

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of SCAI Documents
Sent: Thu, 17 Feb 2022 14:14:31 +0000
To: SCAI Documents
Subject: Foster Care - Section 21 notice- A-D Report- follow-up queries OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE
Attachments: Action Plan - Learning Review Inspection and Self Evaluation.xlsx, Alloa phase 2 learning review.docx

From: Lindsey Manzie <[REDACTED]> On Behalf Of Sharon Robertson
Sent: 11 February 2022 15:18
To: SCAI Solicitors <solicitors@childabuseinquiry.scot>
Cc: Nikki Bridle <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Foster Care - Section 21 notice- A-D Report- follow-up queries OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE

Good Afternoon

Please see response to follow up queries sent on 24th January 2022. Please note the attachments contained in this email are password protected. Could you please provide a telephone number for us to contact you with the password details.

1. In answer to Question 1.7(a) of your Part A and D response there appears to be a typographical error in the final sentence of the first paragraph- do you mean that parents relinquishing children is less common now than it was in the timeframe of Clackmannan County Council?

Yes it should read parents relinquishing children is less common now than it was in the timeframe of Clackmannan County Council.

2. In your Part A response, you have missed question 1.8(ii)(f), which is whether the checks referred to at (e) were reviewed. We would be grateful if you could provide your response to that accordingly.

72 carers files were read. 36 of those carers were approved pre 1996. 4 in the 70's were deregistered in the 70's (Clackmannan County Council), however the 9 in the 80's and 23 in the 90's (prior to 1996) continued to be registered after 1996 therefore they would be under both Central Regional Council and Clackmannanshire Council. No carers records were available before this timeline.

The 4 carers from the 70's did not have any evidence of reviews taking place.

The 68 carers files that were read, the majority (85%) noted there was evidence of regular contact and visits being undertaken by supervising social workers. These included unannounced visits, telephone contact, home visits, and carer reviews. There was also evidence of visits by the child's social worker to visit the placement. It was also noted that there is good evidence of positive relationships between the carer and their supervising social worker. However there is also mention of the occasional missed appointments.

There is evidence of monthly home visits, phone calls, carers reviews, Police checks, medical checks, and home safety reviews. Frequency of checks differed between annual, every two years, every three years, and a few for medicals noted 5 years. However, medical checks were undertaken frequently when a health concern had been highlighted by the carer.

A small number of files read noted there was no evidence of regular visits, it was also commented that there were no updates about the child in placement, foster carers complained about the lack of contact and another had no face to face visits for a period of 3-4 months. Carers also made reference to a lack of support from their supervising social worker.

Although reference was made to regular police checks being carried out on carers, there was only one reference made to a family member of a long standing carer who's daughter had reached the age of 16 years.

There was evidence contained within files that reviews of checks regarding other family members and friends were completed. However there were also files that indicated no checks were undertaken. No reasons are available for this however as noted in section (e) these would be based on how much contact the person would be having with the child or they would be reviewed as part of the supervising social work check home visits.

3. In answer to Question 2.1(m), you note that at the time of drafting a briefing and an action plan was being drawn up following the learning review. We note that the copy of the learning review which you have submitted is marked as a draft. If any changes were made to the version you have provided please send us the final version. It also would be helpful to see the briefing and action plan referred to, together with any other material generated since the time of writing as a follow up to the learning review and putting its recommendations into practice.

4. In relation to witnesses, you provided a list who you advised would be best placed to speak to all parts of the response. From that list, would we be correct in assuming that the Chief Social Work Officer takes overall responsibility for the response and would be best to call as a witness to speak to the response? Can you please confirm that is still Fiona Duncan?

Sharon Robertson, Chief Social Work Officer
Kind regards

*Sharon Robertson
Chief Social Work Officer
Children's Services & Criminal Justice Service
Kilncraigs
Alloa
Clackmannanshire FK10 1EB*

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

This message contains privileged and confidential information intended for the addressee(s) only. If this message was sent to you in error, you must not disseminate, copy or take any action in reliance on it and we request that you notify the sender immediately by return email.

Opinions expressed in this message and any attachments are not necessarily those

held by Clackmannanshire Council or any person connected with the organisation, save those by whom the opinions were expressed.

Please note that any messages sent or received by Clackmannanshire Council's email system may be monitored and stored in an information retrieval system.

Stay Updated:

Follow us at

Airson b arrachd fiosrachaidh lean sinn aig:

- <http://www.clacks.gov.uk/>
- <http://twitter.com/ClacksCouncil>
- <http://www.facebook.com/officialclackmannanshirecouncil>

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

