

Scrutiny Inquiry Report

Safeguarding – Interim Report

Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)
January 2010



Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

1. In January 2009, the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) received a report on safeguarding in Leeds. This coincided with the publication of the latest Annual Performance Assessment (APA) for children's services in Leeds, which assessed safeguarding as 'adequate'.
2. Members were also informed that the Leader of Council had asked, through the Chair, that the Board undertake an inquiry into the safeguarding arrangements for children in Leeds.

Scope of the Inquiry

3. The Scrutiny Board agreed to establish two working groups to focus on two key areas of safeguarding:

Resources – to consider the adequacy of current children's social work resources to meet core child protection responsibilities;

Preventative Duty – to consider the universal safeguarding duty and preventative work, particularly at a wedge level.

4. Both working groups held initial meetings in March 2009 to consider the potential scope of their work. Their proposed work plan was agreed by the full Scrutiny Board on 1 April 2009.
5. The working groups began a series of meetings in July, following the confirmation of Scrutiny Boards for the new municipal year, and the appointment of the new Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care.

6. Since then the working groups have met either separately or together on 12 occasions, with further meetings planned during January and February 2010. The areas covered by each working group meeting are summarised in Appendix 1.

7. On 2 December 2009, having completed the original planned evidence collecting activities, members of both working groups met together with the purpose of discussing their emerging conclusions and recommendations to inform the drafting of their inquiry report to the full Scrutiny Board. However, during the discussion, it became clear that both working groups felt that they needed to explore a number of areas in more depth in order to have more detailed evidence on which to base their conclusions. The three specific areas identified for further investigation were:

- Assessment caseloads
- The quality assurance framework, including case studies
- More detailed analysis of the take-up of the Common Assessment Framework (CAFs) at wedge level

8. Members also decided that it would be sensible to await the conclusions of the announced inspection of safeguarding and looked after children arrangements by Ofsted, due to be published in January 2010, before finalising their own report.

9. However, because this additional activity would inevitably lead to a delay in producing the Scrutiny Board final inquiry report, we considered we should publish an interim report. In particular this would enable us to make a recommendation about social work staffing resources before budget decisions are finalised for 2010/11.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Workload

10. Our interim report focuses on just one key aspect of our inquiry – the staffing resources required to meet the child protection social care workload. The rest of our work will be covered in our final report once we have completed our inquiry.
11. We started the detail of our investigation into local children’s safeguarding practice by learning about the referral routes for raising child protection concerns. We were told that the large majority of referrals are received by the Contact Leeds call centre, whose staff received appropriate training to handle such calls and refer them on.
12. One of the earliest actions undertaken by the new Chief Officer for Children and Young People’s Social Care to address social work caseloads was to second a manager to the Contact Leeds centre to review the referral process. In particular, at that time social care was the only direct referral option available to Contact Leeds staff.
13. This has now changed so that many calls below an appropriate social care intervention threshold are now referred directly to relevant alternative services for action. The social work manager is available to review and advise on any queries regarding the appropriateness of these referrals.
14. Besides taking these cases out of the number that children’s social care assessment teams need to respond to, this has had the added bonus that calls below a social care intervention threshold now receive a response from the relevant service, whereas in the past a social care assessment that no further action was needed (meaning no social care intervention required) could mean that no follow-up took place. Some opportunities for early intervention, avoiding the need for later social care input, could therefore be missed.
15. Two members of the resources working group visited a duty team office in September and discussed the work of the assessment teams with a duty team manager and a service delivery manager responsible for supervising a number of children’s social work teams at a local level.
16. We learned that the five social work areas had recently been re-organised into three areas. There were four assessment teams spread across the south area which we visited, each team being the duty team for a week on a 4-weekly rota. During their duty week all new referrals for the whole area come into the duty team for immediate action. During the other three weeks members of the team will complete initial assessments and progress cases for passing on to local care management teams if longer term social work involvement is required.
17. We learned that referrals come in mainly via computer notification, and will be allocated to individual social work staff in the assessment team by the duty manager. An initial assessment, which is supposed to be completed within seven days, will normally include visiting the home, seeing the child and speaking to other relevant professionals, in order to determine the appropriate course of action.
18. A fortnightly allocation panel takes place to move work from the assessment



Conclusions and Recommendations

teams to a care management team. Around 10-15 families per fortnight will be re-allocated in this way, by which time each case will be requiring a significant level of input from social care.

19. We were also told that the assessment teams are responsible for assessing private foster care arrangements, where the authority is aware of these, and for monitoring the progress of children and young people in these situations.
20. When we visited, the duty team were just starting to experience the impact of the contact centre work to redirect cases which did not meet social care thresholds. The managers we spoke to told us that previously they would expect around 100 referrals a week in the south area, with about half resulting in an initial assessment. This was starting to reduce, with a consequent positive impact on administration time and the duty manager's time in assessing and allocating cases. As the new practices develop and become embedded, a higher proportion of the (hopefully lower numbers of) referrals coming through would be expected to require an initial assessment.
21. The managers we spoke to also confirmed that there was currently no formal caseload management processes for children's social care work in Leeds. They estimated that an average caseload would be about 20 cases, although there were examples of staff with caseloads nearer 40 at present, with staff providing cover for absences. It was however pointed out to us that in some instances several individual 'cases' might relate to different children within the same family.
22. Of around 60 qualified social work staff in the south area, we were told that about half had been qualified for less than two years. Some staff had qualified through the department's scheme sponsoring existing social work assistants. This is something we welcomed in our previous report on children's social work staffing in 2006.
23. We also heard that Leeds was taking part in a Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) national pilot for newly qualified social workers, which ensured newly qualified staff have a smaller caseload in their first year, and receive additional supervision and training support.
24. A new quality assurance framework had recently been introduced following the unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment in July, bringing in extra levels of management audit as a matter of routine. Clearly this brought additional time pressure for managers, in order to quality assure the decision-making process.
25. We also heard that the IT system used by social care staff was not felt to be user friendly, and that there were concerns that the new government requirements of the Integrated Children's System (ICS) would also be too complicated. Management experience was that when staffed faced heavy workload pressures they tended to prioritise immediate assessment over the writing up of records, in order to protect children from immediate risk.
26. Managers also confirmed to us that they were using agency staff where required to supplement the permanent staff, and also that staff could be re-allocated



Conclusions and Recommendations

within and between areas if required to provide cover.

27. The Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care confirmed that alongside the reorganisation of social work teams from five to three areas, there were now three senior manager posts of Head of Service Delivery – one for each area – whereas previously there had been just one post for the whole city.
28. Below this level each area had a number of Service Delivery Managers , each responsible for three or four teams of between five and six social workers with a Team Manager. This structure was being further reviewed as the team size was considered to be too small, making it vulnerable to absences caused by sickness, holidays and turnover. Fewer larger teams would help to manage these issues more effectively.
29. We were later told that the planned remodelling of children's social work teams will also involve staff in carrying a mix of assessment and care management cases, rather than splitting the roles as is presently the case.
30. The Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care told us that a workforce remodelling process was underway to look across all of the tasks currently being undertaken by social workers, and to reallocate tasks to other staff where possible. This included providing more administrative support to front-line teams, and assigning some tasks to social work assistants or other appropriate staff such as family support workers – for example in relation to contact visits between children and parents. A social worker would still need to attend and assess some contact visits but may not be required at all sessions where frequent contact takes place.
31. We were also very aware that there has been a national shortage of social workers, especially children's social workers, for a number of years, as a result of both recruitment and retention problems. A good offer including career development prospects such as the new advanced practitioner roles could help to make Leeds more attractive in a competitive market. These posts will offer experienced social workers the opportunity to progress their careers without needing to move away from field work into management.
32. We were dismayed that these advanced practitioner posts, which were originally described to us when we carried out our previous work in 2006, had not been implemented earlier, but we are pleased that the newly appointed Chief Officer has prioritised the implementation of this development.
33. The new posts of advanced practitioner should also help support managers meet the day to day supervision requirements of larger teams. We were told that the CWDC saw this as an appropriate model.
34. At the time of our first meeting to discuss staffing figures in late September 2009, it was reported to us that there were 93 assessment social workers and 134 care management social workers in post in children's social care, with 13 vacancies. We were pleasantly surprised by the relatively low vacancy rate, as we had thought it would be higher. However, it also meant that filling existing vacancies could not



Conclusions and Recommendations

be the only solution to ongoing workload pressures.

35. The predicted sickness absence rate based on data for the year so far was just over 15%. (This figure included other children’s social care staff.) Turnover for the same group of staff was 11% in 2008/09.

36. We also received the following information about total caseload in September 2009.

	16/9/09	30/9/08
Open children’s cases	5355	4399
Children with a Child Protection Plan	436	386
Looked after children	1361	1325
Initial assessments completed within 7 days April - August	1158/1709 (67.8%)	1588/2034 (78/1%)
Core assessments completed with 35 days April - August	219/281 (77.9%)	385/461 (83.5%)

37. We were also aware of the significant pressure created by the 400 or so cases which had been referred back into the system for further review following the case audit triggered by the unannounced Ofsted inspection in July. Planned overtime for staff and a lifting of the previous embargo on the use of agency staff was helping to cope with this additional pressure.

38. However the combination of the temporary additional cases from re-referrals; the impact of contact centre procedure changes; the new routine management review of decision making by Service Delivery Managers; the revision of thresholds for intervention; re-allocation of duties away from social workers; and the general national

increase in the numbers of referrals being made; meant that managers told us at this point in our investigations that they were not confident at this early stage to sensibly assess and evidence the longer-term need for an increase in social work resources.

39. The Local Government Association (LGA) report – Respect and protect: respect, recruitment and retention in children’s social work – confirms that the most serious recruitment difficulties across the whole local government workforce concern social workers working with children and families, with 64% of employing authorities experiencing difficulties in 2008. The report also highlighted reported retention difficulties and high vacancy rates as being more prevalent in this service area than elsewhere.

40. Children’s social workers nationally were however reportedly generally happy with their career choice, although they felt it was becoming increasingly less attractive, with ever greater demands on them. Significant concerns included not having enough time to give proper attention to cases, bureaucracy and a negative media image. We noted that these findings pre-dated the baby P case.

41. We also noted that any increase in children’s social worker recruits as a result of current national initiatives would not be evident in the workforce for at least three years, whilst these people took their social work degrees to qualify.

42. The Head of Human Resources for Children’s Services told us about some of the recruitment initiatives being pursued in Leeds, including better workforce planning and more timely



Conclusions and Recommendations

recruitment to minimise the dependence on agency staff, as well as keeping good candidates interested until further job opportunities arose.

43. Managers also told us however that they were disappointed at the calibre of some newly qualified social workers applying for posts, again reflecting national concerns about the adequacy of the current social work degree training for child protection work.
44. We were assured that Leeds had not experienced the same level of difficulty in recruiting staff in the recent past as some other authorities, but that this could change. Pay and benefits also currently compared well with neighbouring authorities.
45. We organised an additional meeting in December to discuss caseloads in more detail. Children and Young People's Social Care management provided us with average caseload figures for social workers, excluding team managers and agency staff. The average caseloads were calculated by taking a figure for each month over a four month period.
46. We were told that the majority of staff had a caseload of between 11 and 25. However we were concerned that around 35 staff had caseloads of over 25 cases, and in the most extreme circumstances over 35 cases. The higher caseloads would tend to be in assessment rather than care management teams.
47. We were also given an estimated average caseload based on the number of live cases at each monitoring point, which gave an average of around 24 or 25 cases.
48. The national Social Work Task Force's final report had avoided any definition of the ideal caseload, so there was no national steer on this issue.
49. We recognise that a lower caseload does not in itself mean a good outcome for a child, but we also know that a high caseload is a significant barrier to staff achieving their best for a child and providing a high quality service. The evidence of the recent Ofsted inspection reports has shown how this has impacted through less effective interventions in families in Leeds in some circumstances.
50. At this meeting we were reminded that the service changes that we had already heard about at previous sessions were ensuring that referrals to social workers were more appropriate on the whole. We were also told that most of the 400 audited cases which had been referred back for further work had now been through the assessment process, with some of these cases now having been passed on to care management teams for longer term involvement. 10.5 additional administrative staff had been assigned to this area of work, and the first group of advanced practitioners had been recruited.
51. Discussions were still ongoing regarding the optimum team size for the planned reconfiguration into fewer, larger teams. Staff workshops were planned for January as part of this process, and a realistic timescale for full implementation would be summer 2010.
52. We also asked about sickness levels and leave, and the impact of these issues on staff caseloads. We received evidence on sickness figures at an earlier session (see paragraph 35). We



Conclusions and Recommendations

were told at this meeting that this included some significant long-term sickness. We were assured that staff were generally taking their leave entitlement. However, managers thought that staff were possibly not taking all time-off in lieu for additional hours worked (TOIL), although this could not be substantiated as it was not formally measured.

- 53. We felt that it was vital to tackle the issue of high caseloads before the situation worsens further as a result of staff becoming absent due to stress.
- 54. In terms of staff retention it was hoped that career development pathways such as the advanced practitioner posts; the protected caseloads and supervision offered by the NQSW scheme; and more investment in development and training for all staff as well as clearer procedures and better decision-making practice would help achieve a higher quality of work and fewer children in care over time.
- 55. We emphasised the importance of a good working environment and good communication between staff and managers as contributing factors to staff morale and retention. In particular we were concerned at the quality of some staff accommodation.
- 56. We also recognised that, where staff are under pressure, they naturally focused on the most urgent and risky cases. As a result, there was a tendency not to progress the cases of looked after children, considered to be at less immediate risk as they are already 'in the system'. Nevertheless this 'drift' means that some children are not receiving the attention they need, and that some cases will be staying 'in the

system' longer than necessary, adding to the ongoing workload difficulty. We were told that the service was developing plans for a dedicated service for looked after children to address this issue.

- 57. The Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care provided us with projections for the number of additional staff required to reduce caseloads to between 15 and 20, based on the current caseload levels. We also asked her to provide us with the costs associated with achieving these caseloads. The figures provided are set out below.

Average caseload	Additional social workers required	Additional team managers required	Approx costs (£M)	Approx admin, IT and accommodation costs (£M)
15	126	18	5.31	1.005
16	105	15	4.425	0.8375
17	86	12	3.61	0.675
18	70	10	2.95	0.543
19	55	7	2.275	0.3905
20	42	6	1.77	0.335

- 58. The Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care indicated that the work done to profile the required staffing numbers had used a number of scenarios based on different case load levels.
- 59. Whilst we would all ideally like to see an immediate jump in the number of social workers and a consequent fall in caseloads to a level that could create an excellent service, we recognise that this cannot be achieved in the short-term with the best will in the world, given the national social work recruitment situation and the economic climate. Other strategies will also be required to help alleviate the situation, some of



Conclusions and Recommendations

which have already been outlined to us as part of our work.

60. Nevertheless we feel strongly that we must support children's services leadership and management in making progress towards this ultimate goal through the allocation of some additional social work staffing resource as a matter of urgency.
61. Funding additional posts to cover these crucial statutory duties and protect our children and young people will require the council to re-examine priorities and non-statutory functions across all services.
62. We welcome the various initiatives that have been outlined, and we respect managers' desire to design the future structure on a good evidence base. We are also aware that there are many other factors that come into play in safeguarding the children and young people of Leeds beyond the number of social workers in the child protection service. We will cover these issues in more depth and detail in our inquiry report, once we have completed our inquiry.
63. Despite all of this our view ultimately concurs with that of the recently published Ofsted inspection report, that current staffing resources for core child protection social work are insufficient at present and action needs to be taken urgently.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Executive Board includes an increased resource for children's social care staffing in the budget proposals to be put forward to Council in February 2010.

We recommend that the costings provided to us by the Chief Officer for Children and Young People's Social Care for a caseload of 20 cases are used as a minimum starting point for working towards a children's social work service with sufficient staff to ensure a reasonable caseload, and promoting quality outcomes for the children and families of Leeds.



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- Annual Performance Assessment Letter from Ofsted – December 2008
- Children's Services Annual Performance Assessment 2008 – Report to Executive Board – January 2009
- Recruitment, Retention and Workload of Children's Social Workers – Report of Scrutiny Board (Children and Young People) – April 2006
- Children and Young People's Social Care: Safeguarding on the Frontline – background information
- Safeguarding Children in Leeds: An overview of our Leeds Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and the wider current context – Report to Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)
- LSCB Annual Review July 2008
- LSCB Annual Review of Business Plan 2007-2008
- The National Picture – presentation to working group – 30 July 2009
- What impact will the Laming report have on Children's Services in Leeds – Briefing note – July 2009
- Presentation to working group on referral process – August 2009
- Information in respect of social work staff involved in front line child protection work – briefing note – September 2009
- Training for Children's Social Workers – September 2009
- Children and Young People's Social Care Learning & Development Calendar – October 2009-March 2010
- Leeds Safeguarding Children Board Training Calendar – Autumn 2009
- Presentation to working group on resources – September 2009
- Presentation to working group on Serious Case Reviews – October 2009
- Lessons from Serious Case Reviews – Briefing note from LSCB – October 2009
- Executive Summaries of 5 Serious Case Reviews published by LSCB
- Respect and Protect – respect, recruitment and retention in children's social work – LGA
- Facing up to the Task – Executive summary – Interim report of the Social Work Task Force – July 2009
- Who Cares? Protecting children and improving children's social care – Report of Birmingham Overview and Scrutiny Committee – October 2009
- Presentation on the LGA report Respect and Protect
- Children's Workforce Development Council Social work programme update – November 2009
- Change for social work with children and families – Children's Workforce Development Council
- Safeguarding assurance activity conducted in Leeds and actions taken to progress the recommendations – Report of the Director of Children's Services – November 2009
- Inspection of safeguarding and looked after children services – Ofsted – January 2010



Reports and Publications Submitted (continued)

- Information for Scrutiny Safeguarding Working Group – Social Work Caseloads
- Safeguarding children – CfPS/IDeA Scrutiny guide
- Common Assessment Framework and Multiagency Panels briefing note
- The universal offer for children, young people and parents in Leeds
- Referral Pathways flowchart – Children Leeds
- Service responses to levels of vulnerability and risk of harm – Children Leeds
- Presentation – Integrated working case study
- Building a safe, confident Future – Social Work Task Force – recommendations – December 2009

Witnesses Heard

Jayne Jack – Interim Chief Officer, Children and Young People's Social Care
Tony Griffin – Head of Service, Children and Young People's Social Care
Bryan Gocke – Leeds Safeguarding Children Board Manager
Jackie Wilson – Chief Officer, Children and Young People's Social Care
Elizabeth Shingler – Head of Service Delivery, Children and Young People's Social Care
Ann-Marie Norman – Service Delivery Manager, Children and Young People's Social Care
Simon Johnson – Children's Service Delivery Manager, Children and Young People's Social Care
John Hinchliffe – Team Manager, Children and Young People's Social Care
Jane Myers – Early Years, Children's Services
Gill Eaton – Team Manger, Children and Young People's Social Care
Liz Chatterton – Social Worker, Children and Young People's Social Care
Pam Wilson – Family Support Worker, Children and Young People's Social Care
Cathy Sim – School Nurse
Sue Tuckett – Health Visitor
Lisa Stevens – Fieldhead Carr Primary School
Saleem Tariq - Interim Head of Service Delivery (West), Children and Young People's Social Care
Gail Faulkner – Interim Head of Service Delivery (South), Children and Young People's Social Care
Joanne Hopkins – Interim Head of Transformation, Children's Services
Sally Threlfall – Chief Officer Early Years and Youth Service
Barry Jones – Children Leeds Intervention Panel Manager
Mary Armitage – Integrated Processes Manager, Education Leeds
Paul Jeffrey – Detective Inspector, Leeds Child and Public Protection Unit
Diane Hampshire – Head of Safeguarding Children, Designated Nurse, NHS Leeds
Steve Roe – Inclusion Support Worker, Education Leeds
Catherine Marchant – Head of Human Resources, Children's Services
Pat Kellett – Centre Manager, Shepherd's Lane Children's Centre
Rosemary Archer – Director of Children's Services
Keith Burton – Deputy Director of Children's Services



Members of Working Group

Resources

Councillor Bill Hyde (Chair)
Councillor Geoff Driver
Councillor Bob Gettings
Councillor Vonnie Morgan (part)
Councillor Brian Selby
Mr Tony Britten
Ms Celia Foote
Prof Peter Gosden

Preventative Duty

Councillor Bill Hyde (Chair)
Councillor Geoff Driver
Councillor Bob Gettings
Councillor Brenda Lancaster
Councillor Brian Selby
Mr Tony Britten
Mr Ian Falkingham (part)
Ms Jeannette Morris-Boam

Dates of Scrutiny

Scrutiny Board meetings

8 January 2009
1 April 2009

Resources Working Group

17 March 2009
21 August 2009
10 September 2009
24 September 2009
21 October 2009
5 November 2009
27 November 2009
14 December 2009

Preventative Duty Working Group

19 March 2009
7 October 2009
16 October 2009
6 November 2009

Joint Working Group Meetings

30 July 2009
2 December 2009



Appendix 1

Safeguarding Working Group Meetings			
	Lead Officer	Other witnesses	Scope
Session One 30 July	Jackie Wilson	Bryan Gocke	Joint meeting of both inquiry groups The national perspective – Lord Laming's report and the government response
Preventative Duty Session Two 7 Oct	Sally Threlfall	Barry Jones	Focus on progress towards becoming a Common Assessment Framework (CAF)-led city Receive evidence about the pilot implementation of the CAF and Budget Holding Lead Professional programme Consider evidence on the take-up and outcomes of CAFs across the city to date, including number of CAFs undertaken, number of staff trained to undertake CAFs, spread of lead CAF professionals, examples of good practice and potential barriers to take-up
Preventative Duty Session Three 16 Oct	Mary Armitage	Sally Threlfall Bryan Gocke Stephen Roe Paul Jeffreys (Police) Diane Hampshire (PCT)	Receive evidence from statutory sector partners on their role in the CAF programme and the preventative duty. Domestic violence to be used as a theme for considering various partners' contributions.
Preventative Duty Session Four 6 November	Pat Kellett		Visit to Shepherd's Lane Children's Centre To discuss early intervention as part of the preventative role



Appendix 1

	Lead Officer	Other witnesses	Scope
Resources Session Two 21 August	Liz Shingler	Ann-Marie Norman	Consider the various stages of the journey that a child experiences from initial referral through to a potential child protection plan. Receive information about the various assessments and decision making processes, and the key staff involved.
Resources Session Three 10 Sept	Simon Johnson	John Hinchliffe	Visit a duty team
Resources Session Four 24 Sept	Gail Faulkner	Gill Eaton Liz Chatterton Pam Wilson Sue Tuckett Cathy Simms Lisa Stevens Jane Myers	Meet with care management team staff and a core group for child protection plans
Resources Session Five 24 Sept	Jackie Wilson	Gail Faulkner Saleem Tariq	<p>Detailed information on resources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the current position with regard to social work staff involved in front-line child protection work: eg numbers of social workers, caseload, vacancy rates, sickness rates, recruitment and retention programmes, training and development, supervision, experience levels, turnover. the numbers of children at risk: eg the numbers of referrals, numbers of initial and core assessments, performance against target times for assessments, number of children with a child protection plan budget provision for this area of work the involvement of key partners, eg Police and health partners in relation to resources for front-line child protection work



Appendix 1

	Lead Officer	Other witnesses	Scope
Resources Session Six 21 Oct	Bryan Gocke	Gail Faulkner	Consider information about the handling of serious case reviews in Leeds, including Ofsted assessment of the reviews, and the implementation of findings from reviews
Resources Session Seven 5 Nov	Jackie Wilson	Catherine Marchant Gail Faulkner	Consider the LGA report – Respect and protect: respect, recruitment and retention in children’s social work. Safe recruitment practice. Consider the findings of the audit of child protection plans for 0-4 year olds in Leeds, and the Leeds self-evaluation of issues arising from the ‘baby P’ case, and relevant action plans from the service transformation programme Review progress since April 2006 Scrutiny Inquiry report on Recruitment, Retention and Workload of Children’s Social Workers Review Birmingham Scrutiny Inquiry report
Resources Session Eight 27 Nov	Rosemary Archer	Keith Burton	To hear from the Director of Children’s Services, with particular reference to the interim period before the new Chief Officer for Children and Young People’s Social Care was in post
Resources Session Nine 14 December	Jackie Wilson	Saleem Tariq	To receive more detailed information about caseloads for children’s social workers
Joint Meeting 2 December			To discuss emerging conclusions and recommendations from the inquiry, in order to inform drafting of the inquiry report

Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)
Safeguarding Inquiry Interim Report
January 2010
Report author: Kate Arscott



www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk