

Covering statement

The information and statements contained in this document are provided by the City of Edinburgh Council to the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry under Section 21(2)(a) of the Inquiries Act 2005. As such it is strictly confidential and must be handled with due care, both for the reputation and legal position of the Council, as well as for the right to privacy of those who may be referred to.

Information within this document must not be shared with external parties without the express permission of the Head of Children's Services – the Council's Senior Responsible Officer for the Response Project.

If you have accessed this document by mistake, please contact the Council's Data Protection Officer at: dataprotection.officer@edinburgh.gov.uk

Covid-19 Restrictions

Due to Covid-19 restrictions, Council staff have been unable to access Council buildings and records. This led to the premature ending of a comprehensive file audit and has limited the research opportunities and materials available to staff in compiling the responses listed below.

PART D – ABUSE AND RESPONSE	
5. Abuse	
Question 5.9	<u>Specific Complaints</u>
a)	<p><u>How many specific complaints of abuse of children in foster care have been made to the local authority?</u></p> <p>126 specific complaints of abuse of children in foster care have been found to have been made to the local authority.</p> <p>Prior to 1970 there is no evidence available to review to establish the number of specific complaints.</p> <p>The local authority put in place a team to carry out a file audit of foster carers who were approved between 1970 – 2008. Approved foster carer files are kept for a period of 25 years from the date of the carer's deregistration. Due to the closure of local authority</p>

	<p>buildings and other restrictions as a result of Covid-19, this file audit could not be completed. In addition, the local authority was unable to access any files that would allow an assessment of the number of complaints from 2008 onwards.</p> <p>The answers below reflect this and show that on the file audit information that was completed, 126 specific complaints of abuse of children in foster care have been found to have been made to the local authority.</p>
<p><u>For each specific complaint, please answer the following:</u></p>	
b)	<p><u>Who made the complaint?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
c)	<p><u>When was the complaint made?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
d)	<p><u>Against whom was the complaint made?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
e)	<p><u>What was the nature of the complaint?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
f)	<p><u>When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
g)	<p><u>What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
h)	<p><u>What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>
i)	<p><u>What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?</u></p> <p>See details below.</p>

j)	<u>Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?</u> See details below.
k)	<u>If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?</u> See details below.
l)	<u>If there was no response, why not?</u> See details below.
m)	<u>Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?</u> See details below.
n)	<u>If not, why not?</u> See details below.

Complaint 1

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, ██████████ James Farquhar.
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1987.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	James Farquhar - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in July 1987.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	As the complaint was an allegation of sexual abuse against the registered foster carer, adherence was given to the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, Sections 4 and 8.

		The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) on 14 July 1987 and progressed a Child Protection Investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach to investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>An Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) was held to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>All care commitments offered by the foster carer were monitored pending Child Protection Investigation. The IRD agreed that the young person should have a Joint Investigative Interview (JII). Following the conclusion of the JII, the outcome for the Child Protection Investigation was that no further action be taken.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The IRD agreed that a Joint Investigative Interview (JII) be undertaken with the young person. The JII was concluded and the outcome from the Child Protection Investigation was for no further action to be taken.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The local authority assisted the Police in their investigations and then provided the file to the Procurator Fiscal following allegations made in 1998. The local authority does not now have access to the file to ascertain if a response was provided.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with the Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines and agreed information sharing protocol. This information consequently informed the Child Protection inquiry, Initial Referral Discussion, investigation actions and the conclusions reached.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 2

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 1993.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	James Farquhar - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation was made by a child in placement with the foster carer in relation to sexual abuse committed by the foster carer against ██████████.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in around 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The response was in accordance with Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>A Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) and progressed a Child Protection Investigation. A Joint Investigative Interview (JII) was agreed and held, then subsequently a Child Protection Case Conference was held on 9 June 1993, in accordance with the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, Section 6 & 4.1(c) respectively.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines (Sections 4.1 and 8.1). An IRD was held to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>All care commitments offered by the foster carer were monitored pending Child Protection Investigation. The IRD agreed that the young person should undertake a Joint Investigative Interview (JII). Following the conclusion of the JII, the outcome was to progress to</p>

		an Initial Child Protection Case Conference. This was held on 9 June 1993.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Initial Child Protection Case Conference was held on 9 June 1993 and concluded that based on the information gathered in the Child Protection Investigation, no further Child Protection action was required.</p> <p>It was also decided that alternative accommodation plans for the children in placement with the foster carer were not needed. A minute of the Child Protection Case Conference was to be included in the foster carer's next annual review.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	As noted above in point (i), the response provided was given in a formal manner which followed the Edinburgh and the Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which evidenced a full Child Protection Investigation and Case Conference being progressed. A further element to the response was that the minute of the Child Protection Case Conference was to be included in the foster carer's next annual review panel.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority assisted the Police in their investigations and then provided the file to the Procurator Fiscal following allegations made in 1998. The local authority does not now have access to the file to ascertain if a response was provided. The file is still with the Procurator Fiscal.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Following the conclusions of the Child Protection Investigation and Case Conference that no further action was required, no further specific response was needed.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	<p>Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Lothian and Borders Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol.</p> <p>This information consequently informed the Child Protection inquiry, Initial Referral Discussion, investigation actions and the conclusions reached.</p>
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 3

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	FCY [REDACTED] child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	October 1996.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	[REDACTED] - [REDACTED], foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual Abuse. An allegation of inappropriate sexual behaviour was made by the child in foster care against [REDACTED].
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in October 1996.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority's response was in accordance with Sections 4 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>A Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) and progressed a Child Protection Investigation. A Joint Investigative Interview (JII) was also agreed and held.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach to investigating the complaint was based on the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines (Sections 4.1 and 8.1). An Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) was held in order to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>The IRD agreed that the young person should undertake a JII. The JII was concluded and the outcome was that the information gathered be utilised as part of an ongoing Police inquiry against [REDACTED].</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Inter-Agency Child Protection Investigation informed safety planning for FCY [REDACTED] and her sibling.</p> <p>[REDACTED] was charged with Lewd and Libidinous behaviour, but these charges were subsequently deserted.</p>

		<p>██████████ was immediately removed from the home and accommodated within a local authority Children's Home. Whilst ██████████ was outwith the family home, the children in placement eventually transitioned to adoptive placements in 1997.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>As noted above in point (i), the response followed the Edinburgh and the Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. It resulted in a full Child Protection Investigation and informed the Police inquiry and subsequent charges against ██████████, as well as the alternative accommodation secured for him as part of safety planning for the other children in placement.</p> <p>██████████, and his adoptive parents, received counselling regarding inappropriate sexualised behaviour which was offered by the Young Peoples Unit.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Lothian and Borders Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines and agreed information sharing protocol. This information informed the Child Protection inquiry, Initial Referral Discussion, investigation actions and the conclusions reached. This (and further information) was also shared with the Police in order to inform their ongoing inquiry, which resulted in the charges brought.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 4

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	FCY ██████████, a child previously placed with foster carer.

c.	When was the complaint made?	9 January 1998
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	James Farquhar - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual Abuse. An allegation of sexual abuse was made by FCY against James Farquhar.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place prior to 24 December 1997, while FCY was in a foster care placement with James Farquhar.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>The local authority's response was in accordance with Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>A Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) and progressed a Child Protection Investigation. A Joint Investigative Interview (JII) was also agreed and held.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach to investigating the complaint was based on the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines (Sections 4.1 and 8.1). An Initial IRD was held to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>All care commitments offered by the foster carer were suspended pending the Child Protection Investigation. The IRD agreed that the young person should undertake a JII. The JII was concluded and the outcome was that the information gathered be utilised as part of an ongoing Police inquiry against the foster carer.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The Inter-Agency Child Protection Investigation ceased all placements for children and young people and alternative placements were secured for the children who were presently placed. The complainant was supported to make full disclosure in JII. The other children who were presently placed were also subject to JIIs. The information gathered in the Child Protection Investigation informed the ongoing Police investigation which resulted in the foster carer receiving five charges of Lewd & Libidinous behaviour, for which he received a six-year custodial sentence at a High Court trial in 1999.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	As noted above in point (i), a formal response was initiated which followed the Edinburgh and the Lothians Child Protection Guidelines. This Child Protection Investigation informed the resultant Police investigation, the charges against the foster carer and the custodial sentence. The local authority assisted the Police in their investigations and then provided the file to the Procurator Fiscal following allegations made in 1998. The local authority does not now have access to the file to ascertain if a response was provided
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	As well as the Child Protection Investigation, ongoing support was offered to the young person who had disclosed the sexual abuse. There was also ongoing support provided to the other children who were moved as a result of the allegations in relation to the transition to alternative and appropriate care placements. The foster carer was formally deregistered at a Carer's Review Panel, held on 07 September 1999.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Lothian and Borders Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines and agreed information sharing protocol. This information informed the Child Protection Inquiry, Initial Referral Discussion, investigation actions and the conclusions reached. This (and further information) was also

		shared with Police in order to inform their ongoing enquiry which resulted in the charges brought against the foster carer and subsequent convictions.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 5

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	December 1992
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FSI [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. An allegation was made that the carer left the child unattended in the house while posting a letter.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in December 1992.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The social worker visited the house the next day and discussed the issue with the carer.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue. Reasons for not leaving a baby alone were explained and the carer agreed not to do this again.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	The carer's remit was amended to children aged 0-6 months, rather than 0-12 months at the carer's review.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 6

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 1999.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FSJ ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FSJ ██████████ in relation to her use of physical chastisement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in February 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p>

		Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the allegations were subjected to an Initial Referral Discussion.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Information was passed to the Police in relation to the allegation and they concluded their investigation after a joint interview with the child in May 1999.</p> <p>Information was also passed to the Edinburgh and Lothians Registration and Inspection Service (ELRIS) for an inspection of fostering services. The carers were randomly chosen for the pilot scheme and it was noted in the report that the normal child protection IRD processes were missed resulting in lengthy timescales where the carers were unsure of their current and future status.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>A joint investigation was undertaken by the local authority and the Police. The Police did not proceed to bring any charges against the carer.</p> <p>The local authority took the carer to a Panel for review. The carers decided to take time out following the investigation. The local authority took the carers to a Panel for review in 2001 where they were de-registered as foster carers. From the point of the complaint until their de-registration, no children were placed with the carers.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The foster child remained in placement for a further five weeks and then moved to Balerno Close Support Unit.</p> <p>No children were placed while the investigation was in process.</p> <p>No charges were made against the carers</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information was passed to the police and they concluded their investigation after a joint interview with the child in May 1999.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 7

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Birth mother of child in placement
c.	When was the complaint made?	August 1997.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FSJ-FSZ – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. An allegation of neglect was made against the foster carers in August 1997. The allegations related to concerns around the carers' drinking habits and that a child in placement was wearing clothes that were worn out.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in August 1997.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The foster carers' file makes reference to this complaint being discussed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A letter was sent to the child's social worker from a solicitor detailing various concerns. The social worker forwarded the letter to the carers liaison social worker asking for her to contact him to discuss the concerns raised.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no information available to show what the outcome was.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	A response was sent to the Solicitor noting the concerns raised and the local authority's parental responsibilities to review the interests of the children in the context of their overall needs.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	As above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 8

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Foster child previously in placement with neighbour of carers
c.	When was the complaint made?	December 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTI-FTJ - Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional and physical abuse. Allegations were made of 'heavy handedness' and use of the belt. A child in foster placement with Mr and Mrs FTI-FTJ was seen having to cut her underwear into strips and eat them.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place several years prior to the date of the allegation.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Section 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to assess that an internal investigation should be

		progressed. The carers were informed of the allegations and an investigation took place.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An investigation took place and social workers interviewed the foster child named in the allegation and also two children who were previously placed with the carers.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action was taken. The complaint was denied by the child in question. The child had already left 'care' and was staying on a voluntary basis with FTI-FTJ her ex-foster carers.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No specific response.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	A letter was sent to the carers informing them that no further action would be taken.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as a child protection matter.

Complaint 9

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	August 1992.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTI-FTJ - Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional & physical abuse. The allegation included ill treatment, excessive discipline and preventing the young person from seeing

		family members. These allegations were made in August 1992 relating to conduct that took place between July 1988 and August 1992.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	These allegations related to conduct that took place between July 1988 and August 1992.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Section 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to assess that an internal investigation should be progressed. The carers were informed of the allegations and an investigation took place.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The liaison social worker carried out an investigation with the foster carers to explore the complaint. Recommendations were made to the District Manager.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The District Manager accepted the recommendations of the investigation which were that a home study continue with specific areas requiring further exploration and debate.</p> <p>A letter was sent to the foster carers explaining the summary of the investigation and its outcome.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The young person was sent a letter by the District Manager explaining the decision to permit the Mr and Mrs FTI-FTJ to continue as foster carers. This letter explained that the complaints had been taken seriously and that the carers would be required to undertake training in the areas of weakness identified from the investigation.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No

n.	If not, why not?	The level of physical punishment described by complainant was not substantiated in other statements. It was not assessed as a child protection issue.
----	------------------	---

Complaint 10

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Birth mother of ██████████, a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	March 2002
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTI-FTJ ██████████ - Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse and neglectful care. Mr FTJ ██████████ had allegedly sworn at the child in placement resulting in the child walking to her mother's house. The carer had searched her room and found condoms.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in March 2002.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority response was in accordance with Appendix 2 of the Foster Carer Agreement: Departmental Complaints Procedure (2002). This was used to determine that an internal investigation be progressed. The child returned to the carers after the weekend spent at her mother's home.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Internal investigation. The child returned to the carers after the weekend spent at her mother's home.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue. The child returned to the carers after the weekend and remained in placement until end of July 2002.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The Director of Social Work wrote a letter to the complainant. Support was offered to the carers to maintain the placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as a child protection issue.

Complaint 11

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's birth mother
c.	When was the complaint made?	April 1984
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTH [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made against FTB [REDACTED] of slapping a child in placement across the face.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on [REDACTED] April 1984.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority instigated an internal investigation.

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The social worker spoke with the birth mother who made the complaint as well as the child in placement, the child's sibling and the carer. It is not recorded whether the foster carer admitted to the allegation, however it does appear from the case records available that the allegation was linked to the child's feeling of anxiety regarding being outwith their mother's care.</p> <p>It was agreed that the birth mother speak directly to the carer and after discussion it seemed resolved between all parties.</p> <p>The children remained in placement.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The birth mother and the carer discussed the incident and the children remained in placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The social worker supported both the birth mother and the carer to resolve the issue and the children remained in placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 12

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Headteacher
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 1985

d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTH – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglectful care. Concerns were reported that FTH had too many fostered children in her care and was unable to provide them with the support required.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged neglect took place prior to the complaint being made in February 1995.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The placements of children were overseen regularly by the children's social workers, liaison workers and senior social workers and regular reviews of placements and carers took place.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The social worker had no concerns of the carer's skills as a foster carer.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The Social Worker wrote to the headteacher to assure them of carer's skills as a foster carer and that they had no concerns following their assessment.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 13

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The complaint was made at some time in 1986.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████, child in foster care.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. It was alleged that the alleged abuser had gotten into bed with a child in foster placement and had attempted to kiss her and to touch her underwear.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	From the limited information available, it appears that this was a singular incident that occurred at some time in 1986.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. An Internal Investigation was progressed to address the allegations made.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A meeting was held to discuss the allegation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The alleged abuser, who was another child accommodated in the foster care placement, was moved to an alternative foster placement and therapeutic intervention was provided to both children in foster care.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	An alternative placement was secured, and therapeutic support provided to both children.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Not recorded
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 14

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, siblings in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1986
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████, child in foster placement with the complainants.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in foster placement was alleged to have bullied another child (AE) into the inappropriate touching of her brother (NE), who was also a child in the foster placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	From the limited information available, it appears that the alleged abuse was a singular incident that took place at some point in July 1986.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. An internal investigation was progressed in order to address the allegations which were made.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A meeting was held to discuss the allegation. There was also an investigation into why the siblings were placed with the foster carers when the alleged abuser was there and who had complex needs.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of the investigation resulted in therapeutic intervention being given to all children involved. The alleged abuser was moved to a different foster care placement.

		This complaint also resulted in the local authority reviewing how it used Emergency Foster Care placements in November 1986.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority ensured that therapeutic support was offered to all children involved.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	This information was not recorded within the foster carers' file.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 15

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Summer of 1985
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	Previous foster carer. Actual name not recorded.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation of historical sexual abuse was made. The child alleged that when the female carer went out the male carer would send his son to the shops and he would sexually abuse her.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse happened between 1978 and 1980 for a period of 1.5 years when the child was between 8 and 9.5 years old.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The allegation was disclosed to the child's foster carers at the time who contacted social workers and the child's GP.

		The alleged abuser was already deceased; therefore, it was noted there was little merit in pursuing any formal child protection investigation. Support was given to the child.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The information regarding this complaint was mentioned in the current carer's Review Report of December 1985. It states that the young person was interviewed by a Social Worker and that the alleged abuser was deceased at the time the allegation was made.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Due to Covid-19 restrictions we have been unable to review the child's records. The allegation was brought to the attention of the Divisional Director.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Therapeutic support was provided by a Psychologist at The Royal Hospital for Sick Children. Although the carers' remit was for more than one child, a decision was made by the Senior Social worker that they would only have the child in placement to enable them to focus on the child's wellbeing following the allegations. The child remained with their current foster carers.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement

Complaint 16

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ child in foster care.

c.	When was the complaint made?	Unclear (information taken from the previous carers' Review Report December 1985)
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	Mr FTL – Foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	The child in placement contacted her previous carers after three weeks in a placement with the Mr FTL to say that she was frightened to return to the placement with Mr FTL after an incident.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident happened before November 1985.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>Due to Covid-19 restrictions, we have been unable to review the file of [REDACTED] and identify if we hold records for Mr FTL.</p> <p>The information regarding this complaint was mentioned in the Carer Review Report for the previous carers and the child returned to their care on a full time basis until she was matched to permanent carers.</p> <p>The information contained in the report states, "investigations were made" and it was agreed the young person would not return to the care of Mr FTL.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Due to Covid-19 restrictions, we have been unable to review the file of [REDACTED] and identify if we hold records for Mr FTL.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child returned to the previous carers until a permanent placement was identified.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The child returned to the previous carers until a permanent placement was identified. She was given support to come to terms with the incident at involving Mr FTL.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	A pastoral response was provided.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	This is unclear as due to Covid-19 restrictions, we have been unable to review the file of [REDACTED] and identify if we hold records for Mr FTL
n.	If not, why not?	See above.

Complaint 17

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	[REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	25 July 1988
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTM [REDACTED] foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in foster care alleged that she was sexually abused 10 or 12 times by the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was said to have taken place 10 or 12 times between 19 January 1988 and 29 February 1988.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Sections 4 and 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to allow an investigation to be progressed. The carers were informed of the allegations and an investigation took place.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority held a Child Protection Case Conference where the child was interviewed twice by Social Work and the Police. The foster carer was also interviewed by the Police and statements were taken. The case was referred to Fettes Women & Children Unit of the Police for investigation.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>Following interviews with the child and the foster carer, the Police felt that it was unlikely that abuse had occurred, so no further action was taken.</p> <p>The local authority noted that the allegations were unfounded.</p> <p>The child had moved on to a new placement.</p> <p>The foster carers took a break and then later returned to fostering.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>An alternative placement was secured for the child.</p> <p>The foster carers took a break from fostering but returned later.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police were involved as there were child protection issues relating to the complaint.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 18

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	22 March 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTM ██████████, foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in foster care disclosed that the foster carer had sexually abused her when the foster carer's wife was at Brownies and the foster carer's daughter was in another room.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was said to have taken place during the child's foster placement which lasted from 10 January 1991 until 15 March 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Sections 4 and 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to progress the investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority held a consultative meeting with a representative from the Police to plan the course of action. The allegation was referred to the Woman & Children's Unit of the Police for investigation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The Police investigation resulted in the foster carer being arrested and charged. The local authority then de-registered the foster carer. The allegation was made after the child in foster care had left the placement and there were no other children in place at that time.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority did not place any children with the foster carer following the allegation. The local authority then de-registered the foster carer once he had been arrested and charged by the Police. The local authority's Social Work department offered support to the foster carer's wife and daughter. A Child Protection Case Conference was held for the daughter of the carer which involved reports from school, doctors, and interviews with the daughter. The foster carer's daughter denied the allegation that she had also been abused.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police were involved as there were child protection issues relating to the complaint.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 19

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	[REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	28 January 1992.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTM [REDACTED] foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. This complaint was a historical allegation of abuse where a child in foster care disclosed that she had been sexually abused by the foster carer when she was previously in foster placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was said to have taken place between 6 September 1989 and 18 July 1990.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Sections 4 and 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to progress an enquiry. The local authority made a referral to the Police in relation to the complaint as there was already an existing investigation into the foster carer.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority referred the allegations to the Police as there was already an investigation underway into abuse by the foster carer. All children who had previously been in placement with the foster carers were interviewed.</p> <p>A Case Conference was held on 11 February 1992.</p> <p>A Child Protection meeting was held for the foster carer's biological daughter on 18 February 1992 and another Case Conference was held on 3 March 1992.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	While the Police investigation was ongoing, the foster carers had no children in placement. The foster carer was arrested and charged on 12 February 1992 and the foster carers were then de-registered by the local authority.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority held case conferences and child protection meetings for the children in placement. The local authority also de-registered the foster carer.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police were involved as there were child protection issues relating to the complaint.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 20

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	January 1988.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	EJH ██████████ - birth son of Foster Carers, FTN-FTO ██████████.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Inappropriate sexual behaviour – EJH ██████████ and the young person in care had at some point in the placement kissed. It was alleged that he then continued to pester her and make her feel uncomfortable. She spoke to his brother who intervened, and this behaviour stopped. She received a letter from EJH ██████████ after Christmas and feared that the pestering would start again and made the disclosure to her social worker on 13/01/1988.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place between 1987 and January 1988.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The Edinburgh and Lothians Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Section 8.3 was used to inform how this process should be progressed, which determined that an internal investigation be carried out initially. After discussion with the Senior Social Worker, it was agreed that the scheduled foster carer contract review meeting, due the day after the allegation was made, was to be cancelled. Instead a meeting took place at the carers home with the young person, her allocated social worker, the carers and [REDACTED] where the allegation was discussed.</p> <p>The Social Worker informed her senior of the outcome of the meeting at the carers home and they decided that it was not in the young person's interest to hold a NAI (Non Accidental Injury) Case Conference called or involve the police. To do so would be traumatic for the young person as she had already been involved in a rape trial the previous year. In addition, she was out of the house and not at further risk and it would be difficult to establish circumstances as the accused was denying it.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A full foster carer placement review was carried out after the end of this placement to see what lessons could be learned.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The allegation and outcome of the placement review was raised at the next carer review in February 1988. The young person was removed from placement and returned to the care of her mother. In addition a family learning meeting took place with the liaison social worker to discuss lessons learnt for their future fostering role.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The young person was removed from placement and returned to the care of her mother where she remained.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	Not recorded.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	A decision made by social workers and seniors that it was not in the young person's best interest to hold a NAI (Non Accidental Injury) Case Conference called or involve the police. To do so would be traumatic for the young person as she had already been involved in a rape trial the previous year. In addition, she was out of the house and not at further risk and it would be difficult to establish circumstances as the accused was denying the allegations.

Complaint 21

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in placement
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 1994
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTN ██████████ - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The carer allegedly manhandled the child in placement on his return from being missing.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in May 1994.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance. The process taken required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Initial Referral

		Discussion under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines (Section 4).
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance. The process taken required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines (Section 4).
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was removed from placement
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	It was determined that the child should not be placed on the Child Protection Register as he was staying with his Grandmother and Aunt.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	It was determined that the child should not be placed on the Child Protection Register as he was staying with his Grandmother and Aunt. The carers were eventually de-registered but not as a result of this complaint.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, as per Child Protection Inquiry.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 22

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1994.

d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTN - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical & emotional abuse. The young person in placement alleged that the foster carer had threatened him and pushed him around and that he was unhappy with staying in the placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in July 1994.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Section 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to assess that an internal investigation should be progressed. The local authority also had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>The carer had contacted the Emergency Duty Team (EDT) as the young person left the house after an argument. The young person was in the garden and refused to enter the house.</p> <p>The EDT social worker(s) attended the house where the young person was anxious and silent and made the allegation. The EDT social worker was concerned that the home was unwelcoming, and the carer was asking for respite.</p> <p>It was arranged for the young person to be moved to alternative carers that evening.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>This allegation was dealt with as a practice issue and the young person was removed from placement and placed with Outworkers.</p> <p>A meeting between Outworkers and the carers was convened to address the issues in the complaint and the file suggests that these issues were resolved.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The young person was removed from placement and the allegation was discussed at the next carer review in December 1994.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No specific response.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	No specific response
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not required.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	There is no record of this event being assessed as a police matter.

Complaint 23

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 1999.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTN-FTO ██████████ Foster carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. The complaint related to the misuse of clothing allowances, the children in placement sharing bedrooms, the role of the foster carers' adult sons and the language used by FTN ██████████ and his sons.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place between October 1994 – May 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The issues raised by the young person in the placement review form were processed using the Complaints procedures in place at that time. The local authority response was in accordance with Appendix

		2 of the Foster Carer Agreement: Departmental Complaints Procedure (2002).
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The complaint was investigated by the Acting Resource Team Manager and the findings of this investigation was provided to the Service Manager who made several recommendations to the Panel Chair of issues that need to be discussed and addressed at the next carer review.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The young person was moved to an alternative placement and the findings of the complaint investigation were to be discussed at the next carer review.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The findings recommended that the carers attend the next training sessions provided on "Skylight/Safer Caring"
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 24

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	3 October 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	EJG ██████████ - birth son of Foster Carers, FTN-FTO ██████████.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. It was alleged that EJG had assaulted a young person by grabbing him around the neck in an attempt to restrain him.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place on 3 October 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	As the complaint was an allegation of physical and emotional abuse against the registered foster carers, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were also followed. Child Protection inquiry initiated and note that interviews were to be scheduled.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority instigated a Child Protection inquiry.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	At a scheduled review of carers' remit on 4/10/2000, due to previous complaints, it was agreed that the carers be de-registered. There is no further information available in the carers file regarding this Child Protection Inquiry. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the local authority has been unable to access and review the child's file to provide further information.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	At a scheduled review of carers' remit on 4/10/2000 due to previous complaints, it was agreed that the carers are de-registered. There is no further information available in the carers file regarding this Child Protection Inquiry. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the local authority has been unable to access and review the child's file to provide further information.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, as per the Child Protection Inquiry.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 25

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	Historical – since 1993
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTN-FTO – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect, Physical and Emotional abuse, alleged assault, the male carer's attitude towards social work staff was noted as hostile and abusive on several occasions; threatening to 'dump' children at ESWS, lock children out the house, also threatening to end the placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Years
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	A Carers Review in 2000 of the FTN-FTO listed a variety of complaints and the varying processes that were followed to investigate them including Child Protection procedures, Complaints Procedure, Internal Investigation, with discussions involving liaison workers and PT Social Workers and a Carers Review.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Child Protection procedures – Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was adhered to. Complaints Procedure – the local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.

		Internal Investigation – discussions involving liaison workers and practice team social workers. Carers Review.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Following a Fostering Panel meeting on 4 October 2000 it was recommended that the carers be deregistered.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carer was deregistered.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	There is evidence of the police being involved in some of the complaints made against the carers
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 26

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a young person previously in a foster care placement with FOJ-FON ██████████
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FOJ ██████████ - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. A letter was brought to the attention of the Social Work Department that FOJ ██████████ had allegedly sexually abused a young person in placement.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Evidence relating to the time period of this complaint is believed to be held by West Lothian Council who hold the records for the child.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The Emergency Duty Team and Police were informed of the allegations and a single agency police investigation progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The Police interviewed both foster carers and their family, including their older children.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The young person who made the allegation of sexual abuse admitted to inventing the story under pressure from the Police during the investigation into the allegation. Following the allegation, the foster carers changed their registration to only take boys for foster placements.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Following the police investigation, the foster carers' social worker requested a 28-day break to allow the family to get over the trauma of the allegations.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 27

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care

c.	When was the complaint made?	May 1994
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FOJ-FON - Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. At a Children's Hearing panel, the child raised concerns about his placement and refused to return to the carers. The child alleged that the male carer made threats about the child's safety, unfair punishments, swearing at the child and lengthy questioning and discussions about his behaviour.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place during the child's placement between 10 December 1993 and 11 May 1994
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach was in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines to determine an internal investigation be progressed. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority instigated an internal investigation.</p> <p>An alternative placement was found for the child that day as he was refusing to return to the carers.</p> <p>The next day, the social worker and senior social worker interviewed the child and reassured him that he would not be returning to the care of the FOJ-FON.</p> <p>The resource team manager met with the carers to discuss the ending of the placement and allegations made.</p> <p>This information was shared with the Principal Officer for Children & Young People.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was removed from placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child was removed from placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a child protection matter.

Complaint 28

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████ – joint foster carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	August 1990
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FOQ ██████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation of sexual abuse was made against the male carer. The child in placement had a friend sleep over and the friend alleged that the male carer made a pass at her. This was subsequently passed to the female carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in the days preceding the allegation.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The female carer informed her Liaison Social Worker and the child's Social Worker.

		<p>An interview took place with the child, who made the allegation, and her mother.</p> <p>A Senior Social Worker and the Liaison Social Worker interviewed both FOQ-SPO [REDACTED]</p> <p>FOQ [REDACTED] denied the allegation and spoke of the safeguarding behaviour he put in place when female children were being placed with them. A report detailing the investigation was forwarded to the Divisional Director.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Due to inconsistencies in the account from the child, no further action was taken.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	A letter from the Divisional Director was sent to the carers confirming that no further action would be taken regarding the allegation, and there was no reason to question the care provided to the two children that were in placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a child protection matter.

Complaint 29

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Birth family member of [REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	April 1989.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPI-FPJ [REDACTED] - foster carers

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	<p>Neglectful abuse. The birth mother of the child in placement made several allegations. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - her son running around 'like a tramp' despite the carers getting a clothing grant - FPI [REDACTED] was drinking daily in a social club - FPJ [REDACTED] being late in collecting her son from school which resulted in him being knocked over by a car - both carers swearing all the time.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place throughout placement which started June 1988.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed. An internal investigation was carried out. The Senior Social Worker visited the carers the day after the complaint was received and discussed the issues raised in the letter. A meeting was arranged with the mother of the child in placement to discuss the findings however she failed to attend.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An internal investigation was carried out. The Senior Social Worker visited the carers the day after the complaint was received and discussed the issues raised in the letter. A meeting was arranged with the mother of the child in placement to discuss the findings however she failed to attend.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue and discussed at the next carer review panel held in March 1990.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The parent of the child in placement was asked to attend a meeting to discuss the findings of the investigation, however she did not attend. There is no further information in the file.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	As above.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	As above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The matter was not regarded as a child protection matter.

Complaint 30

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	FPJ [REDACTED] Joint Foster Carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	October 1984
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPI [REDACTED] - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The female carer, FPJ [REDACTED], reported an incident that occurred that evening when the male carer 'hit the child' in an altercation at the dinner table.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in October 1984.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach was in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines to determine and internal investigation be progressed. The out of hours Emergency Duty Team (EDT) responded to the complaint and an internal investigation was initiated.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The out of hours Emergency Duty Team (EDT) were contacted by the female carer requesting an immediate visit to remove the young person in placement following a physical altercation between the male carer and the young person. The police were also contacted, and it was agreed that the matter be dealt with by the EDT social workers.

		<p>The EDT social workers visited with an outworker and spoke with the carers and the young person to determine the events leading up to the assault. The young person declined to see a doctor about his injuries. Both the carer and the young person declined to make a formal complaint to the Police.</p> <p>It was agreed that the young person be temporarily moved to Outworkers that evening and should he be placed elsewhere, a medical would be undertaken.</p> <p>Information from EDT was passed to the relevant social workers.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The young person was moved to Outworkers that evening.</p> <p>A review of the placement was conducted detailing areas of difficulty, progress made, effect on the family, skills and knowledge gained and the implications on future placements.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The young person was removed from placement and the carers took time out.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. The carers contacted the police who attended and after talking to EDT the police took no further action.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 31

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 1998

d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPJ - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The child alleged that during his placement with the carer, she put him over her knee and smacked him three times. He stated that he was sent upstairs to his room and made to stay there till morning, that he was screaming and crying during that time and no one came to comfort him.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place during his placement, between October 1992 and January 1993.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach was in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	In accordance with 8.1 Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Carers or Agency Employees, a decision was made that an internal investigation was progressed. The liaison social worker and the resource team manager visited the carers and conducted an internal interview on 24 June 1998. They discussed the allegations and confirmed that the carers were aware of the departmental guideline that physical punishment was not to be used. The carers discussed their caring practices and the placement in an open manner. The Investigation found there was no reason to believe that the incident had occurred as alleged.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The investigation found there was no reason to believe the incident had occurred as alleged. The allegation was discussed at the next carer review panel in June 1999.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence in the carer file that a response was provided to the complainant.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as child protection matter.

Complaint 32

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	3 October 1989.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPK ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against the carer. It was alleged that the carer had grabbed the neck of a child in placement and that this had left a mark.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident would have taken place on 1 October 1989.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The child in placement made an allegation of assault and was examined by a doctor. The doctor who examined the child in placement found that the mark was not consistent with being grabbed.

		The Police interviewed the carers and the child's social worker and found the allegation to be unfounded and no further police action was taken.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The carers took time out while the allegations were being investigated. The allegation was discussed at the next carer review held in June 1990.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence of a response included in the carer records.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 33

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Several complaints made between August 1994 and April 1995.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPQ-FPR ██████████ – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	The child in placement made various calls to the Police and Childline making allegations about the foster carers.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place between August 1994 and April 1995.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	Whilst there are no case records indicating the exact process that was followed regarding these allegations, there is no recording of any child protection investigation, therefore it would be prudent to assess that an internal investigation was carried out, as these issues were discussed and addressed at the carers review panel.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Whilst there are no case records indicating the exact process that was followed regarding these allegations, there is no recording of any child protection investigation, therefore it would be prudent to assess that an internal investigation was carried out, as these issues were discussed and addressed at the carers review panel. A carers review took place in December 1995.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	From the minutes of the carers review in December 1995 it is noted that there was no evidence found to support any of the allegations made. As the strain became too much for the carers, the child was removed from placement and transferred to a secure unit.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child was removed from the placement and transferred to a secure unit. The carers were "close support" carers working with very difficult children and supports were put in place to allow them to continue carrying out this difficult role.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. The minutes from a Carer Review Panel in December 1995 indicate that the carers were spoken to by the police on several occasions while in the car regarding the allegations, but there is no record of any outcome.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 34

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Prior to 8 December 1995.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPQ-FPR ██████████ – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical Abuse – An allegation of physical abuse was made to the police by the child in placement that the carers had hit him.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place prior to 8 December 1995.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p> <p>The police contacted the Emergency Duty Team (EDT) who instigated an internal investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The EDT social workers visited and after discussions the child retracted the allegation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	From the minutes of the carers review in December 1995, the child was removed from the placement and transferred to a secure unit. It is not clear if this was as a result of the allegations made.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, the carers were approved as close support carers working with children who displayed significant behavioural and emotional distress, with supports in place to allow them to continue carrying out this challenging role.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child was removed from the placement and transferred to a secure unit as this was assessed as the required placement in accordance with assessed needs of the young person.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes
n.	If not, why not?	The police made the referral to the EDT social workers.

Complaint 35

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	A member of the child's birth family.
c.	When was the complaint made?	30 March 1998.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV [REDACTED] – Respite Foster carer for the child
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse/Neglectful care. An allegation of physical abuse was made on 30 March 1998. The child returned home from respite care with his upper face red and a blister below his eye.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The allegation related to an incident in March 1998.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Following a discussion between the practice team manager and Family Based Care it was decided that the matter should not be dealt with as child protection. Involved workers were to follow up with Mrs FPV.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was taken to a GP in relation to the injury reported in this allegation. The GP's view was that the injury was caused by an insect bite rather than physical abuse by the foster carer. The parents chose to end the placement and the child was removed from placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The allegation of abuse was not upheld by the child's GP, but the child's parents chose to end the placement for respite care.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter.

Complaint 36

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbours of the foster carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	March 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV – Foster Carer & her son

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect – An allegation was made after the child in placement was found in the street by the neighbour and said that the foster carer's son had hit them.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in March 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An immediate home visit was made by Emergency Social Work Service and the child in placement was returned to the care of FPV on the basis of their assessment. The complaint was then dealt with as learning practice issue.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The file noted that the complaint was dealt with as a learning practice issue. The behaviour of the carer's son was addressed in a subsequent investigation undertaken following other complaints about the carer in July 1991.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	An independent investigation was later opened following a second complaint which resulted in FPV having a break from fostering to focus on her son. The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter requiring any Police involvement.

Complaint 37

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of foster carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV [REDACTED] – Foster Carer & her son [REDACTED]
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect. An allegation was made of physical abuse and neglect in June 1991.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place before July 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation</p> <p>An internal investigation was undertaken into this complaint among others in July 1991 by the local authority who appointed an investigator from another area of Social Work to try to ensure a measure of independent scrutiny in the investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>An immediate home visit was made by the liaison Social Worker.</p> <p>A discussion took place with line managers and the Divisional Director where it was agreed that an independent investigation was to take place. The carer was formally advised of this by letter dated 06 June 1991.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Divisional Director requested information from the police in respect of the carer and her then boyfriend.</p> <p>A Senior Police Officer subsequently contacted the team Area Officer in response to this enquiry to state that police contact had</p>

		<p>been mainly in relation to absconding of the child and noise disturbance. There was no police information about unpaid fines or warrants but the boyfriend had been arrested on one occasion for a “comparatively minor matter”.</p> <p>The liaison social worker continued to support the foster carer during the investigation.</p> <p>Following the allegations and prior to the investigation being concluded, the child involved in the complaint continued to reside in the foster placement. This was monitored by the liaison social worker who continued to support the foster carer. Once the investigation was concluded, recommendations were made that the child in placement be moved within 6-8 weeks and the foster carer take a break from fostering that was to be reviewed after nine months. The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The liaison social worker continued to support the foster carer during the investigation.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 38

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of foster carer

c.	When was the complaint made?	June 1991.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV [REDACTED] – Foster Carer and [REDACTED]
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect. An allegation was made relating to physical abuse by the foster carer's son and neglect by the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place on 9 June 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation</p> <p>An independent investigation was undertaken into this complaint among others in July 1991 by the local authority who appointed an investigator from another area of Social Work to try to ensure a measure of independent scrutiny in the investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A Hospital Social Worker was contacted by the neighbour's mother on Tuesday 11 June 1991. The incident was reported in writing on 13 June 1991 to the Investigating Officer of the earlier complaint against Mrs FPV [REDACTED].
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	FPV [REDACTED] was permitted to continue as a foster carer, however, there were no further placements at that time to allow Mrs FPV [REDACTED] to focus on her son. This was reviewed after nine months. The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	The Liaison Social Worker continued support during the investigation.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	An investigation into complaints against the carer was underway and complaint not treated as child protection by involved workers.

Complaint 39

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of foster carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] – Foster Carer & [REDACTED]
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect. Allegations were made of lack of supervision of looked after children, lifestyle issues and the behaviour of the carer's son.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place before July 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An internal investigation was undertaken into this complaint, among others, in July 1991 by the local authority.

		<p>An investigator was appointed from another area of Social Work to try to ensure a measure of independent scrutiny in the investigation.</p> <p>Information was sought from the Police in relation to the absconding of the child named in the complaints, as well as allegations of noise disturbance. The neighbour who made the complaint was interviewed by the independent investigator as part of the investigation that was undertaken in July 1991.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The liaison social worker continued to support the foster carer. Following the independent investigation, recommendations were made that the placement of the child was to end within 6 to 8 weeks. No further placements were to be made with FPV [REDACTED] for an initial period of nine months.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>FPV [REDACTED] was permitted to continue as a foster carer, however, there were no further placements at that time to allow Mrs FPV [REDACTED] to focus on her son. This was reviewed after nine months. The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter.

Complaint 40

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Mother of child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 2000.

d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. An allegation was made that the carer made derogatory remarks regarding the child's birth mother and that this impacted on the child's emotional wellbeing as well as breaching confidentiality.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place on 13 June 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>A meeting was held with Mrs FPV the liaison worker and senior social worker to address the complaint made. This was resolved as a practice learning issue.</p> <p>Mrs FPV liaison social worker continued to provide support and advice to the foster carer on confidentiality issues and boundary keeping.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue. The liaison social worker for Mrs FPV was to continue to "support and advise on confidentiality issues and boundary keeping". Mrs FPV also met with the birth mother of the child in foster care and apologised.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided support, advice and identified relevant training for the carer to undertake.</p> <p>Mrs FPV also met with the birth mother of the child in foster care and apologised.</p> <p>The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.</p>

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This matter was not regarded as a Child Protection matter.

Complaint 41

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	The birth mother of a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 2001.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV [REDACTED] – Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglectful abuse. The carer was alleged to be drunk and unable to assume the care of the child in placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 14 September 2001.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach was in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The Senior Social Worker discussed the allegation with the Resource Development Manager and an immediate home visit was made.</p> <p>The foster carer's explanation was accepted by the Senior Social Worker and when discussed with the line manager, it was agreed that no further action should be taken.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A further discussion was had with the Resource Development Manager and no further action agreed. The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	No further action agreed.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter. This allegation was dealt with internally as a practice issue.

Complaint 42

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	20 January 2003
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and Emotional abuse. A historical allegation was made on 20 January 2003 that FPV ██████████ hit the child in placement resulting in a bloody nose.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place during placement in 1995.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach was in accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The allegation was passed to the practice team on 21 January 2003, late in the afternoon. In the absence of the allocated social worker a decision was made to defer until 22 January 2003. The decision was then made to progress Child Protection Investigation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The information relating to this allegation was passed to the Police and following an IRD discussion there was no action taken as the child in placement was 16 years old and did not want to talk to the Police or take the matter further.</p> <p>The foster carer was eventually de-registered following further complaints. See complaint 43 for further details.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carer recalled that the alleged incident occurred prior to Christmas whilst in her car. She had put her hand on the young person's shoulder, and he had turned his head unexpectedly and knocked his lip on her ring. This was not reported at the time. A reminder was given to carer of procedures to follow if a child/ young person in her care was injured in any way.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, as per Child Protection inquiry.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 43

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 2005.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPV ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect – An allegation of neglect, use of alcohol and failure to provide adequate care to a young person was made against FPV ██████████ in February 2005. The alleged abuse resulted in the young person taking an overdose of paracetamol on 28 February 2005.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have happened in February 2005.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach was in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines to determine an internal investigation be progressed. The local authority instigated an internal investigation. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An immediate assessment was undertaken by the practice team and resource team about safekeeping issues and viability of ██████████ return to the care of Mrs FPV ██████████
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The decision was taken that a full re-assessment of Mrs FPV ██████████ as a foster carer be undertaken and that no children / young people be placed with her pending the re-assessment being completed.</p> <p>The re-assessment was competency based and very comprehensive.</p> <p>There was an internal investigation of the carer, the outcome of which was that Mrs FPV ██████████ was de-registered as a carer by the Fostering Panel on ██████████ 2005.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child in foster care did not return to the care of Mrs FPV
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection issue.

Complaint 44

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	22 September 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPW – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical Abuse and Neglect. An allegation of historical physical abuse and neglect was made against FPW.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place prior to the placement ending in 1991.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint.</p> <p>The Emergency Duty Team (EDT) were contacted by the carer as the child's mother had turned up at the house being abusive and demanding the children's clothes to be packed as they would not be returning to the carers.</p>

		The EDT social workers met with the children's mother where she made various allegations.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The children were placed with respite carers following the allegations.</p> <p>A case note on 24 September 1991 details "an unfortunate end to a good placement" and notes that the "mother was trying to manipulate the department to move the children due to her dislike of the carers".</p> <p>The issues were discussed with the carer and two areas of concerns were identified; a them and us attitude toward natural parents and an expectation that the department would always back up carers rather than challenge them. These concerns were noted to be discussed at a later time.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	An alternative placement was secured for the children.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 45

Question	Answer
----------	--------

b.	Who made the complaint?	Child in placement.
c.	When was the complaint made?	March 1992
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPX [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FPX [REDACTED] in March 1992. It was alleged that the foster carer had beaten a child in placement with a belt.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in March 1992.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	As the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was adhered to, which determined not progress with a child protection enquiry. The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The allegation was dealt with using frontline resolutions and the issue was discussed with the foster carers. The child alleged that his father beat him with a belt and that the carer did this too.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The allegation was resolved as a practice learning issue and the child was moved to an alternative placement as a result of the difficulties that had arisen.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child moved to an alternative placement due to the difficulties and that it was a short-term placement. The child claimed to have mixed up events with those with his father. Support was provided to the carers following the allegation.

		We have been unable to review the child's records due to Covid19 Restrictions.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 46

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	March 1993
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPW – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. An allegation of neglect was made against FPW in March 1993 about events that had occurred in October 1992. It was alleged that the children in placement had lice and that they had been locked in their bedrooms.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	October 1992
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint. The local authority instigated an internal investigation in order to address the allegations made.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The complaint was made to the child's social worker. The files were checked from the time period of the alleged neglect and there was no reference to the concerns raised.

		The children were no longer in placement and the matter was referred to the Resource Team.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence in the carer's records providing a specific response to the complainant.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 47

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Self-reported by the Foster Carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	30 August 1993
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FPY [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. A report of physical abuse was made against FPY [REDACTED] in August 1993. It was alleged that the foster carer had smacked a child on the leg and on the bottom in response to the child misbehaving. This incident was self-reported by the foster carer.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	30 August 1992.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint.</p> <p>The local authority instigated an internal investigation and immediately removed the children in placement.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The carer contacted social workers as the placement was deteriorating and she felt she was not coping. She had seen her GP and was advised that she was exhausted. The carer disclosed that she smacked the child twice.</p> <p>Social workers visited the carer to discuss the events leading up to the allegations.</p> <p>A decision was made that no children be placed with the carer while an investigation was carried out. Concerns raised in the investigation were noted and the carer was advised that these would be presented to a Fostering Panel before children would be placed.</p> <p>The carer decided to withdraw from caring and was deregistered in [REDACTED] 1993.</p> <p>A Withdrawal from Caring Report was presented to Panel in November 1993 detailing the events and concerns that were noted should she make a return to fostering.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The carer chose to be de-registered in November 1993 and the child in placement was removed at the time of the allegation.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	An alternative placement was secured and the carers were de-registered.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	See above.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See Above
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	There is no evidence that this complaint was passed to the police.
n.	If not, why not?	See above.

Complaint 48

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Father of [REDACTED] a foster child in care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Mid 1989.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQD [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual. An allegation of sexual abuse was made against FQD [REDACTED] at some point in 1989.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between December 1988 and 1990.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The child had experienced physical abuse prior to this foster placement and disclosed that she was sexually abused whilst at home.</p> <p>The child's father made counter allegations that the carer was responsible.</p> <p>A report dated 30 January 1990 recorded that the Department's position was that they did not accept the allegations and they were unfounded.</p>

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is no evidence available of a specific process for investigation of the complaint. A report dated 30 January 1990 recorded that the Department's position was that they did not accept the allegations and they were unfounded.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence available about a specific response.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement

Complaint 49

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ children placed in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 1994.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FKC ██████████ – Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. Two children placed with the foster carer made allegations of sexual abuse against FKC ██████████ on 10 and 11 September 1994.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place during the placement. [REDACTED] was placed in [REDACTED] 1992 and [REDACTED] was placed in [REDACTED] 1994.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was one of sexual abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to. The Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>A Detective Constable from the Women and Child Unit and a social worker from the emergency duty team conducted interviews on with both children. On the basis of these interviews, FKC [REDACTED] was subsequently charged with indecent assault.</p> <p>Joint interviews were also carried out with FKC [REDACTED] own children who were added to the Child Protection Register as well as the other child in placement.</p> <p>At a Child Protection Case Conference on 20 February 1994 the decision was made to remove FKC [REDACTED] children from the register.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. An IRD was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>The two girls who made the allegations returned to the care of their parents. Long term carers had already been identified for the other child in placement and introductions had already taken place. Support was provided for this to take place earlier in light the allegations made.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>FKC [REDACTED] was deregistered as a foster carer.</p> <p>FKC [REDACTED] was arrested, charged and found not guilty of one charge, and not proven on the other charge.</p>

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	An alternative foster care placement was found for the children in placement and support given.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. As a result of this FKC was arrested, charged and found not guilty of one charge and not proven on the other charge.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 50

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 1999.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQJ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. It was alleged that the child's hand was smacked, and the child was roughly grabbed and later pushed.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have happened in February 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The allegation was made anonymously to ELRIS (Edinburgh and Lothians Registration and Inspection Services).</p> <p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p>

		Information was passed to the Resource Team Manager to investigate the allegation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An unannounced home visit was made to the foster carers by the Resource Team Manager and the liaison social worker in March 1999.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of the investigation found that the foster carer against whom the allegation had been made had not been in attendance at the Toddler Group when the allegation was said to have taken place. The local authority took no further action in relation to the allegation.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The local authority took no further action in relation to the allegation.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a police matter.

Complaint 51

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	The mother of [REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	January 2002
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQK [REDACTED] – Respite Foster Carer

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made that the Carer grabbed the wrist of the child in placement by the wrist. After discussions, a previous incident came to light which had occurred the previous weekend where the carer's sister had slapped the child on the hand. None of the other children witnessed this.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in January 2002.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation Information from the Emergency Duty Team (EDT) social workers was passed to the liaison social worker to discuss with the carer.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The EDT social workers agreed that this did not constitute an assault and it was not necessary to implement Child Protection measures. A discussion was had with the carer that day. The provision of respite care by the carer for the child ceased after this event.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The carer no longer provided respite care for this child. The incident was also discussed at the carer review held in February 2002.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carer no longer provided respite care for this child.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as being a Child Protection matter requiring any Police involvement.

Complaint 52

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous.
c.	When was the complaint made?	21 August 1992.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQL-FQM – Foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse and neglect. An allegation was made on 21 August 1992 that both carers were frequently under the influence of alcohol with children present, that they both worked long hours and that there had been an incident involving an axe.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The allegation related to events that took place prior to 21 August 1992.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Following the allegation made on 21 August 1992, the foster carers' liaison worker made a home visit on 11 September 1992 to discuss the allegations.</p> <p>The social worker counselled against drinking and working long hours. They discussed the incident with the axe. which FQM denied, stating he had intervened in a fight between two males relating to the alleged assault of the wife of one of the males.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The social worker counselled against drinking and working long hours.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The social worker counselled against drinking and working long hours.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The matter appears to have been dealt with as a practice issue between the liaison social worker, senior social worker and carers.

Complaint 53

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Practice Team Social Worker (PTSW)
c.	When was the complaint made?	14 September 1992
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQM [REDACTED] - Foster carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect and emotional abuse. An allegation was made on 14 September 1992 that FQM [REDACTED] was admitted to hospital with alcohol poisoning while on holiday which may have had an emotional impact on the children in placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place between August and September 1992.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The information was provided to the PTSW by a relative of a client who was on holiday with the carers. A joint home visit took place with the liaison worker and senior social worker to discuss the allegation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A letter was sent to the carers from the Resource Team Leader outlining discussion relating to the issues presented above. This confirmed that no further action would be taken and that any future placement of children would be outwith the immediate area where the foster carer resided.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	See above.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as being a Child Protection matter requiring any Police involvement.

Complaint 54

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of foster carer

c.	When was the complaint made?	2 January 1993.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQL-FQM – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse and neglect. An allegation of neglect and verbal abuse was made on 2 January 1993 by the foster carers' neighbour. He alleged that the carers were holding a party and were drunk. He also alleged that the child had been verbally abused in the street.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken on and prior to 2 January 1993.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The Emergency Duty Team (EDT) instigated an investigation into the allegations.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An EDT social worker contact the Police who visited the carers' home and found that although the carers were having a party, they were sober and the child was asleep in his bed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no evidence of any further action regarding this event. It should be noted that the complainant made several calls (complaint 55) to EDT which were referred to the Complaints Officer to review.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence of any response provided to the complainant on this occasion.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the EDT Social Worker notified the police and they attended the property immediately.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 55

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of foster carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	27 February 1993.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQL [REDACTED] – Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse & neglect. An allegation was made to the Emergency Duty Team (EDT) of Mrs FQL [REDACTED] being drunk and allegedly shouting and swearing in the street.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 27 February 1993.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The EDT instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The EDT social workers visited the carers home and found that FQM [REDACTED] had been drinking but able to hold a conversation. They found FQL [REDACTED] to be sober and able to look after the children. The children in placement appeared happy. A copy of the EDT report was passed to the Liaison Social Worker.

		A complaint was made about the EDT. Both this complaint and the original complaint were referred to the Complaints Officer.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action was taken.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, a letter was sent to the complainant offering a meeting to discuss the complaints and outcomes with the Liaison Social Worker and the Resource Team Manager. A note in the file stated that this appointment was not kept.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as a Child Protection matter requiring any Police involvement.

Complaint 56

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 1993
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVT - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	An anonymous allegation was made against the foster carer in 1993 in relation to her "drinking habits" and "seedy personal life" following her approval as a foster carer. However, the letter set out concerns and did not relate to any allegations of abuse.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Not recorded
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority response was in accordance with the Departmental Complaints Procedure.</p> <p>The local authority followed the complaints procedure. As this was an anonymous letter, a notification of potential complaint form was completed. The liaison social worker and Resource Team Manager held a meeting with the carer to discuss the concerns raised in the letter.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	As this was an anonymous letter, a notification of potential complaint form was completed. The liaison social worker and Resource Team Manager held a meeting with the carer to discuss the concerns raised in the letter.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There was no evidence to substantiate the claims made in the letter and the social workers did not have concerns. It was decided that no further action be taken.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	There was no evidence to substantiate the claims and social workers did not have concerns. No further action taken.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	There was no evidence to substantiate the claims and social workers did not have concerns. No further action taken.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter.

Complaint 57

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 1995.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVT - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. An anonymous letter alleged that the child in placement was not receiving adequate supervision on account of the foster carer's drinking habits.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Not recorded.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority response was in accordance with Appendix 2 of the Foster Carer Agreement: Departmental Complaints Procedure.</p> <p>The Resource Team Manager was appointed to investigate. This involved consultation with the liaison social worker, child in placement, therapist and staff at the child's school. A medical report for the carer was also obtained. The investigation concluded that the placement was satisfactory.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority followed the complaints procedure in relation to the allegation and the Resource Team Manager was appointed to investigate. This involved consultation with the liaison social worker, child in placement, therapist and staff at the child's school. A medical report for the carer was also obtained. The investigation concluded that the placement was satisfactory.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	It was concluded that work be undertaken with the carer and that the placement was satisfactory.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The local authority provided ongoing support and training to the carer.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority provided ongoing support and training to the carer.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a Child Protection matter.

Complaint 58

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1995.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVU [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. Allegations were made at a childcare review that the male foster carer shouted and swore at the children in placement. It was also alleged that the foster carer had been drinking on one occasion and had been asked by the female carer to back off.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place prior to July 1995.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The complaints were raised at a Child in Care Review in July 1995. These concerns were discussed at the review by the birth mother, social workers and the carers. The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.

		The allegation was dealt with through frontline resolution.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The concerns were discussed at the time, with the suggestion that all parties work on better communication with each other.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	See above.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The concerns were discussed at the time.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 59

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Headteacher
c.	When was the complaint made?	November 1997.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVU [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglectful care. The Headteacher alleged that the carer had collected a child in placement from school whilst drunk.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in November 1997.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>The allegation was dealt with through frontline resolution and was denied by the carer.</p> <p>No further action was taken.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A social worker contacted the carer to discuss the allegation and the carer denied he had been drinking.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action was taken.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No specific response was recorded.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	No applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement as the issue was raised a day after the incident, so too late to involve the police to test alcohol levels.

Complaint 60

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Police
c.	When was the complaint made?	March 1998
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVU-FQN – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect, Physical and Emotional Abuse. An allegation of neglect as well as physical and emotional abuse was made against FVU-FQN in March 1998. It was alleged that a child in placement had been found by police officers with minor facial abrasions and lacerations and that a child in placement had been permitted to consume alcohol.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 6 March 1998.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>Police officers contacted the Emergency Social Work Service (ESWS) to inform them of the alleged incidents. As the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The incidents alleged were managed jointly by the Police officers and the Emergency Duty Team and information appears to have been shared between the organisations.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Senior Social workers from ESWS and an Outworker visited the property and decided to remove the child in placement that evening.</p> <p>The foster carers admitted to drinking alcohol. The child had been crying and the carers were alleged to have shown no concern for the child's health and wellbeing. The carers had also allegedly referred to the child using derogatory terms while in the presence of the Police officers.</p> <p>The child was taken to the Royal Hospital for Sick Children Accident and Emergency Department to be checked over. The child was placed with Outworkers over the weekend.</p>

		ESWS social workers informed the Resource Team Social Workers who met with the carers on to discuss the incident in some detail and talk about the next steps. Whilst the carers denied making some of the comments, they admitted they may have made something derogatory remarks towards the child as a response to what he was saying.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	It was recommended that the couple be deregistered as foster carers and this happened on [REDACTED] 1998.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Due to Covid-19 restrictions we have been unable to review the child in placements records. The information held in the Carer records ends with their de-registration.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, Police informed ESWS of the incident and followed up with a written statement to the local authority.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 61

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	FQO [REDACTED] Foster Carer
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 1994
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQO [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The foster carer informed the liaison social worker that he had hit a child in placement at some point in June 1994 while the child was on holiday with the foster carers and their family.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	June 1994
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the allegations were subjected to an Initial Referral Discussion.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The child's GP provided an examination of the child's injuries.</p> <p>The liaison social worker visited the foster carers after the incident was reported.</p> <p>The foster carers were suspended following the investigation report and the child was moved from the placement.</p> <p>A child protection case conference was held in July 1994 which the Police attended. No further action was taken as the incident occurred outside of their jurisdiction.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was removed from the placement and an alternative placement secured.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	An alternative placement was secured. The foster carer was de-registered but it is unclear if this was in response to this complaint.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. No further action was taken as it occurred out with Police jurisdiction (incident happened on holiday).
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 62

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	17 January 1996
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP-FQQ ██████████ foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. The Child in Care Review Report noted that at the start of the placement the child did not feel parented or claimed and that Mrs FQP did not like her. The child claimed that she would get into trouble about her bed-wetting and for not keeping her room clean.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	This was said to have happened throughout the child's placement from ██████████ 1995 until the complaint was made on 17 January 1996.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.

		The liaison social worker informed the foster carers of the complaint and addressed the issues raised through several sessions with them.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The social workers involved addressed the complaint with the foster carers through several sessions and the complaint was resolved as a practice learning issue.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The complaint was resolved as a practice learning issue through several sessions with the foster carers.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority supported the placement until it ended on 17 July 1996.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The complaint was not assessed as requiring Police involvement.

Complaint 63

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Mrs [REDACTED], a neighbour of the foster carers.
c.	When was the complaint made?	7 July 1996
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP-FQQ [REDACTED], foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. The complainant called to inform the local authority that she thought that a child was unhappy in her

		placement and was kept in her room. It was also alleged that the complainant's son had witnessed this child in placement being smacked and being spoken to harshly by her carers.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	From the case notes, it appears that the allegations related to incidents that happened across July 1996.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	There is no evidence available to say what process and approach was followed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is no evidence available to say what process and approach was followed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is evidence that the child's placement appeared to end shortly after the complaint was received.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	This information was not contained within the foster carer's file.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable
l.	If there was no response, why not?	The local authority has been unable to find evidence within the foster carer's file that would answer this question.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	The local authority has been unable to find evidence within the foster carer's file that would answer this question.
n.	If not, why not?	The local authority has been unable to find evidence explaining why this information was not passed to the Police.

Complaint 64

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	An anonymous call was made to the local authority. It is suggested in the file that this call was made by a neighbour of the foster carers.
c.	When was the complaint made?	9 July 1996
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP-FQQ foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. An anonymous call was made in the evening to say that a child in placement had been 'shut out' the house since that morning.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged neglect was said to have taken place on 9 July 1996 and the complaint referred to a singular incident. However, the caller referred to a complaint they had made previously.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority informed the caller that her other concerns were being responded to. However, there is no evidence or further detail in the foster carer's file on what process was followed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is no evidence or further detail in the foster carer's file on how this complaint was investigated.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of the complaint is not noted in the foster carer's file, however, there is evidence suggesting that the complaint was a contributing factor to the carer's de-registration years later.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The local authority informed the caller that her previous complaint was being dealt with. There was no further response recorded in the foster carer's file.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority informed the caller that her previous complaint was being handled.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	There is some evidence to suggest that this was passed to the police.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 65

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	The child in foster placement's birth mother.
c.	When was the complaint made?	24 January 1997
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP-FQQ, foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect and emotional abuse. The child in placement had been staying at a friend's house and the foster carers did not know who or where this was. The foster carers were not overly concerned and did not wish to report her as missing to the police. Following the incident, the female foster carer had been very short in her manner. The male foster carer also told the child in placement that he would not shout at her but that he would not take responsibility for her if she left again.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	According to the file, there had been two separate incidents where the foster carers had not known the location of the child in placement. This complaint related to the incident on 24 January 1997.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The foster carers' file noted that Emergency Social Work Services explained to the male carer his responsibility to report the child as missing. The file noted that the foster carers did not seem to have a clear understanding of the procedures involved in working with children in care.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An investigation does not appear to have been required as the facts of the complaint were accepted by the foster carers.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Following a discussion with the foster carers of their responsibilities to report a child in placement missing, no further action was taken.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, the local authority responded to the complaint by addressing the foster carers' lack of understanding of the procedures relating to foster care.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The form of the response was to clarify the foster carers' understanding of the local authority's procedures.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The local authority did not assess the complaint as requiring Police involvement.

Complaint 66

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	7 October 1998.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP ██████████, foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. The child in placement disclosed that her foster carer expressed opinions about her birth mother in front of her. The child in placement made this complaint through her Care Review Report where she had also selected that her placement was great.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint did not specify the exact date of these comments. They would have taken place at some time between 30 April 1998 and 18 January 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	There is no evidence available to say what process and approach was followed.

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is no evidence available to say what process and approach was followed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no evidence available to say what the outcome was.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence available to say what specific response was made.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	There is no evidence available to say what specific response was made.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	There is no evidence available that the information was passed to the police.
n.	If not, why not?	There is no evidence available about this.

Complaint 67

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The complaint was made on 20 December 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQP-FQQ ██████████ foster carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. The complainant claimed that the placement was like a B&B and the child in placement rarely ate with the family. The case notes held for the foster placement also showed that the child in placement had issues with how rigid the foster family were, for example, she was only able to do washing at certain times.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse was said to have taken place throughout the child's foster placement which ended in [REDACTED] 2000 and appears to have lasted for approximately one year.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.</p> <p>There is evidence in the case notes which suggests that the foster carers were spoken to by the social worker and made aware of the complaint.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is evidence in the foster carer's file of a discussion between the foster carers and Social Work.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The foster carers were de-registered in November 2002 and there is evidence that the allegations contained within this complaint had some impact on that decision.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	The child who made the complaint had left the foster placement when she made the complaint. There is no evidence within the foster carer's file regarding a specific response.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This complaint was not assessed as requiring Police involvement as it was not assessed as a child protection issue.

Complaint 68

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The allegation was made at some time after 8 November 1996.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQR ██████████ foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual and physical abuse. The child in placement made an allegation of physical abuse against the foster carer and alleged that his brother, ██████████ had been sexually abused.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse was said to have taken place between 31 October 1996 and 8 November 1996.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority has evidence that the Police were involved and that the foster carer was interviewed. Whilst a particular process is not recorded in case files, it would be prudent to presume that child protection investigation was pursued as the Police were involved in the investigation and the foster carer was interviewed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Whilst a particular process is not recorded in case files, it would be prudent to presume that child protection investigation was pursued as the Police were involved in the investigation and the foster carer was interviewed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The children were moved from their placement with the foster carer at the time the allegations were made.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority responded to the complaint by securing an alternative placement for the two children. The foster carer was de-registered in 2002, but not as a result of this complaint.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	The file indicates that there was information passed to the Police.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 69

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 1999.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQS ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. It was alleged that the foster carer had sworn at a child in placement and slapped him on one occasion.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in July 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p>

		Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the allegations were subjected to an Initial Referral Discussion.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The police did not feel that the allegation merited their involvement, therefore a further Internal Investigation was progressed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The foster carers denied the allegation. A report was prepared which sets out the tensions in the lead up to the end of the placement. The child was moved from the placement as it had broken down.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	An alternative placement was secured.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	The Police were informed of the allegations but did not believe that the incident warranted their involvement.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 70

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member.
c.	When was the complaint made?	January 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQT - Foster carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. It was alleged that the foster carer smacked the child in her care and that she did not comfort the child when she was cold.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in January 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p> <p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>At the end of January 2000, two social workers visited the child's mother to go over the allegations.</p> <p>Discussions were held between the Senior Social Worker and the Practice Team Manager and a decision was made not to pursue the allegations as a child protection matter as there was no evidence of assault and it would not be appropriate to interview the child.</p> <p>The Social Worker and Resource Development Manager visited the carer in early February 2000 to discuss the allegations. The foster carer vehemently denied smacking this child or any other child, including her own.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was removed from the placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The child was removed from the placement.</p> <p>The carers' remit was changed to One to One Share the Care.</p> <p>She subsequently secured a different job. After a period of no contact she wrote to her Social Worker apologising and informing her she</p>

		would not return to her role as a foster carer. The carer was de-registered.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 71

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Family member of the child in foster placement.
c.	When was the complaint made?	22 February 2000
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████, foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse and neglect. A social worker wrote to the Resource Team social worker following a conversation with the complainant. It was alleged that the foster carer had picked up the child in his care to take her to the foster placement smelling strongly of alcohol. The child had also allegedly asked if she was going to watch him drink again.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint noted some uncertainty around the date of the alleged abuse, but it was estimated to have been around December 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file of the process and approach taken.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file of the process and approach taken.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file of the outcome.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file of any specific response being provided in relation to the complaint.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable
l.	If there was no response, why not?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file a response.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	There is no evidence within the foster carer's file of the complaint being passed to the Police.
n.	If not, why not?	There is no evidence available within the file.

Complaint 72

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 1997.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQU-FQV – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect. An allegation of physical abuse and neglect was made against both foster carers in February 1997. This related to smacking a child, favouring other children in placement, using food punitively and a previous foster child staying overnight without the department's knowledge.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse related to incidents over a period of time.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p> <p>The local authority instigated an internal investigation by a Senior Social Worker into the allegations made.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Due to the severity of the allegations, a decision was made to remove the child mentioned in the allegation from the placement while an internal investigation was carried out. The other child remained in placement.</p> <p>Interviews took place with the foster carers, the child's social worker, Children Centre staff and the Liaison Social Worker. The investigation identified several areas of concern that had to be addressed before the carers attended a Review Panel to review their approval.</p> <p>The finding of the investigation was provided to a Carer Review Panel in July 1997 with recommendations made and the investigation officer in attendance.</p> <p>The child was moved from the placement at this time.</p> <p>The Panel was held in July 1997 and the decision was taken to continue registration of the foster carers.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Senior Social Worker and the Liaison worker visited the carers on numerous occasions to work through the areas of concerns and to rebuild trust identified in the report. The investigation report was provided to a Review Panel held in July 1997 and the decision was taken to continue registration of the foster carers.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The carers returned to panel on 21 July 1997 and consideration was given to the investigation report and continued registration and remit.</p> <p>The carers were approved for their original remit of two children aged 0 -7, however it was noted that they needed to undertake training sessions as identified before a second placement was made.</p>

		Concerns were noted about maintaining boundaries and some of their responses. The Family Based Care worker agreed to arrange sessions to address issues on attachment, separation and loss and on rebuilding trust and working relationships.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement

Complaint 73

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	August 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQU ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FQU ██████████ in August 2000. It was alleged that a child in placement had been slapped across the face.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place prior to the placement ending in June 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation into the allegations.

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The social worker visited the foster carer and discussed the use of physical chastisement and the department's policy in relation to the discipline of children. The carer denied slapping the child in placement.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no information available to give evidence of a specific response.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The complaint was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 74

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	[REDACTED], child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	18 February 2001.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQX [REDACTED] son of foster carers, FQU-FQV [REDACTED]
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation of historical sexual abuse was made by a child who had previously been in placement with FQU-FQV [REDACTED] FQU-FQV against their adult son, FQX [REDACTED]

		As part of the investigation into this, allegations of physical abuse against FQU were also made.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between October 1998 and February 2001.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority instigated a child protection investigation under Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. A Child Protection Case Conference was held on 23 February 2001.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A child who had been in placement at the time of the allegations was interviewed along with the complainant. Both children who made the allegations were interviewed jointly by the local authority and the Police.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The Carers were deregistered in 2001. They had been matched with a child for adoption and this was reviewed separately on the undertaking that they had to undertake Skylight 'Safer Caring' Training.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	In relation to the sexual abuse allegations, no charges were made against the carer's son due to insufficient evidence. However, reports indicate that it was "probable that sexual abuse took place" and on this basis, combined with other concerns that had been raised, they were deregistered as carers. One of the conditions for them continuing to care for the child remaining in placement who was freed for adoption, was the family should undertake safe caring training from Skylight.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. Child protection procedures were instigated, and the children were interviewed by both police and social workers.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 75

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Social work professional from an Adoption Agency.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 2001.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FQU-FQV – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect and physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse and neglect was made against the foster carers. This related to allegations of physical chastisement. poor fitting shoes, poor eyecare and poor dental treatment.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken prior to the child being moved to permanent carers in June 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially. The local authority instigated an internal investigation into the allegations.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A meeting was arranged between the Resource Development Manager and senior social workers who determined that the issues relating to ill-fitting shoes, poor eyecare and dental treatment would not be addressed with the carers. They noted that there were no outstanding areas of concern identified in the medicals carried out in February and June 2000. In relation to the allegation of physical abuse, this was raised with the carer and she denied the allegation. No further action was taken.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	A letter from the Senior Social Worker to the Social Worker at the Adoption Agency was sent detailing the outcome of the investigation.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 76

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Police
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 1995 and October 1995
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FRK [REDACTED] - Foster carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical neglect. There were two incidents noted in the foster carer's file relating to the misuse of alcohol. The first incident related to a police charge for driving under the influence of alcohol on 2 September 1995. The second incident occurred on 24 October 1995 where an employee of the local authority reported that the foster carer smelled strongly of alcohol.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	September 1995 – October 1995
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	There was a request from the Children's Reporter for an Initial Inquiry Report, which was completed, and no further action taken.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The foster carer appears to have continued fostering between the allegations.</p> <p>There is no information found relating to the outcome of the police charge.</p> <p>The outcome of the court case in relation to driving under the influence charge is not reported in the information available.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The carer made the decision to leave fostering.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carer made the decision to leave fostering.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the police raised the concern initially.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 77

Question	Answer
----------	--------

b.	Who made the complaint?	A health visitor holidaying at the same place.
c.	When was the complaint made?	July 2000
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FRL – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. An allegation of emotional abuse was made in July 2000. The foster carer was alleged to have been unsympathetic in response to a child in placement falling off a quad bike while on holiday.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in July 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>The allegation was investigated fully following departmental procedures.</p> <p>The allegations appear to have been raised at the carer's annual review on 10 October 2000.</p> <p>The concerns were raised with the child's social worker.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A letter was sent to the complainant explaining the investigation was ongoing but due to confidentiality reasons the outcome could not be shared with her.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	At the annual Carer Review it mentions this complaint and states 'this matter was investigated and resolved.'
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	A letter was sent to the person who made the complaint explaining that the complaint was being dealt with but due to confidentiality the outcome could not be shared with her.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 78

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Current at time
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	Another child in placement.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made whilst the child was in respite care. The child complained that she was being picked on and hit by one of the other children in the original placement and stated that she did not wish to return to the original placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Unclear but child had been in placement from ██████████ 1998 to ██████████ 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p> <p>The local authority also had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The carer was in hospital at the time of the allegation and the children were placed in respite care during this time.</p> <p>A discussion took place with the foster carer and she confirmed that there was friction typical of "last in" rivalries between children.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child chose to leave the original placement and the local authority agreed to allow the respite carers to continue with her placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child remained with the respite carers.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 79

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	October 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FRL ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made by the child alleging that FRL ██████████ had hit/pushed her. The child had learning difficulties and had lived with FRL ██████████ for many years. FRL ██████████ was ill and was in the process of being medically de-registered.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 31 October 2000.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The child's mother died on [REDACTED]/2000 and arrangements were being made to move the child as the carer was ill and in the process of being medically de-registered. The child went to stay with her aunt and then refused to return to the carer.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child did not return to the placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The Practice Team Social worker supported the child during this time with the child realising that the carer was ill and not behaving in her usual manner.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 80

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 2000
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	KDL [REDACTED] – Foster Carer. (Share the Care)

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglectful care. An allegation of misadministration of medication, the use of baby wipes and health and safety concerns was made against the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between November 1999 and May 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority instigated an internal investigation into the allegations.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Social workers met with the complainant to discuss the concerns noted in the letter sent to the department. They spoke with the carer regarding the alleged incidents. There was an acknowledgement that trust had broken down between the child family member and the Share the Care carer. Social workers were satisfied by the carer's account of the incidents. While the investigation was taking place, no children were placed with the carer.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child family member decided to end the Share the Care arrangement and the child was no longer placed with the carer. The carer resigned from caring to attend college and was de-registered.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The Resource Development Manager provided written reports of the investigation to the Director of Social Work who responded to the complainant by letter.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.

n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.
----	------------------	--

Complaint 81

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	April 2008.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FRZ-FSD ██████████ – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical, emotional & neglect of ██████████ by the named foster carers above.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between around September 2006 and April 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The process taken required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Procedures (Section 7). This took place on 26 June 2015.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to Section 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures), these allegations were subject to an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion, where it was agreed that there should be a single agency response by social work.</p> <p>The Resource Duty Manager and the carers' liaison social worker met with Mr and Mrs FRZ-FSD on 17 June 2008 to address the issues which had been raised by the young person regarding allegations of neglectful care. Mr and Mrs FRZ-FSD were able to provide an acceptable explanation. They were upset that their approach to the</p>

		<p>young person's care, for example in relation to bathing her and giving her some measure of privacy and independence, in keeping with their safe caring policy, was perceived by the young person as neglectful.</p> <p>The outcome of this investigation was that no further action be taken, other than ongoing support for the carers in developing areas of identified practice.</p> <p>This outcome was relayed formally to the young person's Practice Team Social Worker.</p> <p>The young person continued to make allegations; therefore, the Children's Rights Officer became involved in meeting with [REDACTED] and the carers. The Children's Rights Officer relayed the outcome of discussions with the Mr and Mrs FRZ-FSD back to the young person, as part of a planned approach.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of this investigation was no further action to be taken, other than ongoing support for the carers in developing areas of identified practice.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided the young person with the support of the Children's Rights Officer, as well as ongoing support from the allocated social worker, who both informed and supported the young person with the outcome of the investigation.</p> <p>The foster carers received ongoing support from their Family Based Care social worker and Resource Team Manager.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	In adhering to Sections 7 & 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures, these allegations were subjected to an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion. Therefore, information was shared with the Police when it was then agreed that there should be a single agency response by social work.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 82

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 2003.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTP-FTQ ██████████ – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place between 2001 and 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse against the registered foster carers, Sections 4.1 and 8.1. of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were adhered to. This was complicated by the fact that the complainant had already moved from the foster care placement to return to reside with his birth mother who, at the time of the allegations being made, lived in Northern Ireland.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>An Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) was considered initially. However, the content of the initial allegations resulted in senior management treating the complaint as a care issue rather than a child protection matter. This approach provided flexibility to reassess</p>

		<p>the decision if further evidence relating to child protection matters was gained from the initial investigation.</p> <p>Interviews were carried out with the foster carers by two senior social workers in relation to the allegations raised.</p> <p>A further interview, carried out by the same social workers, was completed with the sibling of the complainant who had remained in the foster care placement. Both interviews were carried out on 30 September 2003.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The interviews provided no corroboration to substantiate any of the allegations relating to child protection matters. However, care issues were identified. These were progressed by the Liaison Social Worker with the foster carers and were highlighted for discussion at next Carers Review Panel.</p> <p>The information gained from the investigation was relayed back to social work staff in Northern Ireland who held responsibility for the complainant's case at that time.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The information gained from the investigation was passed to the social work staff in Northern Ireland who held responsibility for the complainant's case at the time.</p> <p>Ongoing support was provided to the foster carers and to the young person in placement to address the emotional distress that had been caused by the allegations made and the care issues that had been identified by the investigation.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.

n.	If not, why not?	<p>The information contained in the complaint was not shared with Police as the nature of the complaint was not assessed as a child protection matter. The complaint was assessed as a care issue and the response was through a single agency investigation.</p> <p>There was therefore no need, or requirement, to share this information with the Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p>
----	------------------	---

Complaint 83

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	23 October 2008.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTP-FTQ ██████████ – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>As the complaint was an allegation of physical and emotional abuse against the registered foster carers, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were also followed.</p> <p>A Senior Social Worker initiated an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) on 14 June 2007 and a Child Protection Investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures. An IRD was held on 27 October 2008 to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation into the complaint.

		<p>The complainant had already moved from the foster care placement due to a prior breakdown in the placement. The IRD agreed that the young person should undertake a Joint Investigative Interview (JII) and this took place on 27 October 2008. The JII confirmed that there were issues within the relationship between the young person and the foster carers, their birth children and another Looked after Child who had been in the placement at the time. However, these relationship issues were not assessed as child protection matters.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Child Protection Investigation concluded that no further child protection action was required. Instead, a single agency response was progressed by a Senior Manager who requested a Standards of Care Investigative Interview with the foster carers to address the issues of care that had arisen in the Joint Investigative Interview.</p> <p>The interview was carried out on 19 December 2008 and resulted in the issues being positively addressed with the foster carers. This outcome was relayed to the Service manager who agreed that no further action was required other than acknowledgment at the next Carers Review Panel.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>As noted in part (i) above, a Standards of Care Investigative Interview was carried out on 19 December 2008 where the issues were positively addressed with the foster carers.</p> <p>This outcome was relayed to the Service manager who agreed that no further action was required other than acknowledgment at the next Carers Review Panel on 09 June 2010.</p> <p>Ongoing support was offered to the complainant by the allocated social worker and the involved professionals for the young person in their current placement.</p>

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Lothian and Borders Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures and agreed information sharing protocol. This information informed the Child Protection inquiry, Inter-Agency Referral Discussion, investigation actions and the conclusions reached.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 84

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Other professional from Scottish Adoption
c.	When was the complaint made?	1999
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTR [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. An allegation of emotional abuse was made against FTR [REDACTED] for conduct that occurred at some point between July 1997 and June 1999.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place prior to June 1999.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The adoptive parents raised concerns over remarks made in the introduction sessions with the carers. This was addressed with the carers, but they were reluctant to address the areas of concerns identified and opted to de-register.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	They de-registered as foster carers.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	It was suggested that the carers take a break after the child moved to her adoptive placement, but the carers became angry, and resigned.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Not recorded.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 85

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Unnamed 10-year-old female who attended school with the foster carers' birth son.
c.	When was the complaint made?	2 February 2007.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████ - birth son of foster carers ██████ and ██████ ██████████
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The allegation was in relation to inappropriate touching of the 10 year old female.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in the weeks prior to the allegation, which was made on 2 February 2007.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse against the son of registered Foster Carers, the guidance in Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also followed.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) and progressed a Child Protection Investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. An IRD was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young person in the foster care placement by the allocated practice team social workers who conducted interviews to establish if there had been any concerns regarding the son of the registered foster carers' behaviour within the placement towards them. No concerns were raised from the interviews. The liaison social worker was confident that the foster carers would be able to ensure the children's safety in the placement as they were fully familiar with safe caring practices and were assessed as very competent and confident foster carers.</p> <p>The son of the registered foster carers was interviewed by Lothian and Borders Police and charged with a lewd and libidinous offence.</p> <p>The youngest of the foster children placed with the foster carers was moved to an alternative long-term foster care placement. This decision was taken as it was deemed necessary in relation to the child's specific background and future planning.</p> <p>The older two children remained in placement. This decision was taken at a Risk Assessment meeting held on 22 February 2007, which was chaired by the Child Protection Amethyst team and attended by the social workers from the two Practice Teams along with the Family's Liaison Social Worker and the Senior Social Worker from the Family Based Care Team.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Foster Carer's Review Panel was held on 8 May 2007 which acknowledged the allegations and investigation. The Panel approved amendments to the carers' registration criteria, and they were no longer registered to offer short term placements.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>A referral was made to Barnardo's Lighthouse Project for the son of the registered foster carers to have appropriate support, as well as support for his parents.</p> <p>The foster carers welcomed the offer of specialist help and a referral was completed for a consultation with this specialist service.</p> <p>A Foster Carer's Review Panel was held, as detailed above, which reviewed the family's circumstances and amendments to registration criteria.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with the Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol. This informed the Child Protection enquiry, Initial Referral Discussion and Police charges.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 86

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	November 2015.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████ - birth son of foster carers ██████ and ██████ ██████

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation of inappropriate sexual behaviour was made.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place at some time in 2007.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>An Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) was initiated by the Senior Social Worker (SSW) at Craighentenny Social Work Centre (SWC) on receipt of the allegations. under Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures was also followed.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures. A Pre-Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>All the information known was shared and reviewed and a decision was made not to progress to IRD at that time. It appears that, despite being fully supported to do so by the professionals involved, the complainant would not agree to providing a formal statement to the Police. As the complainant was an adult, it was decided that a formal child protection investigation would not provide any further safeguards to the single agency actions proposed.</p> <p>A shared view was taken that the current risk posed by the son of the registered foster carers was low and there was no evidence of risk to the children currently in the placement, who already had established plans to move from the foster carers as part of their individual care plans.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young people in the foster care placement by their allocated Practice Team Social Workers, who</p>

		<p>subsequently supported their moves from the current foster carers to longer term alternative placements.</p> <p>The Liaison Social Worker and Resource Manager met with the foster carers on 24 November 2016 to discuss the historical allegations and to inform them that no further children could be placed with them under the circumstances.</p> <p>The carers decided to resign from their fostering role.</p> <p>A Carers Review Panel approved their deregistration on [REDACTED] 2017.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Carer's Review Panel was held on [REDACTED] 2017, which acknowledged the allegations and investigation. The Panel accepted their resignations from fostering and approved the carer's de-registration.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>A Fostering Carer's Review Panel was held, as detailed above, which reviewed the family's circumstances and approved de-registration for both from their fostering roles.</p> <p>The children who were placed with the carers, at the time when the historical allegations were disclosed, were transferred to appropriate longer-term alternative placements in accordance with their long-term care plans.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The information contained in the complaint was not shared with Police as the complainant would not agree to providing a formal statement to the Police, despite being fully supported to do so by the involved professionals. A decision was taken that a formal child protection investigation would not provide any further safeguards to the single agency actions proposed.

Complaint 87

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████ adopted child.
c.	When was the complaint made?	1 May 2008.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTS ██████ - Adoptive parent, and registered foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against the foster carer by his adopted child.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between April 2008 and May 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The process taken required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Procedures (Section 7).</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to Section 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures), these allegations were subject to an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD), where it was agreed that there should be a joint interview arranged for the child on 1 May 2008.</p> <p>The child was removed to the care of his grandparents while the investigation was ongoing. On 3 May 2008, the child was subject to a Joint Paediatric Forensic Medical (JPFM) examination, as agreed by the IRD. This examination was inconclusive for determining whether physical abuse had been perpetrated against the child by any party.</p>

		<p>The IRD agreed that the allocated social worker would speak to the young person about the circumstances at home. In this discussion, the young person stated that they had not told the truth and had fabricated the story. It was assessed that the fabricating of this story was related to the young person's previous earlier childhood trauma experiences. The outcome of this investigation was that no further child protection action was to be taken.</p> <p>As the allegations had caused significant distress to the adoptive parents, further time for the child with the grandparents was agreed, as was a meeting between the professionals to agree and ensure support was in place for the young person and their adoptive parents, prior to his return to their care.</p> <p>A further Carer Review Panel was also convened, to consider the impact of the allegations from the foster carer's perspective on their ongoing foster care role. The child returned the care of the adoptive parents after the short respite period with the grandparents, with the required supports being in place.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of this investigation was no further action to be taken, other than ongoing support for the adopters/carers in developing areas of identified practice.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided the young person with the support of the allocated social worker and support through the adherence to the child protection procedures and process.</p> <p>The adoptive parents/foster carers received ongoing support from their Family Based Care social worker and adoption agency. All were given support to ensure a smooth transition for the young person back to the care of his adoptive parents.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	In adhering to Sections 7 & 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures, these allegations were subjected to an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion. Therefore, information was shared with the Police when it was then agreed that there should be a joint interview as well as a joint paediatric forensic medical.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 88

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	December 1998.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTT ██████████ – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FTT ██████████
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between 29 November 1998 and 4 December 1998.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined that an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint made The information regarding this complaint was in recorded in a Carer Review Panel held in May 2000.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	This placement was initially to be a two week placement while the child's mother was in hospital. The child was extremely disruptive and informed his mother that the carer was hitting him. During this time the child was also suspended from school.

		<p>The carer contacted social workers to ask for assistance and additional support as the child was becoming physical with her.</p> <p>A social worker attended with the foster carer. The situation did not improve, and the child was moved to Outworkers.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child was moved from the placement to Outworkers.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no evidence of a specific response provided to the complainant.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 89

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Sheila Jackson, headteacher.
c.	When was the complaint made?	8 March 2004.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████ foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. The headteacher was concerned that she could smell alcohol on the foster carer's breath.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint related to an incident which took place on 8 March 2004.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The senior social worker had a meeting with the foster carer and the headteacher. It was noted in the foster carer's file that other workers within the school had also mentioned they could smell alcohol on her breath.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Following investigation, it was acknowledged that the foster carer was experiencing some issues at home. It was agreed that the foster carer would meet with her liaison social worker before returning to fostering on 17 March 2004.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The foster carer took a break from fostering and then returned to the school as a Child Support Worker.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	The complaint was not assessed as a matter requiring Police involvement.

Complaint 90

Question	Answer
----------	--------

b.	Who made the complaint?	Several teachers, office staff and headteacher.
c.	When was the complaint made?	8 September 2004.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████, foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglect. It was alleged that teachers and office staff could smell alcohol on the foster carer's breath. The foster carer was sent home.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint appears to relate to an incident that took place on 8 September 2004.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The senior social worker attended the school on 10 September 2004 to discuss the complaint with two teachers and the depute headteacher. The teachers spoke of smelling alcohol on the foster carer's breath and that her face was puffy, and her eyes were bleary. The classroom assistant and office staff had also raised concerns that day. The foster carer had been sent home.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The foster carer took a six-month break from fostering following a report from a Medical Adviser She later decided not to return to fostering and was de-registered.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority investigated the complaint and the foster carer then took a six-month break from fostering before deciding not to return. The foster carer was then de-registered.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable

m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	The complaint was not assessed as a matter requiring Police involvement.

Complaint 91

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Birth mother of [REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	During placement, sometime between [REDACTED] 2000 and [REDACTED] 2000.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	[REDACTED] – Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against the carer by the child in placement's mother. This abuse took the form of a scratch on the child's leg which happened at some time between 28 June 2000 and 17 August 2000.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	Between 28 June 2000 and 17 August 2000.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The allegation was later retracted; however, the carer took the child to be medically examined.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The allegation was later retracted, and no further action was taken.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The allegation was later retracted, and no further action was taken.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The carer took the child to be medically examined.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carer took the child to be medically examined.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 92

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	7 June 2002
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU ██████████ - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The child in placement alleged both physical and verbal abuse by carer. The allegations included the carer hitting the child with a plastic draining board, grabbing her, shouting and swearing at her and making remarks about her mother who at that time was in hospital, possibly terminally ill. This allegation was made to the out of hours Emergency Social Work Service (ESWS) while the child was at a friends' house.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place in June 2002.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority's approach was in accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. The Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach was in accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. The Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. It was agreed during the IRD that ESWs should interview the child in placement in the first instance to see if a joint interview was necessary. The Carers were also contacted and informed of the allegations.</p> <p>ESWS social workers visited the friends' house and spoke to the child in placement. Once they had the details of the allegation, they asked if the child would accompany them to the carers house and she agreed. On arrival, the child went to her room so that the carers could speak to the social workers about the events leading up to the allegations. The child had been unsettled since a recent discussion about the possibility of her return to the care of her mum. The child later joined them, and after discussion it was agreed that the child would remain in placement.</p> <p>This decision was based on the judgement that the incident initially reported was not as serious as first thought. The police were informed and agreed with this decision. The child's social worker was notified of the incident and was able to offer support to the child to remain in placement.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The child returned and remained in placement at the carers and was supported by her social worker.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Support was provided to the child by her social worker.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	Support was provided to the child by her social worker.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, in accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the local authority shared the specific information with the Police.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 93

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	28 October 2002.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU ██████████ - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical, emotional & neglectful abuse. The child in placement was at respite with relatives and refused to return the placement. She alleged that the carer was drinking regularly and heavily; she smacked the younger children in placement; she had phoned the child in placements relatives when drunk.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place during the foster placement, between ██████████ 2000 and ██████████ 2002.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.

		Practice team and resource team social workers agreed that these allegations should be dealt with as complaints against the carer and not as a child protection matter.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>From notes in the carers file, the child was interviewed and did not return to the placement. The carer was spoken to and denied the allegations. The other children remained in placement. It is not clearly recorded how the allegations were investigated other than interviews/discussions took place.</p> <p>On the same day the above allegations were made, a child protection investigation was instigated for the two younger children in placement who had made allegations of sexual abuse by a family member. It may be that the allegations made by the child in placement were overlooked in the dealing of the sexual abuse allegation. The carer attended a joint interview to support the younger children.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome is not clearly recorded. The child did not return to the placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The child did not return to the placement. Support was offered to the child to assist her in re-establishing contact with the carer as the child's sibling was still in placement with the carer.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not clearly recorded. However, these allegations were included in a subsequent independent assessment into the carers and they later resigned. (See complaint 40)
l.	If there was no response, why not?	As above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a child protection matter.

Complaint 94

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Childcare professional
c.	When was the complaint made?	22 November 2002.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU [REDACTED] - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical, emotional & neglectful abuse. An allegation was made by a member of the children's centre that the carer FTU [REDACTED] was smelling of vodka.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in November 2002.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.</p> <p>The member of staff at the children's centre spoke to the carer at the time and reported the matter to the liaison social worker who also spoke to the carer.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	This complaint was assessed and treated as a practice learning issue.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The foster carer was spoken to by the liaison worker. The foster carer was not exhibiting any signs of/smelling of alcohol or being intoxicated.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There was no specific response as this was dealt with locally at the children's centre and followed up by the liaison social worker.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	No further response than noted above.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not regarded as a child protection matter.

Complaint 95

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Practice Team Senior Social Worker (SSW)
c.	When was the complaint made?	6 January 2003
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU [REDACTED] - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical, emotional abuse and neglectful care. The carer had contacted the SSW to discuss arrangements for one of the children in placement to meet her sibling to attend the funeral of her grandparent later that day. It is alleged that the carer was under the influence of alcohol. It was confirmed that the foster carer had failed to take the younger children to the children's centre and the other child in placement was not in school.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident took place in January 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>The Resource Team SSW visited the carer with two social workers that morning to assess the situation. The two younger children were dressed and taken to the children's centre. During discussions with the other child in placement, it was alleged that a physical altercation took place in the middle of the night. She was removed from the</p>

		<p>carers home and taken to the social work office to meet up with her sibling to attend the funeral later that day.</p> <p>As part of the child protection investigation, a joint interview with the child took place on 7 January 2003. The carer was later interviewed on 29 January 2003 by the police and they decided that no charges would be made.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The Resource Team SSW visited the carer with two social workers that morning to assess the situation. The two younger children were dressed and taken to the children's centre. During discussions with the other child in placement, it was alleged that a physical altercation took place in the middle of the night. She was removed from the carers home and taken to the social work office to meet up with her sibling to attend the funeral later that day.</p> <p>Alternative placements were found for all three children.</p> <p>As part of the child protection investigation, a joint interview with the older child took place on 7 January 2003. Interviews also took place with the sibling of this child who had recently returned home from the same placement.</p> <p>The carer was later interviewed on 29 January 2003 by the police and it was decided that no charges would be made.</p> <p>No children were placed during the police investigation and the carer was informed that she would have to attend a fostering review panel before any further placements could be considered. A report was drafted by the liaison social worker.</p> <p>Support to the carer was provided by the liaison social worker, the Fostering Network and the Army Welfare Officer (joint carer and spouse was serving abroad at time of incident).</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>All three children were found alternative placements. The liaison social worker compiled a report for the carer review recommending the de-registration of the carer.</p> <p>After consultation, the Resource Development Manager requested that the review be postponed, to allow an assessment to be carried out to ensure that the carers views were sought and represented to</p>

		<p>the fostering panel. He also requested that it be carried out by someone who was independent of the line management of the carers and children's social workers.</p> <p>The independent assessment looked at the previous complaints and allegations, and made various recommendations including that the carers be suspended for at least a year and undergo a reassessment of their suitability to remain as carers. Part of this would include a full medical assessment considering their mental health and emotional state. At the time of the independent report the medical assessor was not supportive of their return to foster care.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The children were removed from placement. The carers were suspended for at least a year and decided to resign.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The children were removed from placement and support provided by their allocated social workers.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. The older child in placement was interviewed by the Police. The foster carer was not charged; however, they eventually withdrew from fostering.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 96

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	February 2003.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU ██████████ - Foster Carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. A historic allegation was made against FTU of physical abuse in addition to threats of violence. The allegation was made in February 2003 by a child who had previously been placed with Mrs FTU. The child alleged that they had witnessed another foster child be slapped across the face.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place at some time during the placement between August 2002 and January 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	At the time of this allegation, a child protection investigation was in process, relating to previous incidents, in accordance with the Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Sections 4 and 8
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The child referred to in the allegation was interviewed by the police as a result of the child protection investigation being carried out into a previous incident in January 2003.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A previous incident in January 2003 resulted in all children being removed from the placement and an internal independent investigation took place with a recommendation that the carer be suspended for at least a year. The carer and her spouse decided to resign as foster carers.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	An internal independent investigation took place with a recommendation that the carer be suspended for at least a year. The carer and her spouse decided to resign.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	It is unclear from the file whether further information relating to this allegation was passed to the police as it appears to overlap with a previous allegation where there had already been police involvement.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 97

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	April 2003
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTU ██████████ - Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. A historic allegation was made against FTU ██████████ of smacking the child in foster care.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place throughout the foster care placement between August 2002 and January 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The Inter Agency Child Protection Guidelines Section 8; Allegations of Abuse Made Against Foster carers or Agency Employees, were followed in order to assess that an internal investigation should be progressed. The social worker discussed the allegation with the senior social worker and it was agreed that a child protection investigation was not to be carried out due to the length of time that had elapsed and the child's reluctance to speak to the police.</p> <p>Due to previous events an internal independent investigation took place with a recommendation that the carer be suspended for at least a year.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	An internal independent investigation had been carried out into previous allegations with the recommendation that the carer be suspended for at least a year and undergo a full assessment including medicals, before attending a fostering review panel. The carer decided to resign.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The carer was deregistered.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No specific response.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not required.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Due to the length of time that had passed and the reluctance of the child to speak to the police.

Complaint 98

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 2015.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTV-SPO ██████████ – Foster Carers to ██████████ and her brother ██████████, during the above period.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. It was alleged that FTV ██████████ slapped the child and threatened to place her on the naughty step as a result of soiling.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between August 2012 and September 2012.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7

		<p>and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The process required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Procedures (Section 7). This took place on 26 June 2015.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures (Sections 7 and 15), where an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young person by the allocated practice team social worker who listened to the allegations and informed the young person of potential options as how to progress these. The allocated practice team social worker then explained the process of video recorded interview (VRI) allowing them to help them be more confident in the process and to be more able to engage in it.</p> <p>The young person was jointly interviewed on 15 July 2015, where disclosures were made alleging physical and emotional abuse by the carers.</p> <p>The social worker ensured that the carers had no children placed with them ensuring no other LAAC young people were at risk.</p> <p>The social worker arranged to hold a planning meeting with the carers to make them aware of, and discuss further with them, the allegations that had been made.</p> <p>The social worker provided notification to the Care Inspectorate of the nature of the complaint made and known details at that time.</p> <p>The social worker carried out a home visit to the foster carers on 22 July 2015 to discuss the allegations and confirm that no further children could be placed with them whilst the investigation was ongoing.</p> <p>A Foster Carers Review Panel was held on 12 August 2016 which acknowledged the allegations and investigation. It agreed changes to the registration status for FTV [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].</p>

		Following a Police interview with FTV [REDACTED] on 4 th August 2015, the local authority was informed of the outcome of the investigation. With no further corroborative evidence, the Police concluded that no further action was to be taken.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Foster Carer Review Panel was held on 12 August 2016, which acknowledged the allegations and the resultant investigation, and agreed changes to the registration status for both FTV [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Their registration criteria was changed to being approved as foster carers to respite foster carers only.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, as detailed above.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The young person had been successfully rehabilitated back to the care of her parents prior to the allegations of abuse whilst in foster care being made.</p> <p>The allocated practice team social worker provided emotional support to Ellen throughout the period of the investigation, as well as practical support in informing of and preparing for VRI process.</p> <p>The allocated social worker also referred to, and secured ongoing support from a specialist service for the family.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	<p>Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police Scotland in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Child Protection Procedures agreed information sharing protocol, and which consequently informed the resultant Child Protection inquiry and Inter Agency Referral Discussion.</p> <p>The Police notified the local authority of the outcome of the investigation which was that no further action was being taken. After the Police interview with FTV [REDACTED] on 4th August 2015, Police informed that there was no further corroborative evidence. Therefore, the Police investigation was concluded with no charges and no further action being taken.</p>

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 99

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	FTX-FTY - Foster carers
c.	When was the complaint made?	October and November 2001
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTW – Respite Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Neglectful care. On two separate occasions (October 2001 and November 2001) concerns were expressed by the foster carers about the respite carer's drinking habits. The child in foster care had said that the respite carer had been chasing him and he did not like it because he was drunk.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	During respite placements in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 2001.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority instigated an internal investigation.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Concerns were passed to the FTW [REDACTED] Liaison Social worker and Senior Social Worker at SERT. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, we have been unable to review the records of FTW [REDACTED]
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no outcome recorded in the file of carers FTX-FTY [REDACTED] who raised the concerns. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, we have been unable to review the records of FTW [REDACTED]
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	See above.

k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 100

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	4 April 2002.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTX-FTY – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. In April 2002, after a review meeting, the child's mother complained that: - the carers had given the child a row and sworn at him - the carers had told the child that his mother had stolen his sticker album
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint related to an incident in April 2002.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Phone calls were made separately with each foster carer discussing why the child had made allegations and why the mother had complained.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	This was resolved as a practice learning issue.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	No specific response recorded.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 101

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	December 2002.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTX-FTY – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Other. A letter written in December 2002 listed 16 complaints made by the mother of the child in placement. The complaints ranged from issues about the care of her son, things said about her, confidentiality, lack of communication and consultation by social workers etc. It should be noted that her child had disclosed abuse by her mother and her mother's partner to his carers.

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The concerns noted relate to events during the child's placement which began in [REDACTED] 2001.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The process and approach were in accordance with Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, which was used to determine that an internal investigation should be progressed initially.</p> <p>An internal investigation was opened into the complaints and allegations. This was handled by a Senior Social Worker and the Resource Development Manager.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Various complaints in the letter were clarified with the complainant by letter and telephone. The allegations were discussed with the foster carers. A letter was provided to the complainant and it appears to be the case that pastoral support was offered.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>A letter was written detailing the outcome of the investigation which was again disputed by the complainant.</p> <p>A final letter was sent to the complainant asking for more information on the confidentiality allegation and stating that differences of opinion remain.</p> <p>Pastoral support appears to have been offered.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 102

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	August 2003
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTX-FTY – Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. On 7 and 8 August 2003 the grandparents of the child in foster care alleged that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - their grandson had not been allowed to call them back - their grandson was scared of FTX - FTY had told the child he would be sent to another home if he was bad and that FTX had said "your Gran is naughty".
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incidents took place on 7 and 8 August 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	Allegations were discussed with the carers. The social worker met with the grandparents to discuss the allegations, but the grandfather walked out before all the issues could be discussed.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The social worker commented that 'as far as the Department is concerned, they will not be taking it any further.'
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress,	The carers were informed that it would not be taken any further.

	pastoral response or any other type of response?	
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	Not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 103

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a young person in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	30 November 2006.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FTZ ██████████ - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An allegation of inappropriate sexual behaviour was made against the carer. He was alleged to have sent inappropriate text messages to the young person and tried to kiss her.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 30 November 2006.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse against a registered foster carer, Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) and progressed a Child Protection Investigation.</p>

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. An IRD was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young person by the allocated practice team social worker who listened to the allegations and informed the young person of their options for progressing. The young person was then supported by the allocated practice team social worker who explained the process of Joint Investigative Interview (JII). This was designed to help the young person to be more confident in the process and more able to engage in it.</p> <p>The young person was formally joint interviewed and was assessed as providing a credible account of the alleged abuse. However, due to the lack of corroborating evidence, the Police took no further action and the investigation was passed to the local authority to address the practice issues with the foster carer.</p> <p>The young person was moved to an immediate respite care placement while the investigation was ongoing and was subsequently moved to a longer-term placement. The young person did not return to the care of FTZ.</p> <p>The Family Based Care social worker arranged for the carer to attend a Foster Carer's Review Panel.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Foster Carer's Review Panel was held on 2008. The Panel acknowledged the allegations and investigation and approved the carer's de-registration as a foster carer for the local authority.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The young person was successfully transitioned to immediate respite care while the investigation was ongoing, and then successfully transitioned to a longer-term alternative placement.</p> <p>The allocated practice team social worker provided emotional support to the young person throughout the period of the</p>

		investigation, as well as practical support in informing of and preparing for JII process.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol. This informed the Child Protection enquiry and Initial Referral Discussion.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 104

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	10 July 2008
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUA ██████████ - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in placement made an allegation of sexual assault against the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The child was in placement between ██████████ 2005 and ██████████ 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The child was removed from placement and the allegation was investigated by social work and police.

		<p>A decision was taken by the Police that no further action was required.</p> <p>However, the investigation into these allegations by social work led to serious concerns about the foster carer. FUA admitted to withholding significant information and also to inappropriate behaviour for example, he saw the child in various states of undress and witnessed the child masturbating.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The outcome of the investigation by the Police was that no further action should be taken.</p> <p>The social work investigation led to the revelation of the foster carer withholding information from his wife and from the local authority.</p> <p>The foster carer had previously attended a course on 'Men in Foster Care' and was aware of safer caring issues due to a child's abusive history.</p> <p>The recommendation was then to deregister carers.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes. The foster carers were deregistered.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police investigated the allegations and decided that no further action was required.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 105

Question	Answer
----------	--------

b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	January 2015.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████ - Grandson of foster carers ██████ and ██████.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse by the grandson of the foster carers against the young person in foster care.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse alleged to have taken place was from 9 th February 2012 to 24 June 2014.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The process followed required the Practice Team Leader to initiate an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (Section 7) under the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Procedures.</p> <p>The young person was formally interviewed on 2 February 2015. Disclosures were confirmed alleging sexual abuse by the carer's grandson, ██████. The family based care social worker ensured that the carers had no children placed with them. The family based care social worker also progressed the Carer's Review Panel, where they were to be recommended for de-registration, due to ongoing concerns in relation to their lack of adherence to care standards.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures (Sections 7 and 15), where an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion was held to plan an appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>The carers were also presented at a Foster Carers Review Panel, where they were deregistered as foster carers, due to the concerns noted in the sexual abuse complaint, as well as concerns for their lack of adherence to the care standards required of foster carers.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A criminal investigation was undertaken by Police Scotland in relation to the alleged abuse. The carers were deregistered as foster carers at a foster care review panel.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, as detailed above.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The young person was referred to, and gained input from, a service which offered specialist support in relation to sexual abuse. The young person was also offered and engaged in a support plan which offered structured support and supervision to their time in the community and in relation to keeping themselves safe and establishing safe relationships.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police Scotland in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Child Protection Procedures agreed information sharing protocol, and which consequently informed the resultant Child Protection inquiry and Inter Agency Referral Discussion.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 106

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in Respite Foster Care
c.	When was the complaint made?	January 2007
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	██████████ - Respite Foster Carer
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Verbal threat of physical abuse. An allegation was made that the carer told the child he would "give the child a slap".

f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place January 2007.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse against the birth father, who was registered as a Foster Carer, Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Manager made an initial enquiry to assess and decide if this was to be investigated as a Child Protection matter, or for an internal/practice development route to be followed.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines where it was decided by the senior manager, after concluding initial inquiry, that this should be treated as an internal practice development matter with the foster carer.</p> <p>A safety plan was agreed where the complainant did not return to the respite care placement while the investigation was ongoing.</p> <p>The liaison social worker and the senior manager both met with the foster carer in January 2007 to discuss the allegation. The foster carer admitted to using threatening language but stated that this had not meant to be threatening and was made in jest. A discussion was held with the foster carer about the importance of using appropriate language and the impact that inappropriate language can have on children and young people, especially those who may have experienced previous abuse and related trauma. The foster carer was able to fully recognise the impact of this, and on reflection, was able to acknowledge their use of inappropriate language.</p> <p>As well as recognising this in the discussion and to further address this issue, agreement was reached for the foster carer to take this forward as part of ongoing professional development, and subsequently attended foster carer support groups, as well as safe</p>

		<p>caring training inputs offered by the local authority and Fostering Network.</p> <p>This issue was also formally discussed and addressed at the Carer Review Panel on 11 February 2009, prior to the carers being approved as continued New Opportunities foster carers for the local authority.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Carer Review Panel was held on 11 February 2009, which acknowledged the allegations, the investigation, the agreed outcomes and consequent engagement for the carer in specific practice development groups. The panel also discussed and recognised the learning that had been achieved for the carer from these development opportunities.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>As described above, a restorative response was provided by the local authority.</p> <p>The young person was fully supported in making their complaint by the allocated Practice Team Social Worker and residential staff.</p> <p>The foster carer was supported by their Liaison Social Worker and Resource Manager to acknowledge the issue and then secure means and resources as how to address this issue, to ensure safe and appropriate care being offered to the young person in the future. A focus on reparative relationship work allowed the young person to confidently re-establish themselves in the respite care placement with the foster carer.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The information contained in the complaint was assessed as a practice development issue, and treated as such, after initial inquiry was carried out by Senior Manager.

		As the allegation was assessed and progressed as a complaint relating to a practice issue, there was no requirement to share this information with Police.
--	--	--

Complaint 107

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 2003.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUE ██████████ - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made by the child that the carer slapped him.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in May 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was one of physical abuse, Section 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to. The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the allegations were subjected to an Initial Referral Discussion.</p> <p>It was agreed at the IRD that the young person should be afforded the opportunity of a joint interview. During the joint interview, the young person retracted their allegation.</p> <p>It was assessed that the initial allegations had been the result of emotional instability that the young person was experiencing in</p>

		relation to previous childhood experiences/trauma and related attachment issues.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of this investigation was for no further action to be taken, other than ongoing support for the foster carers in developing areas of identified practice, as well as ongoing support for the young person.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided the young person with the support of an allocated social worker.</p> <p>The foster carer received ongoing support from their Family Based Care Social Worker.</p> <p>All were given support to ensure stability was achieved for the young person with their foster carer in an environment where their emotional and physical needs were being met.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. In accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the local authority shared the specific information with the Police, which then informed the child protection investigation process and decision making regarding the outcome of the child protection investigation.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 108

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 2003.

d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUE - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation was made by the child that the carer hit him.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in June 2003.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was one of abuse, Section 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to. The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion under Section 4 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the allegations were subjected to an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD). It was agreed at the IRD that the young person should be afforded the opportunity of a joint interview.</p> <p>The young person had, at the time of the IRD, absconded from the placement, with Police officers being involved in tracing and returning the young person to the placement.</p> <p>Whilst in the presence of the Police officers the young person retracted the allegations made earlier. Instead the young person then provided a version of events, which reflected the foster carers perception, that led to the young person injuring themselves, through volatile behaviour being displayed.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of this investigation was for no further action to be taken, other than ongoing support for the foster carers in developing areas of identified practice, as well as ongoing support for the young person.

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided the young person with the support of an allocated social worker.</p> <p>The foster carer received ongoing support from their Family Based Care social worker.</p> <p>All were given support to ensure stability was achieved for the young person with their foster carer in an environment where their emotional and physical needs were being met.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. In accordance with Sections 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, the local authority shared the specific information with the Police, which then informed the child protection investigation process and decision making regarding the outcome of the child protection investigation.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 109

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ birth child of the foster carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	September 2005.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUE ██████████ - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. An allegation was made that the carer threw the child across the room in anger.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in September 2005.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse against the birth father, who was registered as a Foster Carer, Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines was also adhered to.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) under Section 4.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Child Protection Guidelines.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to the Section 4.1 and 8.1 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines, an IRD was held to plan appropriate multi agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young person by the allocated practice team social worker who listened to the allegations and informed the young person of potential options for progressing. The allocated practice team social worker supported the young person by explaining the process of Joint Investigative Interview (JII). The young person was interviewed at which point they withdrew the initial allegations.</p> <p>The young person who was placed in foster care with FUE FUE was moved to respite care placement while the investigation was ongoing. The allegations made the foster carer rethink their longer-term commitment to foster caring. He decided not to continue as a foster carer due to the impact this was having on his own family unit. The foster child was transitioned to a longer-term foster care placement from the respite placement.</p> <p>The Family Based Care social worker arranged for the carer to attend Foster Carer's Review Panel.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>A Carer Review Panel was held on 22 June 2006, which acknowledged the allegations and the investigation and agreed changes to registration status for the carer. The carer had withdrawn their resignation as a foster carer and now wanted to offer respite care placement, as this would be more positive for the birth family.</p>

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The young person had been successfully rehabilitated back to the care of their parents. The allocated practice team social worker provided emotional support to the young person throughout the period of the investigation, as well as practical support in informing off and preparing for JII process.</p> <p>The allocated social worker also referred to, and secured, the ongoing support from a specialist service for the family.</p> <p>The child who was placed in the foster care placement was provided with alternative short and long-term alternative accommodation and was provided with practical and emotional support throughout the transition period.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol, and which consequently informed the resultant Child Protection enquiry and Initial Referral Discussion.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 110

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous source.
c.	When was the complaint made?	June 2008.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUH - Foster Carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Verbal/emotional abuse. An allegation of inappropriate language used by the carer around children.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place in June 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure. However, as the complaint was made anonymously the procedure could not be followed fully as there could not be further discussion with the complainant about the nature of the complaint or to relay the outcome of the investigation.</p> <p>The decision was taken to progress the investigation on an informal basis. This was in accordance with the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was set in Appendix 2 of the local authority's Foster Carer Agreement (2002).</p> <p>Agreement was reached for the allocated Liaison Social worker to meet with the foster carer in order to discuss the nature of the complaint.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Adhering to the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure, which was set out in Appendix 2 of the local authority's Foster Carer Agreement (2002), an agreement was reached that the allocated Liaison Social Worker was to meet the foster carer in order to discuss the nature of the complaint. This discussion took place on 05 June 2008.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding the anonymous complaint in relation to FUH use of language around children. She admitted that she had referred to one of the foster care children in a negative and derogatory manner but stated that she does not normally act in this manner.</p> <p>The behaviour was thought to be caused by complicated placements which were having a negative impact on the carer's emotional wellbeing and, therefore, on her coping strategies. The allocated Liaison Social Worker advised the carer about the importance of speaking respectfully, not just to children, but to professionals, regardless of how she was feeling.</p>

		To address this issue, there was further discussion about the foster carer's remit. It was agreed that there would be no further foster children placed with the carer to maximise the chance of success for all members of the household. This was discussed further and monitored at a Carers Review Panel in May 2010.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The outcome of this investigation was no further action to be taken, other than ongoing support for the foster carers in developing areas of identified practice.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority provided the young person with the support of the allocated social worker, while adhering to the Looked After Children Regulations.</p> <p>The foster carer received ongoing support from their Family Based Care Social Worker.</p> <p>All were given support to ensure stability was achieved for the young person with their foster carer in an environment where their emotional and physical needs were being met.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	<p>Given the nature of the complaint, this was assessed and treated as an inappropriate verbal response to an emotionally challenging situation for the foster carer, rather than wilful abuse.</p> <p>The decision was taken not to report to the Police or treat within the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-agency Child Protection Procedures. Instead, professional support was provided to the foster carer to address the issue.</p>

		Ongoing support was provided to the young person by the allocated Practice Team Social Worker, to ensure the placement continued to meet their emotional and physical needs.
--	--	--

Complaint 111

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ the sister-in law of FUI ██████████.
c.	When was the complaint made?	19th February 2008
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUI-FUO ██████████ – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. The foster carers were alleged to have struck children in placement, been mentally cruel and pinned a child against a wall.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place between the start of the placement on ██████████ 2004 and the date the allegation was made on ██████████ 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>In line with this procedure, an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) was initiated by the Senior Social Worker (SSW) at Craightinny Social Work Centre (SWC) on receipt of the allegations.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint followed the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures. An Inter-Agency Referral Discussion was initiated by the Duty SSW at Craightinny SWC with Amethyst.

		<p>Lothian and Borders Police (Dalkeith) and Amethyst decided that there should be no joint interview. This decision was based on the lack of indicators to support the allegations: no complaint from the child; no concerns raised from his school; and no other concerns noted. It was decided, based on the information gathered in the IRD, that the child remained in the care of the foster carers.</p> <p>The child protection inquiry progressed with Lothian and Borders Police (Dalkeith / Musselburgh) attempting to gain a formal statement from [REDACTED]. However, she did not agree to be interviewed. A decision was made by the Police that they could not proceed with the case and consequently there was no follow-on investigation.</p> <p>On 29th February 2008, an agreement was reached to conclude the IRD. This was because [REDACTED] had declined to make a statement to police on four occasions and the child, the family nor professionals involved had raised any other concerns.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The Inter-Agency Referral Discussion was concluded on 29th February 2008 with no further child protection action being taken. The child remained in the placement with the carers, as there had been no corroborating evidence found through the child protection inquiry.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The carers were informed of the conclusions of the Initial Referral Discussion and the child protection inquiry, in order to support them in their ongoing care of the children placed with them.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. The details of the allegations were shared with the Police as part of the Initial Referral Discussion and ongoing child protection enquiry. This process was concluded on 29th February 2008.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 112

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	19th April 2008
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUI-FUO ██████████ – Foster Carers
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical and emotional abuse. It was alleged that FUI ██████████ had slapped the child, pulled his hair and made him wash his soiled underwear.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	3 rd and 19 th April 2008
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p> <p>An Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) was initiated by the Senior Social Worker (SSW) at Craigentinny Social Work Centre (SWC) on receipt of the allegations.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>Following the child's disclosure, the allocated social worker (SW) contacted FUI ██████████ to inform her that the child would not be returning to her care due to a complaint he had raised regarding the care that was being provided by herself and FUO ██████████</p> <p>The SW made emergency safety and accommodation plans for the child to be cared for by his maternal grandparents. The SW contacted the SSW, and an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) was held. ██████████ was jointly interviewed by Police and Social Work</p>

		<p>the following day. It was agreed that the child should not return to FUI-FUO care and instead remained with his grandparents.</p> <p>FUI was subsequently interviewed by Dalkeith Police under caution on 26th April 2008. The outcome of this interview was noted by the Police that FUI had nothing further to answer.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The child was jointly interviewed by Police and Social Work on 20th April 2008, in relation to the allegations that he had made against the foster carers FUI-FUO. In the joint interview the child reiterated the allegations that he had made.</p> <p>It was agreed that the child should not return to FUI-FUO care and he remained with his maternal grandparents. As part of the ongoing Child Protection Inquiry, FUI was interviewed by Dalkeith Police under caution on 26th April 2008. Following this interview, no further criminal investigation was to be pursued, as there was no corroborative evidence gained in order to support the allegations. The IRD was concluded with no charges against any party.</p> <p>The child was not returned to the care of FUI-FUO.</p> <p>Given the separate allegations made by two sources, a Service Manager in Family Based Care, requested an investigation into their care standards under sections 17 and 18 of 'Edinburgh's Children – A Guide to Foster Carers and Staff' and Carer's Agreement'.</p> <p>This investigation followed on from the allegations made on 19th February and 24th April 2008 relating to both children in their care. A Senior Social Worker was appointed in June 2008 as the lead officer and a co-investigator was also appointed. Neither officer had direct working involvement with either of the carers or children involved.</p> <p>The report was completed, recommending that both FUI-FUO be deregistered as foster carers. The report was submitted to an arranged Review of Registration Panel held on</p>

		██████████ 2009, where the report content and other matters of care provided by FUI-FUO ██████████ were discussed and considered, with the panel making a unanimous recommendation that the carers were de-registered. This recommendation was ratified by the Agency Decision maker on 27 July 2009.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority responded by supporting the young person when they made the disclosure, listening to the allegations that they were making, treating the allegations as serious and credible, arranging both immediate and longer-term appropriate safety plans for the young person, supporting them in their transition to further identified care placements, affirming with them that they had made the correct choice in informing involved professionals of the allegations, so that these could be addressed in a formal manner and ensure that the young person was free from any further potential harm.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, all relevant information relating to the complaint was shared with the Police at the point of the Initial Referral Discussion and subsequently as part of the consequential child protection inquiry.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 113

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The complaint was made in June 2005.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	ETZ ██████████ - Specialist Foster Carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in placement alleged that she had been sexually abused by ETZ [REDACTED] on several occasions throughout her foster placement. She also alleged that she had watched child pornography with the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place on several occasions between February 2004 and June 2005.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The child in placement disclosed the abuse to [REDACTED] her foster carer, while they were on holiday together with ETZ [REDACTED]</p> <p>The allegation was not passed to the local authority at this time and on the day of their return from holiday, the child confronted her abuser.</p> <p>The local authority's Emergency Social Work Services were notified of the allegation along with the Police.</p> <p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>The Child Protection Guidelines were then instigated, and a joint interview took place with the child in placement on 11 June 2005.</p> <p>The child was moved to her respite foster carers at this point; however, these foster carers were relatives, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], of the abuser named.</p> <p>The Police investigated ETZ [REDACTED]'s computer and found child pornography. Further child pornography was found on the [REDACTED] computer which had been downloaded while ETZ [REDACTED] borrowed it.</p> <p>Due to the insufficient distance between the alleged abuser and the respite foster carer, the child was moved after three days to another foster carer.</p>

		ETZ-SPO had no foster placements following the removal of the child in June 2005.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The Child Protection Guidelines were instigated as soon as the local authority became aware of the allegations. A joint interview took place with the child in placement on 11 June 2005.</p> <p>A police investigation was initiated, and child pornography was found on ETZ's computer. Child pornography was also found on a computer that ETZ had borrowed from the [REDACTED]. The child was moved from her respite foster placement with the [REDACTED] after three days due to the lack of distance between them and the alleged abuser.</p> <p>ETZ-SPO had no foster placements following the complaint being made.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The outcome of the complaint was that charges were brought by the Police against ETZ for the possession of child pornography.</p> <p>There were no children placed with ETZ-SPO following the complaint.</p> <p>The local authority wrote to the Court in May 2007 to find out the outcome of the criminal proceedings. It was confirmed in 2007 that ETZ had been sentenced to five months imprisonment for the possession of child pornography and he had been placed on the sex offenders' register for a period of five years.</p> <p>Due to an administrative oversight, the foster carers were not deregistered until 15 January 2010. However, no children were placed with the foster carers from June 2005 onwards.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	The local authority asked the Panel to de-register the foster carers in January 2010.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority's Social Work Department supported the child through the criminal proceedings as she had received a citation. For example, her social worker provided her with a booklet on the Court process and assisted in her request for special measures for vulnerable witnesses.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Child Protection Guidelines were initiated, and a joint investigation was carried out. This resulted in criminal charges being brought against ETZ [REDACTED]
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 114

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	[REDACTED], a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	May 2007
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUP [REDACTED] - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. The child in placement recorded a conversation between herself and the foster carer about her sexual behaviour.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse appeared to have happened on a day at some time in May 2007.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The matter was investigated under the Child Protection Guidelines and the child was removed from the placement.</p> <p>The foster carers were suspended pending investigations by the Police.</p>

h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The matter was investigated under the Child Protection Guidelines and the Police conducted an investigation into the allegations.</p> <p>The social worker also investigated the allegations to report back to a Review Fostering Panel.</p> <p>The foster carers were interviewed by two social workers on 29 February 2008.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The outcome of the investigation was that the foster carer had held an inappropriate conversation with the child in placement.</p> <p>The Police investigation also resulted in charges.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the response to Question 5.12.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, the deregistration of the foster carer.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police investigated the complaint and brought charges against the foster carer.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 115

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Two members of the public.
c.	When was the complaint made?	21 June 2007.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUT – Foster Carer

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical assault. The carer was alleged to have mistreated the child in placement by shouting and assaulting the child while driving.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place on 21 June 2007.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) on 21 June 2007 and progressed a Child Protection Investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint was based on Section 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. An IRD was held on 21 June 2007 to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>Support was provided to the young people in the foster care placement by their allocated practice team social worker. The social worker supported each young person in their move to an alternative foster care placement pending the investigation into the allegations made.</p> <p>The IRD agreed that both children were to be subject to medical examinations, which occurred on 21 June 2007 at Royal Hospital for Sick Children. The examinations confirmed no physical evidence to support physical abuse having taken place.</p> <p>Police action was taken against the foster carer, FUT [REDACTED] resulting in him being charged with Assault and Breach of the Peace. FUT [REDACTED] was remanded overnight to appear at Edinburgh Sheriff Court the following day, 22 June 2007. The Procurator Fiscal decided not to take proceedings forward. This decision was based on the contrast in the information recorded in the Police report and what was reported on the evening FUT [REDACTED] was charged. The</p>

		<p>Procurator Fiscal also found that the action was not in the public interest. There were no further criminal proceedings after 22 June 2007.</p> <p>On 25 June 2007, the IRD decided that there was no evidential purpose for joint interview of the children. It was deemed to be more child centred for the allocated social worker to speak with the children about their time in the care placement and to provide further emotional support to them, as well as context to their move from FUT care. No concerns were raised in the discussions with the children so the IRD was concluded with no further action required.</p> <p>An internal investigation was carried out by two senior social workers into FUT perspective of the incident and subsequent allegations. The findings of this investigation reported that FUT had to deal with a very challenging situation in which he acted in a manner which was focused on keeping the foster care child safe and free from harm. The report acknowledged that the foster child had presented particularly challenging behaviour while being transported in the car. This was an issue that all of professionals involved were aware of and recognised that FUT had attempted to manage this as best as he could.</p> <p>The foster carers were taken to a Foster Carers Review Panel prior to any other children being placed within their care.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Foster Carers Review Panel was held on 11 December 2007, which acknowledged the allegations, investigation and outcome. The Panel approved the carer's re-registration criteria for two placements between the ages of 3 and 10yrs.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The investigation report and the Foster Carers Review Panel offered the opportunity for the carers to participate in specific training to further inform caring abilities, including: Managing Children's Behaviour - the Holly Van Gulden Seminar (introducing the theory

		behind children's developmental delays/attachment problems and how to help children fill the "missing gaps" in their development).
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol. This subsequently informed the Child Protection inquiry, Inter-Agency Referral Discussion, Police charges and actions following the investigation.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 116

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Neighbour of the foster carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Three allegations were made between 22 July 2011 and 2 June 2016. The local authority has been unable to further specify the date of this complaint.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUU foster carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	A complaint was made against FUU by her neighbour for putting a child in placement outside. It was also alleged that FUU treated her grandchildren more favourably over the accommodated children.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The complaint related to behaviour that had taken place in the months prior to the complaint.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency

		Child Protection Procedures, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority investigated the allegations and interviewed the foster carer. The foster carer denied locking the child outside.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Following the internal investigation, the Practice Team took no further action.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	No, the local authority has been unable to find evidence of a response to the complaint.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	The local authority decided to take no further action following the complaint. There was no evidence of a specific response found in the foster carer's file.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	The complaint was not assessed as requiring Police involvement.

Complaint 117

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Siblings of the foster carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	Three allegations were made against the foster carer between 22 July 2011 and 2 June 2016.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUU foster carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional abuse. It was alleged that the foster carer had a drinking problem and that this impacted her emotional care of the foster children in placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	It was alleged that the abuse took place over several months prior to the allegation being made.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures, which determined that an internal investigation should be progressed.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority initiated an internal investigation where FUU denied drinking excessively. In terms of the emotional care of the children, she spoke about how challenging the foster children in placement could be and suggested that respite foster care could be of assistance.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	As none of the children in foster placement had raised any concerns in relation to the issues highlighted in the allegations, the foster carer was permitted to continue in her role. The current foster placements at the time continued and were monitored by Social Work.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority provided ongoing support to the foster placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.

n.	If not, why not?	The local authority did not assess the complaint as requiring Police involvement.
----	------------------	---

Complaint 118

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	■■■■■ a child in foster care.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The complaint was made on 2 June 2014.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUU ■■■■■ foster carer. This complaint also related to the carer's daughter and son-in-law, FUV-FUY ■■■■■ who are detailed further in the complaint below.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Emotional & Physical abuse. The foster child disclosed concerns about the emotional and physical care provided by the foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse was said to have taken place over a period of months prior to the complaint being made in June 2014.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures.</p> <p>The local authority initiated the Child Protection Procedures which involved an Inter-agency response from the Social Work Department alongside the Police and Health.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The child was removed from the foster placement on 2 June 2014 and moved to a temporary placement.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>FUU ■■■■■ was de-registered on ■■■■■ 2014.</p> <p>There were three allegations between her previous Carer Review Panel in 2010 and her de-registration at the end of 2014. However, she had no placements from June 2014 onwards.</p>

j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes, the local authority responded to the complaint by de-registering the foster carer.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority de-registered the foster carer on [REDACTED] 2014.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the Police were informed of the allegations as part of the Child Protection Procedures. The Police determined that no further action was required.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 119

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Aunt and uncle of the children in placement.
c.	When was the complaint made?	7 March 2006
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVA-FVB [REDACTED] - Foster Carers.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse and neglect. It was alleged that the foster carers pulled the children's ears and hair and that they were sent to bed without covers or pillows as a punishment. It was also alleged that one of the children in placement had a bruise on her forehead after being pulled out of bed by the male foster carer.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse was said to have taken place at some time between 15 September 2005 and 3 March 2006 when the allegations were disclosed.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The children in placement's social worker informed the foster carers' liaison social worker and then informed 'Who Cares?' to have one of their workers speak to the children about the allegations.</p> <p>The social workers then spoke with the Child Protection Unit, South Lanarkshire Police about the next point of action where it was decided that the children's social worker would interview them.</p> <p>It was determined that the children would not return to the care of the FVA-FVB based on the assessment by the 'Who Cares?' worker.</p> <p>The Police found that the allegations were unfounded.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The allegations were referred to 'Who Cares?' and a 'Who Cares?' worker was sent to interview the children.</p> <p>The children's social worker also interviewed the children separately.</p> <p>The Child Protection Unit, South Lanarkshire Police interviewed the foster carers as part of their investigation.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	<p>The Child Protection Unit, South Lanarkshire Police interviewed the carers as part of their investigation and determined that the allegations were unfounded.</p> <p>The local authority concluded that the liaison social worker and senior social worker would meet with the foster carers to give further advice on safer caring.</p>
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	<p>The liaison social worker and senior social worker met with the foster carers to discuss the allegations and to give information on safer caring. The social workers felt that the foster carers had learned from this experience in terms of safer caring and thought they could return to fostering shortly afterwards. The foster carers agreed.</p>
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, information was passed to the Police by the children in placement's social worker. They were informed initially by the Child Protection Unit that this complaint would not be a high priority.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable

Complaint 120

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████, adoptive child of respite foster carer.
c.	When was the complaint made?	12 June 2007.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVC ██████████ – Respite Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The carer is alleged to have hit the child on 2 separate occasions.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The abuse was alleged to have taken place in the weeks preceding 12 June 2007.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines were followed in this instance.</p> <p>The Senior Social Worker initiated an Initial Referral Discussion (IRD) on 14 June 2007 and progressed a Child Protection Investigation.</p>
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 4 and 8 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines. An IRD was held on 14 June

		<p>2007 to plan an appropriate multi-agency investigation of the complaint.</p> <p>All respite care offered by the foster carer was ceased pending the Child Protection Investigation.</p> <p>The IRD agreed that the young person should have a Joint Investigative Interview (JII) and this took place on 18 June 2007. The JII outcomes confirmed that there were issues in the relationship between the young person and their adoptive father. However, these issues were not assessed as child protection matters.</p> <p>As part of the Child Protection Investigation, the adoptive father and mother were interviewed by Lothian and Borders Police. There was no corroborative evidence. As a result, the IRD was concluded on 5 September 2007, with no further Child Protection action required and Scottish Adoption providing follow up support to address the relationship issues between the young person and their adoptive father.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	A Foster Carer's Review Panel was held on 14 October 2008, which acknowledged the allegations, investigation and outcome. The Panel acknowledged the respite foster carer's formal withdrawal from their role, as they wished to have the opportunity to focus more on supporting their adoptive son. The Panel accepted the carer's resignation and approved de-registration, which was subsequently ratified by the Agency Decision Maker.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	As noted above, a Foster Carers Review Panel was held on 14 October 2008, which formally approved deregistration of the respite foster carers.

		On the conclusion of the IRD, appropriate support was sought, and secured, from Scottish Adoption, to provide appropriate ongoing support to the family to address the familial relationships.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, the information contained in the complaint was shared with Police in accordance with the Edinburgh & Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Guidelines agreed information sharing protocol. This subsequently informed the Child Protection inquiry, Inter-Agency Referral Discussion, and the actions following the investigation.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 121

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Birth Parent of child in placement.
c.	When was the complaint made?	21 October 2008
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVG [REDACTED] - Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. The foster carer was alleged to have struck her birth child.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse took place on 20 October 2008.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>However, as the complaint was an allegation of abuse, Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures were followed in this instance.</p>

		In line with this procedure, an Inter-Agency Referral Discussion (IRD) was initiated by the Senior Social Worker (SSW) on 22 October 2008.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint followed the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures.</p> <p>An Inter-Agency Referral Discussion took place on 22 October 2008 and a Joint Investigative Interview by Police and Social Work took place later that day at the family home of the carer.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The Inter-Agency Referral Discussion was concluded on 23 October 2008 with no further child protection action being taken. The child in placement was removed.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes. The child in placement was removed to an alternative placement.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	<p>The local authority engaged a private consultant to work with the foster carer and her daughter to explore the child's feelings about her mother being a foster carer and the dynamic between them.</p> <p>During this time the carer was on hold and no children were in placement.</p> <p>The consultant was clear that the level of contact facilitated by the carer between the child in placement and the birth mother at the carers home was at an unacceptable level for a foster carer to carry out and a contributing factor in the incident taking place. Contact for the child in placement took place for 3.5 hours, 5 days a week. He recommended that in future placements, any contact between parents and children in placement take place away from the carers.</p>
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes. The details of the allegations were shared with the Police as part of the Initial Referral Discussion. This process was concluded on 23 October 2008.

n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.
----	------------------	-----------------

Complaint 122

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	██████████ a child in foster placement with FUU ██████████, FUV ██████████ mother.
c.	When was the complaint made?	The complaint was made on 2 June 2014.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FUV-FUY ██████████ foster carers. There were also complaints made at the time against FUV ██████████ mother, FUU ██████████ which are detailed elsewhere in Question 5.9.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	The complainant alleged that FUV ██████████ had been drinking excessively and made allegations against FUY ██████████ of rough handling.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse was said to have taken place in the months prior to the disclosure of the complaint.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time. The local authority's approach for investigating the complaint was based on Sections 7 and 15 of the Edinburgh and Lothians Inter-Agency Child Protection Procedures. The local authority followed its Child Protection Procedures and removed the child from placement with FUU ██████████ on 2 June 2014 to a temporary placement. There were no children in placement with FUV-FUY ██████████ when these allegations were made.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The local authority conducted interviews with FUV ██████████ following the allegations being made and this information was then passed to the Police.

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	Mr and Mrs FUV-FUY were de-registered on [REDACTED] 2014.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The local authority responded by de-registering the foster carers on [REDACTED] 2014.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes, there is evidence suggesting that FUU [REDACTED] was interviewed by the Police as part of the complaint. There was no further action taken.
n.	If not, why not?	Not applicable.

Complaint 123

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	December 1991
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	[REDACTED] (10 years old).
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual. An allegation of sexual abuse was made against a child in the foster carers' family in December 1991. It was alleged that the alleged abuser had attempted to touch a 7 year old child.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged abuse would have taken place around November 1991, one month prior to the call reporting the alleged abuse.

g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure, which informed an internal investigation to be progressed to address the complaint made.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The allegation was passed to the senior social worker and it was noted that the allegation would be dealt with the following day. The 3 year old child in currently in placement remained.</p> <p>There is no outcome of the complaint recorded and there was no further comment made about the allegation in the carers record.</p>
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There is no information available to say what the outcome of the complaint was.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	See above.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	See above.
n.	If not, why not?	See above.

Complaint 124

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Anonymous
c.	When was the complaint made?	Sometime prior to March 1993
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVR [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.

e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Sexual abuse. An anonymous call was made to the Social Work Department informing that FVR [REDACTED] had been convicted of rape.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	One event.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time, which determined an internal investigation was to be progressed to address the complaint. A second Scottish Criminal Record (SCRO) check was carried out in March 1993.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	A meeting between the Resource Team Manager and social workers was held to discuss the removal of child in placement in a planned way. An interview/meeting with FVR [REDACTED] took place on 9 March 1993 and the carer resigned by phone on 15 March 1993.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	The foster carer was de-registered following a second SCRO disclosure in March 1993. The child was moved from the placement.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Yes
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	The child was moved from the placement.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	Yes

n.	If not, why not?	The allegation was confirmed by the SCRO check.
----	------------------	---

Complaint 125

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	Unclear, but was detailed in a report dated October 1984.
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVS [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FVS [REDACTED]. It was alleged that the carer hit a child in placement and this was witnessed by another child in placement.
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The incident was discussed in a report dated October 1984 and seemed to relate to a one off incident.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	The report states that a formal enquiry took place following which the foster carer was completely cleared of the allegation.
i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	No further action.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	Respite was to be considered for the child in placement and his twin brother.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	Not applicable.

l.	If there was no response, why not?	Not applicable.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

Complaint 126

	Question	Answer
b.	Who made the complaint?	Child's family member
c.	When was the complaint made?	January or February 1996
d.	Against whom was the complaint made?	FVS [REDACTED] – Foster Carer.
e.	What was the nature of the complaint?	Physical abuse. An allegation of physical abuse was made against FVS [REDACTED]
f.	When/over what period was the abuse alleged to have taken place?	The alleged incident was sometime between January and February 1996.
g.	What was the local authority's process and approach in dealing with the complaint?	The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.
h.	What was the local authority's process and approach for investigating the complaint?	<p>The local authority had a defined process called the Social Work Complaints Handling Procedure which was in place at this time.</p> <p>There is a note that the carer informed they were supervising contact between the children in placement and their father. The carer advised that allowing the children to roll down a muddy slope was not a good idea. The father was verbally abusive. The contact ended and the carer took the children to the car. The father complained that the carer had pulled one the children by the arm.</p>

i.	What was the outcome of the complaint following that investigation?	There was no further action taken as the enquiry found there was no substance to the complaint.
j.	Did the local authority provide a specific response to the complaint?	There is no written evidence that the local authority provided a response to the complainant.
k.	If so, what was the form of response e.g. apology, redress, pastoral response or any other type of response?	See above.
l.	If there was no response, why not?	See above.
m.	Was the information/content of the complaint passed to police?	No.
n.	If not, why not?	This was not assessed as requiring police involvement.

