



In our response to the Inquiry's section 21 notices on the Clerwood, Glenallan, Howdenhall and St Katherine's establishments (submission date 28 July 2017) we undertook a file audit of our historic children in care record series to support our response to Part C. This was undertaken by a seconded auditor, who advised that 10 files per decade was an appropriate sample for our purposes. Please bear in mind that this audit was to establish patterns of policy and practice from within case files in an attempt to provide some evidence to those time periods and subject areas where there was little other evidence.

We used our existing finding aids to identify children who were in care during each decade, as these were organised chronologically. 10 files per decade were then selected, at random if possible, and then reviewed by the auditor against criteria that was drafted by the two seconded social workers. The auditor's findings were then recorded in a spreadsheet that informed our response, primarily in relation to policy and practice in Part C.

When we received the section 21 request for Foster Care, the Council's project team realised that another file audit of children's client files would be appropriate for much the same reason of providing some evidence to those time periods and subject areas where there was little other evidence. This time the audit would focus on fostered / boarded out children instead of those who were accommodated. Given, however, that it was an audit of the same record series, for the same time periods, we took the decision to follow the same methodology. Accordingly, 10 boarded out / fostered children per decade were identified (except the 1940's where we could not identify any), at random where possible, from our finding aids. These were then reviewed by our project team using a revised spreadsheet to capture their findings. These were then fed into our response.

- ii. In your responses to Part C, Question 4.3(ii)(b) under the various headings starting at p.61, we note that you refer to a review of 10 files for the period from 1930-1975, 10 files from 1975-1996 and 39 files from 1996-2014. We assume given the subject matter that these are children's files, is this correct? We are not sure how the numbers and relative periods here correlate to the case file sampling which you refer to in Part A of your response and which is mentioned above, so please could you clarify accordingly?

While the files referred to in our response to Part C, Question 4.3(ii)(b) are children's files, the figures provided are in error. We can confirm that 10 client files were audited per decade within each time period (i.e. Corporation, Region, Unitary Authority), not 10 client files audited per period. There are exceptions to this. For the 1940's we could not identify any surviving boarded out children client files. For the 1990's we audited 12, the 2000's we audited 11 and for the 2010's we audited 16.

Upon reviewing our response to this particular question, we have identified some inconsistencies around how the case file audit data was provided originally. We provide below revised text and data for this section of our response.

**Part C, Question 4.3(ii)(b)**

**iii. Medical care**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the corporation period, there is evidence recorded in all of the files audited of a Reception into Care (RIC) medical examination being carried out for each child/young person who was placed in a foster care placement.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

*(No changes to original response)*

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

*(No changes to original response)*

**iv. Children's physical wellbeing**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the corporation period, there is evidence recorded in fifteen out of the forty cases reviewed that the young person/child had their health needs were being monitored and met, from GP registration and doctors' visits, to vaccinations and operations being undertaken.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the regional council period, there is evidence recorded in sixteen out of the twenty-two cases reviewed that the young person/child was subject to medical assessments in order to ensure their physical wellbeing, and that their health needs were being monitored and met. There is also evidence that the children/young people in placement were also given opportunities for outdoor activities to promote their physical wellbeing.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, all twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period demonstrate that the young person/child was subject to medical assessment in order to ensure their physical wellbeing was being monitored and their health needs were being met. There is also evidence that the children/young people in placement were also given opportunities for outdoor activities to promote their physical wellbeing.

**v. Children's emotional and mental wellbeing**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the EC period, there is evidence recorded in nine out of the forty files cases reviewed that the young person/child's emotional and mental wellbeing was considered.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the regional council period, there is evidence recorded in eleven out of the twenty-two cases reviewed that the young person/child's emotional and mental wellbeing was considered.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the CEC period, there is evidence recorded in eighteen out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed that the young person/child's emotional and mental wellbeing was considered.

**vi. Schooling/education**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the corporation period, there is evidence recorded in twelve out of the forty cases reviewed that the young person/child's schooling/education was considered.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the regional council period, there is evidence recorded in fourteen out of the twenty-two cases reviewed that the young person/child's schooling/education was considered.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the CEC period, there is evidence recorded in twenty of the twenty-seven cases reviewed that the young person/child's schooling/education was considered.

**vii. Discipline**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the corporation period, there is evidence recorded in five of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period, that the issue of discipline for the young person/child was considered.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response there was regarding the regional council period, there is evidence recorded in four out of the twenty-two cases reviewed that the issue of discipline for the young person/child was considered.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response regarding the CEC period, there is evidence recorded in fourteen out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed that the issue of discipline for the young person/child was considered.

**viii. Activities and holidays for children**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded of activities and holidays for the young person/child in nine out of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded of activities and holidays for the young person/child in fourteen out of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded of activities and holidays for the young person/child in seventeen out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period.

**ix. Sharing a bedroom**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in three of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period that the young person/child bedroom shared a bedroom.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in six of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period that the young person/child shared a bedroom.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in two of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period that the young person/child shared a bedroom.

**x. Contact with family members**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in fifteen of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period that family members, including parents, were in contact with the young person/child.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in twelve of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period that family members, including parents, were in contact with the young person/child.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded in twenty-one out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period that family members, including parents, were in contact with the young person/child.

**xi. Contact with siblings**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that siblings were in contact with the young person/child, as they were placed together in seventeen out of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that siblings were in contact with the young person/child in twelve out of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period, as the siblings were either placed together or contact was arranged.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that siblings were in contact with the young person/child in thirteen out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period, as the siblings were either placed together or contact was arranged.

**xii. Celebration of birthdays and other special occasions**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that birthdays and other special occasions were celebrated in seven of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that birthdays and other special occasions were celebrated in seven of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that birthdays and other special occasions were celebrated in eleven of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period.

**xiii. Information sharing by the foster carer with family members**

Edinburgh Corporation (1930-1975):

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that information was shared by the foster carer with family members in seven out of the forty cases reviewed for the corporation period.

Lothian Regional Council (1975-1996)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that information was shared by the foster carer with family members in thirteen out of the twenty-two cases reviewed for the regional council period.

City of Edinburgh Council (1996-2014)

Within the case file audit, carried out for this response, there is evidence recorded that information was shared by the foster carer with family members in fifteen out of the twenty-seven cases reviewed for the CEC period.

iii) In your response to Part D, Question 5.2(c), you advise that you audited over 230 files relating to foster care of which 161 files were for approved foster carers who provided placements for children and another 13 were for foster carers who were approved:

- Were the remaining 56 files children's files? If so, were they part of the 80 files sampled as referred to above or were they other files identified? If they were not children's files, what type of files were they?

The remaining 56 files were for carers that were deemed irrelevant by the project team, as they were day carers, registered but had never cared for any children, or kinship carers where parental responsibility did not rest with the Council.

- In relation to the files for approved foster carers, we note that these were all available files. Are you able to indicate the period to which these files broadly relate? We do note in response to Part D Question 5.3, you indicate that you located 1 foster carer file for the period prior to 1975.

The Council's foster carer records are retained for 25 years from deregistration of carer. This means that only the foster carers that were deregistered from 1990 onwards have been retained, after the implementation of the Inquiry's destruction moratorium in 2015. A few earlier carer files have survived, and these were also included in our foster carer file audit. However, due to the fact that foster carers often fostered for decades, the audit team was able to stretch back to the late 1960's with at least one foster carer file. Of the 172 relevant foster carer files audited, 1 started fostering in the 1960's, 7 started in the 1970's, 50 started in the 1980's, 91 started in the 1990's, 17 started in the 2000's, 3 started in the 2010's and 3 where the start decade is uncertain.

- We also note that you have advised that your file audit was not completed as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. We note this reference, for example, at page 1 of your response to Part D Question 5.12(a). Has the audit been completed since you submitted your response? If not, are you able to advise of the extent to which it remains incomplete (i.e. how many of the identified files have not been audited) and the reason for that? If it has been completed, does that have any impact on the response submitted or do you have any additional information to provide?

After some initial research, the Council's project team came to the conclusion in November 2019 that a foster carer file audit would be important to its response to the section 21 notice – in particular around complaints, after no foster care complaints register was found prior to 2006, despite extensive searches. The Council has files for an estimated 843 foster carers (both current and historic), which was too large a volume to review in time for the response deadline of 27 January 2020. Accordingly, we sought a 6-month extension from the Inquiry to review the deregistered foster carer files (covering 586 foster carers).

While it was originally hoped that the core project team could shift over to reviewing these files after completing the other parts of the section 21 notice, the approach changed and a separate foster carer file audit team was organised instead, using existing Council staff (initially 10) on an over time basis. This required budget and it was only at the start of February 2020 that the audit team was in place to start reviewing files. The team had to be relocated at the start of March but plans were in place to double its size and accelerate its work. Unfortunately, on 11 March 2020 our Chief Executive directed staff to work from home by default where they could; a position that has not changed since then. While the core project team has continued working remotely where possible, and on Council premises when reviewing or scanning what files it requires, the file audit team was discontinued as Covid 19 restrictions meant it was too much of a risk to the participants.

The Council took the view in the Spring of 2020 that there was no point seeking an extension to the section 21 notice beyond July in light of continuing COVID-19 restrictions and so submitted a response with the caveats around the sections of the response that relied on the foster carer file audit.

In the roughly 6 weeks of operation, the foster carer file audit team reviewed 230 of the 586 deregistered foster carer files, though this figure is an upwards estimate, with some files being discounted due to being for day carers, or carers that had never cared for children or kinship carers and therefore lay outside the remit of the Inquiry. The audit was not undertaken chronologically, so a range of deregistration dates were covered in the 230 files that were reviewed.

Please note, the 586 files of the intended audit are for deregistered foster carers only. This means that active carers who started caring prior to 2014 were not included in the audit. When relevant complaints about active carers were identified from other sources (i.e. service-based complaints registers, as well as settlement and conviction information from our Legal services team), their files were reviewed and details were provided in the appropriate sections of our response.

The file audit has not been resumed partly because the Council still has significant restrictions around staff working on premises and partly because the Council's core child abuse response project team has been busy responding to additional requests. A further 10 section 21 notices (3 on establishments, 7 for individuals) have been received since submitting our response to the foster care section 21 notice. We have also supported 115 care experienced individuals in accessing their files since July 2020 and are currently dealing with cases for financial compensation through Redress Scotland.

- iv. We note from page 1 of your response to Part D Question 5.12(a) that you were unable to access any files from 2008 onwards. Does this refer to foster carer files only or also to children's files? We do see that you include information in your response to Question 5.12 in relation to complaints and investigations after that date- are we correct in understanding that you have been able to access that from the other sources you have mentioned rather than case files?

We have reviewed the project files for our response to this section and we cannot determine our reasons for making this statement. We were able to access post 2008 files for both the children's and foster carers' file audits; reviewing 11 files for the 2000's and 16 files for the 2010's for the former audit and 7 files that covered the post 2008 time for the latter audit. In addition to these, some complaints detailed in our response to Question 5.12 were separately identified from settlement and conviction information from our Legal Services and Insurance teams, with the relevant and related child and foster carer files then reviewed by the file audit and core project teams.

In reviewing our response to this section, we believe we have identified an additional source for foster care service complaints. We will go through the complaints detailed in this source to see if any are in addition to the ones we provided in our original response. We will provide an update on this to the Inquiry by Monday 28 February 2022.

2. In a number of questions in your Part A response, we note that you indicated that you might have further information to provide once you had completed your case file audit. We are of course aware that you submitted an updated response in relation to Question 1.8(ii). However, we note that you indicated in relation to other questions that further information might become available, namely;

We would be grateful if you could confirm whether you have anything to add to your Part A response in relation to these Questions.

- Question 1.6(c),

While we cannot categorise the foster carer files we have not audited, the 172 relevant files that were audited break down as follows:

<b>Carer Category</b>	<b>Numbers</b>
Mainstream	78
Short term / Emergency	14
Respite	32
Specialist	14
Disability Respite	41
Private	1
Not Recorded	4

Please note that some foster carers were approved for more than one type of care provision.

- Question 2.1(d) and (e) on pages 116 and 117.

Since we have made no further progress with our carers file audit, we have nothing further to add to our response to this question.

- Questions 2.1(h) and 2.1(m)

Since we have made no further progress with our carers file audit, we have nothing further to add to our response to this question.

3. At the bottom of page 107 of your Part A response in your answer to Question 2.1(c), it appears that the last sentence on that page ends prematurely. Are you able to advise us of what the remainder of the sentence should say?

After checking previous drafts of our response, it appears that this line (starting "The report stated...") is an old version of the last line of the next paragraph (starting "It also noted:") and should be removed from the final version of our response. We apologise for the confusion caused.

4. Please provide us with the following documents referred to in your response:

- The Corporate Parenting Action Plan approved by the Education, Children and Families Committee in March 2012 referred to on page 40 of your Part A response

- The Social Work Review presented to the Social Work Committee of LRC in December 1976 (ref LRC2/1/1/20/3) referred to in your answer to Question 2.1(c) on page 110 of your Part A response.
- The Time of Change policy adopted in 1983 by LRC which is mentioned in your Part A response with the reference LRC3/8/3/9 referred to on page 111 in your answer to Question 2.1(c).
- The Director of Social Work report in 1995/1996 referred to on page 113 of your Part A response in answer to Question 2.1(c) with reference LRC3/8/3/21.
- The 1999 Carer Agreement referred to on page 115 of your Part A response in answer to Question 2.1(c), particularly the appendix called “Allegations of Child Abuse or Complaints against Departmental Approved Carers”,
- The 1993 Report by Alan Finlayson and Alison Newman: “Listen, Take Seriously What They Say” with reference LRC3/8/1/1 referred to in response to Question 2.1(g) on page 120 of your Part A response.
- The guideline in the Children and Families Procedure Manual entitled “Allegations of Child Abuse Against Departmental Employees or Approved Carers Principles and Guidance” referred to on page 14 of your response to Part C, Question 4.1(a).
- The Standards for Fostering and Adoption Services referred to on page 41 of your response to Part C, Question 4.1(c)(v) – this may also be the document referred to elsewhere in your response as the “Quality of Caring Standards for Fostering and Adoption Services”.
- The Guidance on the Trusted Person which we understand forms part of the Looked After Children Manual – perhaps section 16 of that Manual – see p.26 of your answer to Part C Question 4.2(d)(ii)
- The procedures recommended by the Director of Social Work to the Social Work Committee in 1977 to assist social workers dealing with cases of suspected child abuse – LRC3/8/3/2 referred to on page 81 of your response to Part C, Question 4.2(ii)(b)(vxi)
- The local authority Boarded Out Children Regulations and Rules (SL164/1/7/1933/34) referred to on page 1 of your Part C, Question 4.8(i)(a) response.
- The two ELRIS inspection reports referred to on page 2 of your Part D Question 5.4(a) response.
- The report from the Director of Social Work to the Social Work Committee on 13th December 1999 referred to on page 2 of your answer to Part D Question 5.6(a).
- The report on the Edinburgh Inquiry dated 30th October 2005 presented to the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel referred to on page 8 of your answer to Part D Question 5.6(c).

All of the above documents were uploaded to your Objective Connect Workspace on Friday 28 January.

Please note that the two last items have incorrect dates that were provided in our original response. The report on the Edinburgh Inquiry presented to the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel referred to on page 8 of our answer to Part D Question 5.6(c) was in fact dated 30 October 2003. The report from the Director of Social Work to the Social Work Committee on 13th December 1999 referred to on page 2 of our answer to Part D Question 5.6(a) was in fact dated 20 January 2000.

5. In relation to the cases where there are convictions, apart from those which were followed by the Edinburgh’s Children report, was any significant case review, external or internal practice review undertaken in order to address any lessons which might be learned? If so, please provide us with a copy of the review/report. If not, please advise why that did not take place.

For the convictions detailed in 5.13 that were not covered by the Edinburgh Children's Report, we have found no evidence of external or internal practice reviews. Similarly, we have found no significant case reviews linked to these carers.

Within Family Based Care Complaints logs dating back to 2004, there is evidence that foster carers returned to the Approval Panel to have their registration reviewed following allegations, complaints and concerns and that within this there were also instances when carers were de-registered.

The current City of Edinburgh Council processes would indicate that, following a conviction of a foster carer, a Significant Occurrence Notification would be made to the Chief Social Work Officer and a decision on whether to hold a Significant Case Review would be referred to the Child Protection Committee.

6. We note that the Chief Social Worker is the senior responsible officer for the Response and we therefore assume that they will be able to speak to the A-D at hearings. Please confirm if our understanding is correct and who that person is at present.

We can confirm that our Chief Social Work Officer will be available to speak to our response to the Inquiry's section 21 notice on foster care. This postholder for this position is currently Jackie Irvine.

\*\*\*\*\*

CEC - Official

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> On  
Behalf Of [REDACTED]  
Sent: 13 January 2022 16:28  
To: Kevin Wilbraham <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: Foster Care - Section 21 notice- A-D Report- follow-up queries

Dear Kevin,

I refer to the Section 21 notice of 27 August 2019 to which City of Edinburgh Council provided a response to Part A on 27 February 2020 and to Parts B, C and D on 30 July 2020.

We write as regards follow-up queries to be addressed in respect of City of Edinburgh Council's Part A-D response. We would be grateful if, in answering said queries, you could prepare and submit a separate document as an Addendum to the Part A-D response outlining the position in respect of each matter, rather than updating or amending and resubmitting the existing response. The points requiring clarification are as follows;

1. We would be grateful if you could clarify certain aspects of your case file audit methodology as follows;
  - i. We note from Question 1.6(i)(a) of your response that 20,229 children were in foster placements from 1930 to 1972 (an average of just over 480 per annum)

and 8,161 children were in foster placements from 2000-2015 (an average of approximately 544 per annum). We note from your response to Question 1.7 on page 64 of your Part A response that you took a sample of 80 children's files, 10 from each decade, in respect of children who were in foster care. You say that "using this technique, the estimated number of records for children in care was 13,946". Are you able to explain this further? Is this the estimated number of records which continue to be retained by you in respect of children in care over the relevant period? We also note that the sample size was taken "in keeping with best practice sampling techniques and methodologies". Are you able to provide further detail as to why that was considered to be an appropriate size of sample?

- ii. In your responses to Part C, Question 4.3(ii)(b) under the various headings starting at p.61, we note that you refer to a review of 10 files for the period from 1930-1975, 10 files from 1975-1996 and 39 files from 1996-2014. We assume given the subject matter that these are children's files, is this correct? We are not sure how the numbers and relative periods here correlate to the case file sampling which you refer to in Part A of your response and which is mentioned above, so please could you clarify accordingly?
- iii. In your response to Part D, Question 5.2(c), you advise that you audited over 230 files relating to foster care of which 161 files were for approved foster carers who provided placements for children and another 13 were for foster carers who were approved:
  - Were the remaining 56 files children's files? If so, were they part of the 80 files sampled as referred to above or were they other files identified? If they were not children's files, what type of files were they?
  - In relation to the files for approved foster carers, we note that these were all available files. Are you able to indicate the period to which these files broadly relate? We do note in response to Part D Question 5.3, you indicate that you located 1 foster carer file for the period prior to 1975.
  - We also note that you have advised that your file audit was not completed as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. We note this reference, for example, at page 1 of your response to Part D Question 5.12(a). Has the audit been completed since you submitted your response? If not, are you able to advise of the extent to which it remains incomplete (i.e. how many of the identified files have not been audited) and the reason for that? If it has been completed, does that have any impact on the response submitted or do you have any additional information to provide?
- iv. We note from page 1 of your response to Part D Question 5.12(a) that you were unable to access any files from 2008 onwards. Does this refer to foster carer files only or also to children's files? We do see that you include information in your response to Question 5.12 in relation to complaints and investigations after that date- are we correct in understanding that you have been able to access that from the other sources you have mentioned rather than case files?

2. In a number of questions in your Part A response, we note that you indicated that you might have further information to provide once you had completed your case file

audit. We are of course aware that you submitted an updated response in relation to Question 1.8(ii). However, we note that you indicated in relation to other questions that further information might become available, namely;

- Question 1.6(c),
- Question 2.1(d) and (e) on pages 116 and 117.
- Questions 2.1(h) and 2.1(m)

We would be grateful if you could confirm whether you have anything to add to your Part A response in relation to these Questions.

3. At the bottom of page 107 of your Part A response in your answer to Question 2.1(c), it appears that the last sentence on that page ends prematurely. Are you able to advise us of what the remainder of the sentence should say?

4. Please provide us with the following documents referred to in your response:

- The Corporate Parenting Action Plan approved by the Education, Children and Families Committee in March 2012 referred to on page 40 of your Part A response
- The Social Work Review presented to the Social Work Committee of LRC in December 1976 (ref LRC2/1/1/20/3) referred to in your answer to Question 2.1(c) on page 110 of your Part A response.
- The Time of Change policy adopted in 1983 by LRC which is mentioned in your Part A response with the reference LRC3/8/3/9 referred to on page 111 in your answer to Question 2.1(c).
- The Director of Social Work report in 1995/1996 referred to on page 113 of your Part A response in answer to Question 2.1(c) with reference LRC3/8/3/21.
- The 1999 Carer Agreement referred to on page 115 of your Part A response in answer to Question 2.1(c), particularly the appendix called "Allegations of Child Abuse or Complaints against Departmental Approved Carers",
- The 1993 Report by Alan Finlayson and Alison Newman: "Listen, Take Seriously What They Say" with reference LRC3/8/1/1 referred to in response to Question 2.1(g) on page 120 of your Part A response.
- The guideline in the Children and Families Procedure Manual entitled "Allegations of Child Abuse Against Departmental Employees or Approved Carers Principles and Guidance" referred to on page 14 of your response to Part C, Question 4.1(a).
- The Standards for Fostering and Adoption Services referred to on page 41 of your response to Part C, Question 4.1(c)(v) – this may also be the document referred to elsewhere in your response as the "Quality of Caring Standards for Fostering and Adoption Services".
- The Guidance on the Trusted Person which we understand forms part of the Looked After Children Manual – perhaps section 16 of that Manual – see p.26 of your answer to Part C Question 4.2(d)(ii)
- The procedures recommended by the Director of Social Work to the Social Work Committee in 1977 to assist social workers dealing with cases of suspected child abuse – LRC3/8/3/2 referred to on page 81 of your response to Part C, Question 4.2(ii)(b)(vxi)
- The local authority Boarded Out Children Regulations and Rules (SL164/1/7/1933/34) referred to on page 1 of your Part C, Question 4.8(i)(a) response.

- The two ELRIS inspection reports referred to on page 2 of your Part D Question 5.4(a) response.
- The report from the Director of Social Work to the Social Work Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> December 1999 referred to on page 2 of your answer to Part D Question 5.6(a).
- The report on the Edinburgh Inquiry dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2005 presented to the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel referred to on page 8 of your answer to Part D Question 5.6(c).

5. In relation to the cases where there are convictions, apart from those which were followed by the Edinburgh's Children report, was any significant case review, external or internal practice review undertaken in order to address any lessons which might be learned? If so, please provide us with a copy of the review/report. If not, please advise why that did not take place.

6. We note that the Chief Social Worker is the senior responsible officer for the Response and we therefore assume that they will be able to speak to the A-D at hearings. Please confirm if our understanding is correct and who that person is at present.

Finally, within each Part of the A-D response we note a covering statement that information in the document must not be shared without your express permission. For the avoidance of doubt, please be advised that as a public Inquiry your A-D response, redacted in terms of the Chair's General Restriction Order, will form part of the evidence bundle for hearings and will be published on the Inquiry website in due course.

I appreciate there are a few matters on which we seek further information. I hope all of the above is clear and makes sense, however if you require any clarification or wish to discuss matters please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course and no later than **31<sup>st</sup> January 2022** with your response as regards the issues highlighted above.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Investigation Lawyer  
Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry  
PO Box 24202, Edinburgh, EH3 1JN

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended for the sole use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this eMail in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without using, copying, storing, forwarding or disclosing its contents to any other person.

The Council has endeavoured to scan this eMail message and attachments for computer viruses and will not be liable for any losses incurred by the recipient.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*