// Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Holt, Kim (2017) Child Protection. In: Critical Issues in Social Work Law. Palgrave, London, pp. 73-81. ISBN 9781137541505

Published by: Palgrave

URL: https://he.palgrave.com/page/detail/Critical-Issue... <https://he.palgrave.com/page/detail/Critical-Issues-in-Social-Work-Law/?K=9781137541505>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/31941/

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

Northumbria University
NEWCASTLE

UniversityLibrary

Child Protection

Introduction

The term 'reform' with particular reference to family justice and child protection continues to be used indiscriminately. There are associated terms that are almost as pervasive; modernize, timely, quality, timeframes and deadlines. These terms have been deployed routinely within the last decade with procedures that have been introduced with the aim of ensuring that court proceedings in respect of children are concluded more quickly, whilst at the same time reducing the resources that are required to deal with these complex matters. The introduction of the Public Law Outline (PLO) in 2008, the revised PLO 2010, 2013 and 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014, has set in train further instrumental approaches to dealing with complex child protection cases by requiring local authorities to demonstrate compliance with pre-proceedings protocols prior to an application to court being made, when in many instances the families have been known to children's social care for several years (Broadhurst and Masson, 2013).

Debates between the modernisers who are seeking reform through legislation and protocols that have introduced further procedural elements to achieving justice for children and their families, and the more conservative approach that advocates a holistic approach to decision making (*Re B (A child) (Care Proceedings: Threshold Criteria)* [2013] UKSC, 33; *Re B-S (Children)* [2013] EWCA Civ 1146; *Re A and B v Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council* [2014] EWCF 47; *Re J and S (Children)* [2014] EWFC 4; *Re C (A Child)* [2013] EWCA Civ 431; *Re*

R (a child) [2014] EWCA Civ 1625; *M P-P (Children)* [2015] EWCA Civ 584; *Re W (Adoption Application: Reunification with Family of Origin)* [2015] EWHC 2039; *Re H* [2015] EWCA Civ 583; *Re B and E (Children)* [2015] EWFC B203), continue. These differences could be perceived as a simple clash between pro and anti-reformers, but this chapter highlights the landscape is far more complex. There is an inherent tension between achieving positive outcomes for children and their families, whilst achieving compliance with procedures that are principally aimed at reducing costs and resources (Broadhurst et al, 2010).

Regardless of the complexity, these terms never shed any light on the detail of how professionals work with families who turn to a system when they are most in need and at times of crisis. There has been widespread uncertainty following the call for holistic assessments following the judgments in *Re B* [2013] and *Re B-S* [2014] that appear to clash with the 'reform' agenda that is driving a 26 week deadline for the completion of care proceedings. This chapter explores the need to re-visit the importance of placing the child and their family at the heart of the family justice and child protection system. Achieving positive outcomes through detailed therapeutic interventions with adequate resources are more likely to resonate with the kind of reform that practitioners and families will embrace (Broadhurst and Masson, 2014). Fundamentally, child protection needs to move away from being a system that is process and assessment driven, to providing interventions that prevent the revolving door syndrome, whereby practitioners and families *tick the box* but no real change occurs (Featherstone et al, 2014). The recent child sexual exploitation inquiries in Rochdale, Rotherham and Oxfordshire highlight the increasingly sophisticated world of perpetrators that

requires an equally strategic response from front line practitioners who need more than ever to be engaging with children, young people and their families, rather than adopting an all too frequent remote control response to child protection that permit moral judgments that feed into the populist and oppressive social attitudes towards children on the edge of care. (Jay, 2014)

However, with severe cuts to the front line services that are so very crucial to the protection of children and young people, and the need for professionals to increasingly *feed the beast* with information that organisations require to demonstrate quality and response targets, professionals are increasingly prone to professional ignorance as they are essentially removed from front line practice where they are able to elicit the rich narratives that protect children (Holt and Kelly, 2014(a)).

The modernization agenda – the remote control approach to child protection

'Reform' implies a repositioning of power from the center to the users of public services. There is evidence to suggest that this is indeed what the government intends, but the drive to achieve quality within shorter timescales with no corresponding resources is arguably not conducive to facilitating this aim. The Family Justice Review, (MoJ,2011), set in train changes within the system of justice that protects children, that have resulted in further instrumental procedures that may indeed shift cases away from the court into a pre-proceedings protocol, but without a significant re-think of policy this places decision-making increasingly within an administrative rather than judicial space that will merely shift power from one arm of the state to another (Holt and Kelly,

2014 (b)). Local authorities hold considerable power when working with families in the context of child protection, and any notion of partnership working in the current context is becoming increasingly illusive (Broadhurst and Holt, 2010). Achieving alternative forms of dispute resolution outside of the court in public law cases where children are on the edge of care is risky, particularly when the local authority is operating within a climate of austerity and targets and is increasingly focused on data inputting to satisfy the regulatory requirements, as the consequences for not doing so are high (Holt and Kelly, 2015 (a)). Practitioners are reporting that if recordings are not completed they are placed on report – there are no corresponding sanctions for not undertaking detailed work with families, as this is increasingly considered a luxury that the local authority cannot afford. Social workers and lawyers are operating between a rock and a hard place; the practice reality of a remote control approach to child protection is so radically at odds with the rhetoric that is supporting a modernization agenda (Holt and Kelly, 2015 (b)).

The timetable for the child or the deadline for parents

Further significant changes were introduced with the Children and Families Act 2014 that purports to address the timetable for the child with the imposition of a deadline for the completion of the majority of care cases within 26 weeks. This timeframe, introduced with no research evidence to support, leaves very little scope for families to make changes following the local authority making the application to court when the clock begins to tick (Holt and Kelly, 2015 (c)).

There is an assumption built into the revised Public Law Outline 2014 that all

cases apart from emergency situations should be properly prepared with all assessments that are required to inform the decision making undertaken before a case proceeds to court. There is an acknowledgement that due to severe cuts within public sector services that the application of the protocol nationally is at best patchy, and this is highly problematic when the family justice system is built on the premise of achieving alternative forms of dispute resolution without the oversight of the court (Holt and Kelly, 2015 (d)).

However, following the plethora of cases during 2014 and 2015 that followed the landmark judgments regarding permanency planning in *Re B Re B (A Child) (Care Proceedings: Threshold Criteria)* [2013] UKSC and *Re B-S (Children)* [2013] EWCA Civ 1146, social work and legal practitioners have faced further confusion and there has been widespread uncertainty.

Re B and *Re BS* reinforce the need for a detailed understanding of the child and their family that requires more than a cursory assessment that lacks the depth of analysis required for a deeper understanding of the alternative options for the child. The facts of *Re B-S* are well rehearsed, but briefly the children in this case were placed for adoption in April 2012, and the mother applied for leave to oppose the adoption orders in 2013.

The Court of Appeal, on hearing this matter took the opportunity to reinforce the key points from the recent Supreme Court decision in *Re B* [2013]. In brief, the child's interests are paramount, and those interests include living with birth family. Furthermore, the court must consider all the *realistic* available options,

and in assessing birth family's capacity to care for a child judges must consider the support the family could be offered (Luckock, 2008).

Not surprisingly, there followed a plethora of cases that have sought to challenge the making of care and adoption orders during 2014. The decision in *Re A and B v Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council* [2014] EWFC 47 where the child was placed with potential adopters and Mr Justice Holman made the decision that it was positively better for the child not to be adopted but to move to live with a maternal aunt. The facts in this case were unprecedented, attracting strong opinion on either side. In *Re M'P-P (Children)* [2015] EWCA Civ 584 (June 2015) and *Re W (Adoption Application: Reunification with Family of Origin)* [2015] EWCA 2039, there have been further developments, and the court arrived at a different conclusion from the original court, with the decision that the children should remain living with their foster carers. The decision has been published as *Re B and E (Children)* [2015] EWFC B203.

Regardless of whether there is a meaningful legal right to challenge an adoption order at this late stage (judgment of Lord Justice Munby in *Re J and S (Children)* [2014] EWFC 4), the consequences are significant in respect of the importance of achieving a holistic understanding of the child and their family, together with a view about permanency options, at the earliest opportunity (Holt and Kelly, 2015 (a)).

Furthermore, the widespread uncertainty amongst professionals operating within the family justice system during 2014, prompted the President to take the

opportunity in the case of *Re R (a child)* [2014] EWCA Civ 1625, 16th December 2014, to calm the chorus of concern amongst professionals following the judgment in *Re B-S,* but it has highlighted the tensions and contradictions within a system that is seeking both speedy resolutions, but requiring a complex understanding of the child and their family. These tensions mirror the administrative space of social work practice whereby practitioners are juggling the demands of increased bureaucracy leaving little time for the level of detail required to satisfy the court (Holt, 2013).

There has always been a duty on local authorities to keep rehabilitation of a child to its family at the forefront and to routinely consider all options for the child's permanency when care planning. Recent changes introduced with the Public Law Outline (2008), the Practice Direction 36C 2013, the revised Public Law Outline (2014) and the Children and Families Act, 2014, have placed increased emphasis on diverting cases away from court wherever it is safe and possible to do so; thereby family and kin placements should, with the exception of emergency situations, have been fully explored long before an application to court is made. However, there has been nothing more than a cursory consideration as to how these cases can be diverted away from court when there continues to be a front loading of resources into assessments that are generally of a poor quality and therapeutic interventions are generally unavailable unless privately funded (Holt, 2014).

The concern for the author is, the changes ushered in with the Family Justice Review (MoJ, 2011), has undoubtedly introduced delay for children at the pre-

proceedings stage and long before. In many instances children will have been left holding the risk for long periods whilst the local authority effectively gathers evidence through an instrumental set of protocols and procedures. The pre-proceedings protocol is frequently introduced following a lengthy period of local authority involvement with the child and their families. In a study by Holt et al, 2014, in the majority of cases children had been the subject of a child protection plan for up to 18 months, and had been known for up to 3 years from the initial point of referral. There was clear evidence of a revolving door syndrome with families seeking support, an initial assessment being undertaken and the case closed at the earliest opportunity, only to be re-opened when the concerns escalated. The pre-proceedings protocol was simply adding another layer of procedure with scarce resources employed to effectively '*tick the box*' rather than undertake the detailed work necessary to effect the change required. The author remains concerned that despite the rhetoric that the child should remain the priority, children are becoming increasingly lost in a system that is adult focused and target driven (Parton, 2014).

The hegemonic concern with the welfare of the child

The welfare of the child should indeed remain the paramount consideration of the court, a principal enshrined in the Children Act 1989, and difficult to dispute. However, whilst ensuring the welfare of the child remains the central focus in all decision making concerning the child is indeed laudable, it is the author's contention that recent developments in policy and practice ushered in by the previous Coalition Government, and no doubt reinforced by the recently elected

Conservative Government has introduced an instrumental approach to child welfare (Featherstone et al, 2013).

Furthermore, the instrumental approaches to parents may be failing to recognise the potential of many parents, if offered appropriate support, to care safely for their children. The impact of austerity measures in the context of the now hegemonic concern with the timetable for the child, have further contributed to a strained relationship between the local authority and parents (Featherstone, et al, 2014). Achieving timely decision making for children is of course important and legitimate, as we have seen the consquence of delay and poor planning in respect of outcomes for children (Luckock & Broadhust, 2013), but the concern is when the timetable for the child is used to support a modernisation agenda (MOJ, 2012) which is principally aimed at reducing costs when a case goes to court, which indeed supports timely decision making, but lacks the flexibility to respond to less instrumental approaches (Holt & Kelly, 2014).

The family justice review set in train a direction of travel that is not readily reversible and it places the emphasis on achieving a holistic assessment of the child and their family to a pre-proceedings stage. Given the deadline for the completion of cases following an application to court, the pressure in on to achieve both timely decisions and to build in the flexibility required before a case proceeds to court. The author remains unconvinced that achieving flexibility within a formal pre-proceedings protocol when parents have received a letter informing them of the local authorities intention to initiate care proceedings is conducive to achieving the level of detail that is required. Increasingly each stage

of the family justice system is adopting an instrumental approach; reinforcing a culture whereby timescales for working with families are being reduced and more tightly defined. Achieving holistic assessments, never mind therapeutic interventions within a target driven context remain illusive (Featherstone et al, 2011).

Furthermore, there is an urgent need for a fundamental re-thinking of the dominant paradigm in policy and practice in child protection (Lonne et al, 2009). The emergence of procedures, protocols and policies that are principally focused on the need to assess and respond to risk are premised on assumptions that these will highlight both quality and shortcomings in practice, that will ultimately protect all children. This approach needs radical change; it is the rich narratives of children and their families that tell a story that no assessment tool can achieve. Professionals need to be released from the iron cage of data inputting and a culture of cut and paste to fill in the boxes with descriptive words that may prevent blame for not complying with reporting deadlines in the short term, but will do nothing to improve the lives of children and their families as most of this information is second and third hand, resulting in a not surprising approach that is risk averse and reactionary (White et al, 2008).

The decision to remove a child from their parents has to be balanced with 'considering the effectiveness of help available to children and families (Munro, 2011: para 2.25 p 36). It is imperative that we move away from a culture of assessment that is driven by prescriptive tools and is largely descriptive towards achieving a holistic view of the child and their family and identifying how

distress within the family can be supported and risk reduced; removing a child from their parents and kin particularly for very young children will inevitably result in permanency planning that also holds risks for the child (Hunt and Waterhouse, 2013). In order to achieve the level of analysis suggested in *Re B and Re B-S* there needs to be a radical re-think of how professionals intervene with children and their families as the current system is not conducive to achieving what is effectively good practice. The core activity of child protection practice must be about making sense in the context of contested meanings and conflicting paradigms (Buckley, 2009). Within a context of regulation and procedure and without the time allowed to explore the complexities practitioners have become reactive, defensive and narrow and arguably oblivious to the complex factors that influence professional judgment.

Furthermore, a suspicious and forensic approach to child protection discourages a holistic focus on the complexity of relationships (Sykes, 2011). It is imperative that practitioners move away from a disembodied relationship with children and their families that fail to capture the interconnectedness of relationships. In response to the judgments in *Re B* and *Re B-S* there is an urgent need for a more explicit engagement and understanding of the philosophical literature on ethics where there is considerable attention given to decision making based upon weighing up of a range of often competing needs and interests (Gray & Webb, 2010).

The hegemonic concern with the timetable for the child reinforces that children ‘cannot wait’ for parents to change, particularly where parental problems are

deemed to be entrenched - lamentably failing to respond to the timetable for their child. (Holt and Kelly, 2014 (a)). There is little or no scope in this context for ongoing long term intervention and the culture within social work practice focuses on a quick turn around with off the shelf packages of care rather than a recognition for some families that managed dependency and long term support may be in the best interests of the child (Turney, 2005). Time is of the essence within local authorities where there has been a move from depth to surface in order to achieve procedural imperatives, resulting in time limited interventions/programmes that are off the shelf (Howe, 1997).

The important area of practice that focuses on developing relationships and making sense of conflicting narratives, which elicit a deeper understanding of the strengths and risks within the family, has been eroded. Where information is being relied upon from a secondary source the rich narratives are lost and what is left is descriptive texts that afford very little insight to what the child or their families need (Holt & Kelly, 2012).

Fergusson, 2011, highlighted the importance of the helping alliance formed between professionals and families that is being eroded as the skills in developing effective relationships within a context of crisis are lost in an increasingly digital world. Instead personal contact is replaced by suspicious time limited approaches when relationship based work is eroded due to the value placed on the standardization of assessment and response in a climate of austerity and targets (Munro, 2011).

It order to reverse the trend of standardization and response, it is imperative that we move away from a culture of assessment with no follow up therapeutic

interventions, as the rich detail shared during this work helps to form the backcloth to the local authority decisions about risk.

Conclusion

The legislative changes introduced with the Children and Families Act 2014, and recent decisions from the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal serve as a reminder of how the state gains but rarely gives up power over individuals, and the relative ease with which significant changes are introduced without question or challenge, and then become permanent features over time that are rehearsed and reinforced. The move to a front loading of cases to the administrative space of a pre-proceedings stage may appear to be a less draconian approach to dealing with complex child protection matters, however, this approach relies upon the rights of children and their families remaining a priority above the need for local authorities to reduce costs and resources. In a climate of austerity, targets and timescales the rights of children and their families' can often be lost (Holt and Kelly, 2012).

It is important to note that human rights are universal, and a right to a fair trial when the state intervenes in family life should be central in a democratic society, and that protection under the law should not be dependent upon an accident of birth or economic power. Legislative changes that have been introduced with little resistance can be seen as a direct attack on welfare, and are counter-productive in terms of achieving justice for children and their families (Byrom, 2013). There has been mounting concern regarding the cost of welfare on the state, but the scenes observed in courtrooms in 21 century Britain, and in

circumstances where there are child protection concerns and parents who lack capacity, portray a shameful picture on a society that purports to hold the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration. When the state intervenes to remove children it is unforgivable that parents are left in a position where they are powerless to defend the action, as they have no right to legal representation in private law, and there is a deadline imposed for the conclusion of proceedings in public law (*Re H* [2014] EWFC B127 (14 August 2014).

Moreover, in Re D (A Child) [2014] EWFC 39 where the matter related to the removal of a child from parents with significant learning difficulties by Swindon Borough Council. Justice Munby gave the following judgment:

What I have to grapple with is the profoundly disturbing fact that the parents do not qualify for legal aid, but lack the financial resources to pay for legal representation in circumstances where, to speak plainly, it is unthinkable that they should have to face the local authority's application without proper representation.(para, 3)

The landscape in the most complex of child protection cases has changed considerably during the last decade, both with a front-loading of cases to a pre-proceedings stage, with the aim of diverting cases away from court. However, the children and families who face pre-proceedings protocols and processes have often been known to children's social care for at least 3 years and this process often only introduces further delay to effectively allow the local authority to *tick the box* (Holt and Kelly, 2014 (a)). Whilst achieving just and fair outcomes for children and their families without the need to involve the court is of course desirable, often the oversight of the court in the most complex of cases is

necessary. It is a travesty of justice given the complexity of these cases that either a deadline for the completion of the case is given at the outset, or in complex private matters there is no right to legal aid, and therefore legal representation, when state intervention can, and often does, result in children permanently living away from their birth parents and family.

There needs to be an urgent re-think about child protection practice at the interface with the court, however, the previous coalition government and the present conservative government show little sign of moving away from what has been a sustained attack on welfare and the children and families who turn to a system at times of crisis and when they are most in need.

References

Broadhurst, K. and Holt, K.E. (2010) Partnership and the limits of procedure: prospects for relationships between parents and professionals under the Public Law Outline, *Child and Family Social Work* Vol15, Issue 1, 97-106.
First published online 23 September 2009
DOI: 10.iii/j.1365-2206.209_00648x

Broadhurst, K., Wastell, D., White, S., Hall, C., Peckover, S., Thompson, K., Pithouse, A. and Davey, D. (2010) "Performing 'Initial Assessment'; Identifying the latent conditions for error at the front door of local authority children's services. In British Journal of Social Work (2010) 40, 352-370

Broadhurst, K. & Mason, C. (2013) Maternal Outcasts: raising the profile of women who are vulnerable to successive, compulsory removals of their children. In Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2013.805061

Broadhurst, K. & Mason, C. (2014) "Social Work beyond the VDU: Foregrounding Co-Presence in Situated Practice –Why Face-to-Face Practice Matters, *British Journal of Social Work (2014)* 44, 578-599.

Buckley, H. (2009) Reforming the child protection system: why we need to be careful what we wish for, *Irish Journal of Family Law*, 12, (2), 2009

Byrom, N. (2013) The State of the Sector: The impact of cuts to civil legal aid on practitioners and their clients. University of Warwick: Warwick).

Featherstone, B., White, S., Morris, K. (2014) Re-Imagining Child Protection Towards Humane Social Work with Families. Bristol, Policy Press.

Featherstone, B., Morris, K. and White, S. (2013) A marriage made in hell: early intervention meets child protection*. British Journal of Social Work: Advanced Access.*

Featherstone, B., Broadhurst, K. & Holt, K.E. (2011) Thinking systemically-thinking politically: Building strong partnerships with children and families in the context of rising inequality. *British Journal of Social Work.*

Ferguson, H, 2011. Child Protection Practice Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan.

Gray, M. & Webb, S. (2010) Ethics and Value Perspectives in Social Work.

Basingstoke: Palgrave

Holt, K. and Kelly, N. (2012) Administrative Decision Making in Child-Care Work: Exploring Issues of Judgment and Decision Making in the Context of Human Rights, and Its Relevance for Social Workers and Managers. *British Journal of Social Work.* 2012:6.

Holt, K.E. (2013) Territory Skirmishes with DIY Advocacy in the Family Courts: a Dickensian misadventure. *Journal of Family Law.*

Holt, K.E. Child Protection Law. Palgrave

Holt, K.E. and Kelly, N. (2014(a)) *Why parents matter: exploring the impact of a hegemonic concern with the timetable for the child.* Child and Family Social Work Journal.

Holt, K.E. and Kelly, N. (2014 (b)) The emperor has no robes: Why are members of the judiciary in the most complex of child-care cases, abandoning a sinking ship? *Journal of Family Law*

Holt, K.E. and Kelly, N (2015 (a)) When adoption without parental consent breaches human rights: implications of *Re B-S (Children)* [2013] EWCA Civ 963 on decision making and permanency planning for children. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*

Holt, K.E. and Kelly, N (2015 (b)) Access to justice: the welfare of children and their families lost in a target focused and cost driven system. *Journal of Family Law*

Holt, K.E. (2015 (C)) What has happened since the Family Justice Review: a brighter future for whom? *Journal of Family Law*

Holt, K.E. and Kelly, N. (2015 (d)) When is it too late? An Examination of A and B v Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWFC 47 *Journal of Family Law*

Hunt J and Waterhouse S (2013) It's Just Not Fair! Support, need and legal status in family and friends care FRG/Oxford University Centre for Family Law and Policy

Howe, D. (1997) Psychosocial and relationship-based theories for child and family social work: political philosophy, psychology and welfare practice. *Child and Family Social Work,* 2: 161-169.

Jay, A. (2014) Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1999 - 2013
http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/1407/independent_inquiry_cse_in_rotherham

Lonne, B., Parton, N., Thompson, J., & Harries, M. (2009) *Reforming child protection*. London & New York: Routledge.

Luckock, B. (2008) *Adoption support and the negotiation of ambivalence in family policy and children's services.* Journal of Law and Society, 35 (1). pp. 3-27. ISSN 0263-323X).

Luckock, B. & Broadhurst, K. (2013) *Adoption cases reviewed: an indicative study of process and practice.* Project Report. Department of Education, UK.

Ministry of Justice (2008) *Public Law Outline*. Ministry of Justice, London.

Ministry of Justice (April, 2010) *Practice Directions 12A – Public Law Proceedings Guide to Case Management.* TSO, London.

Ministry of Justice (April, 2010) *Practice Directions 12A – Public Law Proceedings Guide to Case Management.* TSO, London.

Ministry of Justice (2011) *Family Justice Review: Final Report.* Ministry of Justice, London

Ministry of Justice (2013) Practice Direction 36C - Pilot Scheme: Care and Supervision Proceedings and Other Proceedings Under Part 4 of the Children Act 1989, TSO, London.

Munro, E. (2011) The Munro Report of Child Protection: Final Report *A Child Centered System.* Department for Education: London.

Parton, N (2014) *The Politics of Child Protection: Contemporary Developments and Future Directions.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 9781137269294

Sykes, J. (2011). “Negotiating Stigma: Understanding Mothers’ Responses to Accusations of Child Neglect.” Children and Youth Services Review, Vol. 33, No. 3. pp. 448-456.

Turney, D. (2005) “Who cares? The role of mothers in cases of child neglect.” In J. Taylor and B. Daniel (eds) *Child Neglect Practice Issues for Health and Social Care.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

White, S., Hall, C. & Peckover, S. (2008) “The Descriptive Tyranny of the Common Assessment Framework: Technologies of categorisation and professional practice in child welfare.” In British Journal of Social Work. Advance Access, 10.1093/bjsw/bcn053