>




This trajectory of more framework fostering placements being made for males was seen across three authorities: Derbyshire, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire; however Derby City placed an equal number of males and females in framework fostering placements.

#### Age Band All Placements


Age Band	No. Placements	%
Age 0-4	76	31%
Age 5-10	63	26%
Age 11-15	80	33%
Age 16 -18	23	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>





The most framework placements were made in the 11-15 Age Band at 80, 33% of the total, closely followed by Age Band 0-4 with 76 placements, 31% of the total.


Authorities	Age 0-4	Age 5-10	Age 11-15	Age 16-18	Total
Derby City	21	14	20	5	60
Derbyshire	29	23	28	9	89
Nottingham City	5	14	13	8	40
Nottinghamshire	21	12	19	1	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>242</b>



Despite the 11-15 Age Band having the highest number of framework placements collectively, at Derby City, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire there were more children placed in the 0-4 Age Band, with Nottingham City having made the most placements in the 5-10 Age Band.


**Age Band Fostering Placements**

Age Band	Fostering Placements	%
Age 0-4	76	39%
Age 5-10	59	30%
Age 11-15	48	24%
Age 16 -18	13	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



There were the most framework fostering placements made in the 0-4 Age Band at 76, 39% of the total, the numbers of children placed in framework fostering placements reduced as age increased.


Fostering Placements					
Authorities	Age 0-4	Age 5-10	Age 11-15	Age 16 -18	Total
Derby City	21	14	13	4	52
Derbyshire	29	23	20	4	76
Nottingham City	5	11	6	4	26
Nottinghamshire	21	11	9	1	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>196</b>



This trend of more fostering framework placements being made in the 0-4 Age Band was seen across Derby City, Derbyshire, and Nottinghamshire, however at Nottingham City their highest number of fostering placements was within the 5-10 Age Band.

**Age Band Residential Placements**


Age Band	Residential Placements	%
Age 0-4	0	0%
Age 5-10	4	9%
Age 11-15	32	69%
Age 16-18	10	22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>



There were the most framework residential placements made within the 11-15 Age Band at 32, 69% of the total.

As to be expected, no framework residential placements were made in the Age Band 0-4.


Residential Placements					
Authorities	Age 0-4	Age 5-10	Age 11-15	Age 16 -18	Total
Derby City	0	0	7	1	8
Derbyshire	0	0	8	5	13
Nottingham City	0	3	7	4	14
Nottinghamshire	0	1	10	0	11
<b>Total</b>	0	4	32	10	46



The trend of more framework residential placements being made in the 11-15 Age Band was seen across all four authorities.


### Residential Number of Beds

No. Beds	Residential Placements	%
Solo	4	9%
2 Bed	2	4%
3 Bed	14	30%
4+ Bed	26	57%
<b>Total</b>	46	100%



The majority of framework residential placements were within homes with 4+ Beds at 26, 57%, of the total.

Residential Placements				
Authorities	Solo	2 Bed	3 Bed	4+ Bed
Derby City	0	1	4	3
Derbyshire	2	0	2	9
Nottingham City	0	1	5	8
Nottinghamshire	2	0	3	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>




The trend of more framework residential placements being made in homes with 4+ Beds was seen across three authorities, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire City and Nottinghamshire. Derby City had

placed marginally more children in 3 bed homes but this was then closely followed by 4+ Bed placements.


**Timing All Placements**

Timing	No. Placements	%
Emergency	39	16%
Urgent	67	28%
Planned	136	56%
Total	242	100%



The majority of framework placements were planned at 136, 56% of the total.


Authorities	Emergency	Urgent	Planned	Total
Derby City	19	0	41	60
Derbyshire	15	37	37	89
Nottingham City	2	18	20	40
Nottinghamshire	3	12	38	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>242</b>



The trend planned framework placements being most prevalent was seen across Derby City, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire. Derbyshire had an equal number of urgent and planned placements.


**Timing Fostering Placements**

Timing	Fostering Placements	%
Emergency	32	16%
Urgent	52	27%
Planned	112	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



The majority of framework fostering placements were planned at 112, 57% of the total.

Authorities	Emergency	Urgent	Planned	Total
Derby City	17	0	35	52
Derbyshire	12	32	32	76
Nottingham City	2	11	13	26
Nottinghamshire	1	9	32	42
<b>Total</b>	32	52	112	196




The trend of planned framework fostering placements was seen at three authorities Derby City, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire. There were an equal number of urgent and planned fostering placements at Derbyshire.

#### Timing Residential Placements


Timing	Residential Placements	%
Emergency	7	15%
Urgent	15	33%
Planned	24	52%
<b>Total</b>	46	100%





Just over half of framework residential placements were planned at 24, 52% of the total.

Authorities	Emergency	Urgent	Planned	Total
Derby City	2	0	6	8
Derbyshire	3	5	5	13
Nottingham City	0	7	7	14
Nottinghamshire	2	3	6	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>46</b>




There were more planned framework residential placements at Derby City and Nottinghamshire, however there were an equal number of planned and urgent residential placements at Derbyshire and Nottingham City.

**Primary Presenting Need All Placements**


Primary Presenting Need	No. Placements	%
-------------------------	----------------	---

Mental Health	6	3%
Disability PD/ LD	8	3%
Exploitation	12	5%
Complex Behaviour	13	5%
EBD	44	18%
Neglect/Abuse	159	66%
<b>Total</b>	242	100%



The most prevalent Primary Presenting Need was Neglect/ Abuse, with 159 placements, 66% of the total having recorded this as primary need.


Authorities	Mental Health	Disability PD/ LD	Exploitation	Complex Behaviour	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	0	6	8	0	8	38	60
Derbyshire	3	2	1	5	8	70	89
Nottingham City	0	0	3	2	13	22	40
Nottinghamshire	3	0	0	6	15	29	53
<b>Total</b>	6	8	12	13	44	159	242



This trend of Neglect/ Abuse being the most prevalent Primary Presenting Need was seen across all four authorities.

**Secondary Presenting Need All Placements**

Secondary Presenting Need	No. Placements	%
Mental Health	2	3%
Disability PD/LD	11	17%
Exploitation	13	20%
Complex Behaviour	2	3%
EBD	9	14%
Neglect/Abuse	27	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100%</b>




## APPENDIX 2

Where Secondary Presenting Needs were recorded for a placement, this could not be the same as the Primary Presenting Need, if a secondary need wasn't identified it was left blank.

There were 64 framework placements where a Secondary Presenting Need was identified, 178 placements did not record a secondary need.

The majority of framework placements had Neglect/ Abuse identified as the Secondary Presenting Need at 27, 42% of the total.


Authorities	Mental Health	Disability PD/LD	Exploitation	Complex Behaviour	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	0	2	1	0	1	5	9
Derbyshire	2	2	5	0	0	8	17
Nottingham City	0	4	5	0	1	10	20
Nottinghamshire	0	3	2	2	7	4	18
<b>Total</b>	2	11	13	2	9	27	64



This trend of Neglect/ Abuse being the most prevalent Secondary Presenting Need was seen across three local authorities, Derby City, Derbyshire and Nottingham City, however Nottinghamshire had recorded EBD as the most prevalent Secondary Presenting Need.


Primary Presenting Need Fostering Placements

Primary Presenting Need	Fostering Placements	%
Mental Health	3	2%
Disability PD/LD	7	3%
Exploitation	9	5%
Complex Behaviour	2	1%
EBD	23	12%
Neglect/ Abuse	152	77%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>



The majority of framework fostering placements, 152, 77% of the total had the Primary Presenting Need recorded as Neglect/ Abuse.


Fostering Placements							
Authorities	Mental Health	Disability PD/ LD	Exploitation	Complex Behaviour	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	0	5	8	0	3	36	52
Derbyshire	2	2	1	1	1	69	76
Nottingham City	0	0	0	1	5	20	26
Nottinghamshire	1	0	0	0	14	27	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>196</b>



This trend of Neglect/Abuse being the most prevalent Primary Presenting Need for framework fostering placements, was seen across all four authorities.

**Secondary Presenting Need Fostering Placements**

Secondary Presenting Need	Fostering Placements	%
Disability PD/LD	7	22%
Exploitation	6	19%
EBD	4	13%
Neglect/Abuse	15	47%
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>




Where Secondary Presenting Needs were recorded for a fostering placement, this could not be the same as the Primary Presenting Need, if a secondary need wasn't identified it was left blank.

There were 32 fostering framework placements where a Secondary Presenting Need was identified, 164 placements did not record a secondary need.

The majority of fostering placements had Neglect/ Abuse identified as the Secondary Presenting Need at 15, 47% of the total.


Fostering Placements					
Authorities	Disability PD/LD	Exploitation	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	2	0	0	3	5
Derbyshire	1	3	0	3	7
Nottingham City	4	3	0	5	12
Nottinghamshire	0	0	4	4	8
<b>Total</b>	7	6	4	15	32



The trajectory of Neglect/ Abuse being the most prevalent Secondary Presenting Need for framework fostering placements was seen at Nottingham City and Derby City, however at Derbyshire Neglect/ Abuse and Exploitation were jointly the most prevalent and at Nottinghamshire Neglect/ Abuse and EBD were the jointly the most prevalent.

Primary Presenting Need Residential Placements

Primary Presenting Need	Residential Placements	%
Mental Health	3	6.5%
Disability PD/ LD	1	2%
Exploitation	3	6.5%
Complex Behaviour	11	24%
EBD	21	46%
Neglect/Abuse	7	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>




The majority of framework residential placements recorded the Primary Presenting Need as EBD at 21, 46% of the total.

This is different to framework fostering placements where recorded Neglect/ Abuse was recorded as the most prevalent Primary Presenting Need.

Residential Placements



Authorities	Mental Health	Disability PD/ LD	Exploitation	Complex Behaviour	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	0	1	0	0	5	2	8
Derbyshire	1	0	0	4	7	1	13
Nottingham City	0	0	3	1	8	2	14
Nottinghamshire	2	0	0	6	1	2	11
<b>Total</b>	3	1	3	11	21	7	46




The trend of EBD being the most prevalent Primary Presenting Need for framework residential placements is seen across three authorities, Derby City, Derbyshire and Nottingham City.

Nottinghamshire recorded the most framework residential placements as having the Primary Presenting Need as Complex Behaviour.

### Secondary Presenting Need Residential Placements

Secondary Presenting Need	Residential Placements	%
---------------------------	------------------------	---

Mental Health	2	6%
Disability PD/LD	4	13%
Exploitation	7	22%
Complex Behaviour	2	6%
EBD	5	15.5%
Neglect/Abuse	12	37.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>




Where Secondary Presenting Needs were recorded for a residential placement, this could not be the same as the Primary Presenting Need, if a secondary need wasn't identified it was left blank.

There were 32 residential framework placements where a Secondary Presenting Need was identified, 14 placements did not record a secondary need.

The majority of residential placements had Neglect/ Abuse identified as the Secondary Presenting Need at 12, 37.5% of the total.

Residential Placements							
Authorities	Mental Health	Disability PD/LD	Exploitation	Complex Behaviour	EBD	Neglect/Abuse	Total
Derby City	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
Derbyshire	2	1	2	0	0	5	10
Nottingham City	0	0	2	0	1	5	8
Nottinghamshire	0	3	2	2	3	0	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>32</b>



The trend of Neglect/ Abuse being the most prevalent Secondary Presenting Need for framework residential placements was seen across three authorities, Derby City, Derbyshire and Nottingham City, however at Nottinghamshire Disability PD/LD and EBD were jointly the most prevalent.