READY2COMPLY · FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Reg 45 Report: Fictional Sample

The kind of evaluative draft Ready2Comply returns from a home's own Reg 44 reports, last action plan and notes

FICTIONAL SAMPLE · REG 45 REPORT, DONE

Home	Larch House (fictional), a four-bed children's home in England run by Northbrook Care Ltd (fictional)
Children	Three living at the home during the period: Child A (15), Child B (14) and Child C (16). One bed empty since July.
Review period	1 April to 30 September 2026
Review completed	7 October 2026. Report to be sent to Ofsted by 4 November 2026 (28 days).
Evidence used	Six Reg 44 reports (April to September), the March 2026 Reg 45 action plan, the home's monthly evidence tracker, the manager's notes and answers to four clarifying questions

Fictional sample. Larch House, Northbrook Care Ltd, Northshire County Council, the children, the staff and every event and figure in this report are invented. Any resemblance to a real home or person is coincidental. It shows the kind of draft Ready2Comply returns from a home's own Reg 44 reports, action plan and notes. It is not a model answer and not legal advice. A real report must be checked, changed where needed, owned and signed by the registered person.

> **How to use this example:** Look at how each judgement is tied to evidence, how the children's and others' views lead to action, and how every action has an owner, a date and a way to tell whether it worked. Lines marked [CHECK] show where the registered person must confirm a fact before signing.

What's in this document

- 1 Summary
- 2 How the review was done
- 3 What children, parents, placing authorities and staff told us
- 4 Focus area 1: missing from care and exploitation risk
- 5 Focus area 2: physical intervention and debriefs
- 6 Focus area 3: education
- 7 Progress against the last action plan (March 2026)
- 8 Reg 44 themes this period
- 9 Strengths and areas for improvement
- 10 Action plan for October 2026 to March 2027
- 11 Sign-off
- Sources used in preparing this template

1 Summary

Over the last six months the quality of care at Larch House has improved in the areas that mattered most to the children: they are going missing less often, two of the three are in education every week, and they say staff listen more. The home has not yet shown that its approach to physical intervention has changed: interventions fell, but debriefs with children are not consistently recorded, and that weakness has been raised in three Reg 44 reports. Staffing stability is the main risk for the next period.

Area	Overall view this period	Direction
Children's experiences and progress	Good progress in education and in missing from care; health appointments kept	Improving
Help and protection	Fewer missing episodes; intervention debriefs still inconsistent	Mixed
Leadership and management	Reg 44 recommendations mostly acted on; staffing and supervision under pressure	Stable, with a risk

2 How the review was done

The registered manager and responsible individual reviewed the evidence listed on the cover against three focus areas chosen from the last action plan and the Reg 44 themes: missing from care and exploitation risk, physical intervention and debriefs, and education. In line with Ofsted's advice, the review does not cover every Quality Standard. It concentrates on where the children's experience changed most or where the evidence pointed to a weakness.

Views were gathered from the children (house meetings, key work sessions and two short surveys), two parents, the two placing authorities and the staff team (a team meeting discussion and five anonymous staff survey returns).

3 What children, parents, placing authorities and staff told us

Who	What they said	What we did about it
Child A	Said staff "actually listen now" about her phone and that she helped write her own phone plan.	Phone plan kept as she wrote it; reviewed with her monthly in key work.
Child B	Chose not to take part in the survey. In key work he said he wants more time at the boxing club.	A second weekly session agreed with his social worker from September [CHECK date].
Child C	Said house meetings "just talk about rules" and she wanted more say in food.	Menu rota started in August; house meeting agenda now led by the children for the first 15 minutes.
Parents (2)	Child C's mother feels well informed. Child A's father said he sometimes hears about incidents late.	Contact agreement for Child A updated: the shift lead calls him the same day after any significant incident.
Placing authorities (2)	Both said communication is good. One asked for missing from care information to arrive faster.	Missing episode summaries now emailed within 24 hours (all three since July met this) [CHECK].
Staff	Supportive team; worried about agency use at weekends and about supervision being moved.	See actions 3 and 4.

4 Focus area 1: missing from care and exploitation risk

What the evidence shows: missing episodes fell from 11 in the previous six months to 4 in this period, all involving Child B. Every episode had a return home interview offered; Child B accepted two of the four. The Reg 44 reports for June and July both noted that the risk assessment was updated after episodes, and the August report found the review after the 3 August episode had not involved the placing authority.

Why we think it changed: the drop followed the agreed plan for Child B's Friday evenings (a planned activity with a named member of staff) and closer work with the local police missing person coordinator. The evidence does not yet show whether this will hold through the winter months, when previous episodes were more frequent.

What it means for the children: Child B is spending less time in places where he is at risk, and he told his key worker that Fridays are “better now”. This is our strongest area of progress.

5 Focus area 2: physical intervention and debriefs

What the evidence shows: there were 6 physical interventions (down from 9). All were recorded within 24 hours and reviewed by the manager. A debrief with the child happened in all six, but the child’s own view was written down in only three. The Reg 44 visitor raised this in May, July and September.

Evaluation: the home is doing the debriefs but is not yet using what children say to change practice. Without the child’s view on record, the home cannot show that interventions are reviewed from the child’s point of view, or that learning reaches the team. This is the main weakness this period.

6 Focus area 3: education

What the evidence shows: Child A’s attendance rose from 71% to 93% across the period, and Child C started a college course in September and has attended every week. Child B is on a part-time timetable of 15 hours, which the virtual school agreed in May; he attended 12 of the 15 hours on average [CHECK figure].

Evaluation: staff are consistent with morning routines and school contact, which the school confirmed at Child A’s PEP. Child B’s timetable has not increased since May and there is no agreed date to review it. That is the gap for the next period.

7 Progress against the last action plan (March 2026)

Action	What happened	Status
Reduce missing episodes for Child B through a joint plan with the placing authority	Plan agreed in April; episodes fell from 11 to 4	Met
Record the child’s view in every intervention debrief	Recorded in 3 of 6	Not met: carried forward
Night-time fire drill each quarter	Drills held in May and August	Met
All staff to complete exploitation refresher training	9 of 11 staff completed; 2 new starters booked for November	Partly met

8 Reg 44 themes this period

- Raised in three or more reports: recording the child’s view after interventions (see focus area 2).
- Raised twice: missing from care risk assessments not always reviewed with the placing authority after an episode (now done for every episode since August).
- Praised in four reports: the warmth of relationships and how homely the house feels.
- All 14 recommendations made in the period have a response on file; 11 are complete [CHECK].

9 Strengths and areas for improvement

Strengths	Areas for improvement
Fewer missing episodes and a plan that works for Child B	The child's view is not consistently recorded after physical interventions
Education attendance improved for two children	Child B's part-time timetable has no review date
Children say they are listened to, and examples show it	Weekend agency use (about one in four weekend shifts [CHECK]) affects consistency
Reg 44 recommendations are acted on and tracked	Two staff supervisions were moved more than twice in the period

10 Action plan for October 2026 to March 2027

Action	Owner	By	How we will know it worked
Use a one-page debrief form that asks the child three set questions; manager checks each one within 72 hours	Registered manager	31 Oct 2026	Child's view on record in every debrief; Reg 44 visitor no longer raises it
Agree a review date for Child B's timetable with the virtual school	Key worker and manager	15 Nov 2026	Date set and minuted; hours increase if he is ready
Recruit two permanent weekend staff	Responsible individual	31 Jan 2027	Agency use below one in ten weekend shifts
Protect supervision dates; any move is re-booked within 7 days	Registered manager	From Oct 2026	No supervision moved more than once (checked monthly)
Winter plan for Child B's Friday evenings and holidays	Deputy manager	30 Nov 2026	Missing episodes stay at or below this period's level

11 Sign-off

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Registered manager	[Name]		
Responsible individual	[Name]		

Sent to Ofsted on: [date, within 28 days of 7 October 2026]. Available to each placing authority on request (regulation 45(4)(b)).

Sources used in preparing this template

This template was written from the public materials listed below, which were checked in November 2026. It is not a substitute for reading the current text, and it is not legal advice. Organisations should confirm that each source is still current before relying on a contact detail, a legal test, a timescale or a regulatory duty.

Source	What it was used for	Where to check it
The Children's Homes (England) Regulations 2015, regulation 45	The duty to review the quality of care every 6 months and send the report to Ofsted within 28 days.	https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/541/regulation/45
Ofsted, Regulation 45 reviews and reports – what you need to know (11 October 2024)	What a good report should contain: honest, analytical, short, with an action plan and the views of others.	https://socialcareinspection.blog.gov.uk/2024/10/11/regulation-45-reviews-and-reports-what-you-need-to-know/
Ofsted, Responsibilities of providers and managers in Ofsted-registered children's homes	Sending Reg 44 and Reg 45 reports to Ofsted.	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/register-a-childrens-home/responsibilities-of-providers-and-managers-in-ofsted-registered-childrens-homes
DfE, Guide to the Children's Homes Regulations including the Quality Standards	What each Quality Standard means in practice.	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childrens-homes-regulations-including-quality-standards-guide

Important information

This template supports good practice in children's homes and supported accommodation. It does not replace professional judgement, legal advice, or the requirement to check current legislation, statutory guidance and local procedures. It does not tell any organisation what decision to make in a particular case, and it does not guarantee any inspection, regulatory or legal outcome. The organisation that adopts it remains responsible for adapting it, for the decisions and referrals it makes, and for keeping it current.

Ready2Comply is independent and is not affiliated with, or endorsed by, Ofsted, the Department for Education, Northshire County Council (fictional), the police or any other public body or organisation named in this template. Licence terms are set out in the terms of sale on ready2comply.co.uk. Statutory rights are not affected. Questions: hello@ready2comply.co.uk.