Hamzah Khan Serious Case Review

Answers to the questions set by the Department for Education

Children's Social Care Involvement 2005 – 2009

In the period of Hamzah's life (born 17.6.2005 died 15.12.2009) there were no referrals to Social Care concerning the family in the year of 2005, with the first contact being in November 2006 from Health Services which resulted in a home visit by local authority Children's Social Care. The Health Visiting Service had not been able to access the family home despite several attempts. A social worker visited and saw all the children who were fed, well cared for and well presented. The outcome of the assessment visit was reported back to the health visitor and no further action was required.

In the period December 2006 to May 2007, there were five visits from Social Care to the family home, the detail of which is contained in the answers to the questions one to three. From the period of June 2007 to December 2009, no referrals were received by Children's Social Care from any agencies and, therefore there was no further involvement, with the exception of the incident in April 2009, the detail of which is responded to question four. The agencies that had the most contact with Hamzah's family were those that were supporting Amanda Hutton in dealing with the consequences of domestic violence, and the Education Welfare Service, which at this time was provided by SERCO as part of the out-sourced Education Bradford service. The agencies supporting Amanda Hutton were: "Staying Put", a voluntary sector organisation working with women fleeing violence, the West Yorkshire Police Domestic Violence Unit, and a family support worker who was giving material and practical help at a time that mother and children were moving home. Each of these agencies had contact with Amanda Hutton by telephone and some direct contact, particularly during 2009. During this period no child protection concerns were raised about the care of Hamzah.

1. *December 2006: one of Hamzah Khan's siblings spoke to the Police about domestic violence at home and the Police referred him to Children's Social Care. The child was returned home. <u>Was the child assessed? If not, why not?</u>*

   Child 8, who at this time was 15 years of age, was assessed by Children's Social Care during December 2006 (when Hamzah was around six months old). On Saturday 9 December 2006 Child 8 had left home and went to a local Bed and Breakfast where a friend had stayed before. Child 8 said his parents were fighting and arguing, he was running away as he had been hit and that his mother, Amanda Hutton, did not want him in the home. There were no marks visible or evidence that this child had been harmed. The Police were called by the Bed & Breakfast staff, they tried to take him home but as there was no answer they contacted the Council's Children's Social Care Emergency Duty Team just before midnight. The Police asked Children's Social Care to accommodate Child 8 but they were informed by the Emergency Duty Team that this would be unlikely as there was no evidence of significant harm or immediate risk to the child. Normal practice and procedure would be to gather information, speak to the child and the parents and assess the risk. If accommodation was to be offered, parental agreement or statutory action would be needed. The Police were unhappy with

this decision: they were concerned that Child 8 had stated that he had been hit, that the house was in poor condition and mother did not want him back. The Police kept Child 8 at the Police Station overnight on Police Protection pending the outcome of a visit to the family home the next morning by a social worker.

On the morning of Sunday 10 December a visit was made to the family home by a social worker from the Emergency Duty Team. Amanda Hutton said she had reported Child 8 missing and had gone to the Police Station during the night and she would like to collect him from the Police Station that day. The home conditions were assessed as being acceptable and the social worker informed the Police that Child 8 would be returning home that day. The Police did not agree with that decision. The Emergency Duty Team judged there to be no immediate risk, as the child had no injuries and his mother wanted him home. It was agreed that his mother would collect him and Child 8 returned home.

The case was immediately allocated on the next day, Monday 11 December 2006, to an area team social worker. That morning Amanda Hutton was seen with Child 8. She said this was the second time Child 8 had gone missing. [redacted] The Social Worker spoke to Child 8 who said he had been stupid and was not thinking when he ran away. He was directly asked if anything was troubling him and said he was being bullied at school. The social worker followed this up with his teacher. The school said he was well presented, clean, tidy and always in full school uniform. School staff said that they had never seen any signs of abuse and he had never disclosed any. When the concerns regarding bullying were raised with school staff, they stated that he had referred to being bullied by two younger students. However, school were also aware that the three students socialised outside school. If his mother came into school he got angry with her. He did spend a lot of time in the teachers' office talking.

Ongoing support was offered, but Amanda Hutton said the spell at the Police Station had given her son a shock and she did not need ongoing help. In summary, an assessment of risk was made, he returned home and was spoken to. Bullying was identified as an issue and the social worker spoke to the school about this. The school were alerted to the concerns about bullying but saw inconsistencies between Child 8's concerns and who he chose to socialise with outside school. The Police told Children's Social Care that they would not be taking the matter any further.

2. *March 2007 – one of Hamzah Khan's siblings – it is not clear in the SCR whether it was the same one – was remanded by Magistrates and placed with foster carers for two nights, then returned home.* *<u>Was the child assessed by Children's Social Care? If not, why not?</u>*

Child 8, the same child, was remanded to care by magistrates. He was assessed by Children's Social Care and the Youth Offending Team in March 2007. (By now Hamzah would have been about 20 months old). The Youth Offending Team contacted the social work team on 31 March 2007 as Child 8 had appeared in court over the weekend [redacted] He said his father had hit him, most recently a month ago; there were no marks visible, however. [redacted]

[redacted] He was refusing to go home and was placed with remand foster carers for two nights. A social care assessment was started immediately. Amanda Hutton was contacted and said she wanted support and help. After two days Child 8 said he wanted to go home, Amanda Hutton wanted him back too.

An assessment was carried out and informed a detailed "Asset" assessment required for the Court and completed by the Youth Offending Team. "Asset" provides a common, structured assessment used with all young people involved in the criminal justice system. It is a standard assessment of all of the circumstances and factors that may contribute to that young person's offending. It also focuses on protective factors for the young person that might reduce the risk of the young person committing offences. There was clearly a difficult relationship between Child 8 and both his parents, [redacted] A parenting worker from the Youth Offending Team had started work with the family, the Youth Offending Team were working with Child 8 on his offending under a 'Referral Order' from the court. The children's social worker discussed support options with mother including bereavement counselling, in view of Amanda Hutton's disclosure that she was finding it difficult to come to terms with the death of her mother and specialist help with her drinking in the evening when the children are in bed. Amanda Hutton said she and Child 8 had enough help from the Youth Offending Team so Children's Social Care closed the case.

3. *May 2007 – the child who appeared before Magistrates in March 2007 was injured running away from his father. While at A&E he requested help to live away from his family and was referred to Children's Social Care. He was given emergency accommodation but returned home by the end of May. The SCR says that a statutory assessment could have been expected at this point. Was the child assessed? If not, why not?*

Child 8 stated at A&E that he has been coming home late from school, staying out with friends and had not returned home at all one night. His father went to school looking for him: Child 8 ran away from him and injured his leg. Child 8 said his father had hit him but there were no injuries to substantiate this. The father took Child 8 to the hospital for treatment. An assessment was started but not completed and arrangements made to see Child 8 at school the following day on 18 May 2007. At this point he was of an age to live independently from his family, if he chose to do so (Hamzah would have been almost 2 at this stage).

The role of the social worker was to assess Child 8's circumstances, what had happened in respect of the alleged assault by his father and help him access accommodation and support. As part of this work the social worker visited Child 8 and Amanda Hutton at home. The Youth Offending Team was also involved, supporting Child 8 and regularly updating their assessment. Child 8 visited his parents and the family home several times over the coming days. During a home visit by the social worker on Wednesday 23 May, Child 8 retracted his allegations against them. He said he had sustained a slight scratch in an argument. He was consistently clear throughout this period that none of his siblings have been threatened or hurt by his parents. The three youngest children were also at home during that visit. It was Child 8's decision to return home on 31 May. As the Youth Offending Team and a parenting worker were involved both Child 8 and his

mother were clear they did not want any ongoing involvement from Children's Social Care.

4. *April 2009 – three of the Khan children were not collected from primary school. Following a welfare visit, Police reported to Children's Social Care that there were insufficient beds for at least one of the children in the house and mother appeared to be under the influence of an unknown substance. The SCR says that a statutory assessment could have been expected at this point. Why was no assessment undertaken?*

   On 21 April 2009 Amanda Hutton was late in collecting the children from school, (Hamzah was three years of age and was not one of these children). They were returned home by a teaching assistant who was concerned that mother appeared to be under the influence of alcohol. The teaching assistant was advised to immediately contact the Police, who following discussion with Children's Social Care agreed to do a home visit straight away.

   Following the visit the Police reported back to the social work team that the mother and an adult son were spoken to and all six children were seen. They also checked the entire house including all the bedrooms. The Police said the children appeared to be well. The mother was "under the influence" but unclear of which particular substance. Child 7, who was an adult at this point, was there and able to take care of the children. The family had just moved to the new address after fleeing domestic violence. This move had been supported by "Staying Put", a voluntary sector organisation supporting women who are escaping from domestic violence, the West Yorkshire Police Domestic Violence Unit and a Family Support Worker. The family was still one bed short which Amanda said had been ordered and was due to be delivered the next day. The Police asked Children's Social Care to follow this up.

   Agency checks were undertaken by the social work team to inform whether an assessment was required: this involved liaison with the other agencies who knew the family. These checks showed the following:

   Child 4 had 91% attendance, presentation was fine, and the child had brought a good packed lunch that day. Behaviour in class was seen as a little immature, Child 4 was quiet and just wanted to play.
   Child 5 had 73% attendance, again presentation was described as fine. Child 5 was seen as bright and worked well, but it was stated that the child sometimes said 'bizarre things'.
   Child 6 had 75% attendance. Presentation was fine, behaviour was sometimes aggressive and was quick to challenge. There were no further concerns recorded at the school.

   Agency checks were also undertaken with the School Nurse:

   Child 5 had been seen by a school nurse on 17 October 2007 as part of a school nurse screening programme. The child's height, weight and hearing test result were all noted and no concerns were noted. Child 6 was last seen in January 2004. The child's height, weight and hearing were all acceptable at the time.

   Child 4 [redacted] had not been seen yet as the school

nursing service was waiting for [redacted] medical consent form to be returned. The child was subsequently seen on 21 May 2009, following the receipt of parental consent. The routine school nurse screening checks record that height, weight and hearing were all within normal parameters. No concerns were noted.

An assessment was not undertaken as the Police had visited immediately, assured themselves that the children were seen and appeared well. There was a responsible adult in the family home to look after the children and the Police were happy to leave the children there. The Education Welfare Service was involved with the family and the information was passed on to them and the bed was due to be delivered the following day.

Children's Social Care Involvement December 2009 – 2011

From December 2009 to January 2011 there were no referrals to Children's Social Care by any agency. A request for information was received by Children's Social Care from the Education Welfare Service and this was provided. The detail of this and the events of January and March 2011 are set out below.

5. *Late 2010 – the SCR refers to 'correspondence' between Health Visitors, Education, Early Childhood Services and Children's Social Care 'which centred on the difficulties in seeing the children'. This was followed by reports (it is unclear from whom) that some of the children were living outside Bradford. <u>What action did Children's Social Care take at this point?</u>*

   [redacted] The school nurse on realising that Hamzah and children 2 and 3 were not in school made a home visit on 30 September 2010. Amanda Hutton told her that the younger children are 'not in a school in this district, please come back another day'. On the 6 October the health visitor contacted the Education Welfare Service. By 11 October the Education Welfare Service, which was provided at the time by the private company SERCO[1], identified that two of the children were missing from education and an attendance support worker was allocated. The support worker visited the home on a weekly basis but could not get an answer until the 16 October when she met Amanda Hutton on the doorstep. Amanda said that the children were in Portsmouth but no address was given. On the 18 November 2010 Children's Social Care received a standard request for information from the Education Welfare Service requesting background information on the children. The form was completed and returned. It was not a referral and no other action was requested or required.

6. *January 2011 – the school attended by one of Hamzah Khan's siblings reported to Children's Social Care that attendance had fallen to 51 per cent and apparently (it is not clear from the SCR) reported that the child appeared physically neglected. Children's Social Care decided this was a school attendance issue and declined to assess. <u>Why?</u>*

   On the 6 January 2011 a school teacher for Child 6 contacted Children's Social Care and said they had made a visit to the family home as Child 6 had not been

[1] Education Services were outsourced from the Council to Serco under a ten year contract 2001-2011.

in School since the 26 November 2010. The teacher said there had been no sign of anybody at the property and nobody had answered the door (Hamzah had been dead for more than a year by now). The teacher said that previously Child 6 had looked "a little neglected". The social work team asked that the school try and contact the parents again, but if the school were still unable to make contact with the family they should re-contact Children's Social Care team. The teacher agreed to do this. There was no further contact and this was judged to be a proportionate response by Children's Social Care to a school attendance issue and a child being reported to have previously looked a 'little neglected'.

7. *March 2011 – an anonymous referral was made to Police of shouting and swearing at the children. Why did Children's Social Care rely on the Education Social Work report that concerns did not appear substantiated as the younger children had been 'placed in Portsmouth', and undertake no further inquiries of their own?*

   The anonymous referral was not made to the Police; it went directly to Children's Social Care. Children's Social Care made their own enquires into the anonymous referral received on the 17 March 2011; social work staff spoke directly to key and involved agencies. Both the Education Welfare Service and the Health Visitor told the social worker that the youngest children were residing in another local authority with extended family. The school confirmed this, as they said that mother had told the school that she was planning on moving to Portsmouth. The school said that the mother travelled to Portsmouth every other weekend, which was why the children's attendance was poor as they were going to Portsmouth and not going to school at the beginning of the week.

   Children's Social Care also made contact with a teacher, a trusted adult who had a relationship with the children. Children's Social Care had not been involved with the family for nearly four years at this point. The teacher was asked to speak directly with Child 5 and Child 4 and ask them about their home life and if they were planning to move to Portsmouth. The children were spoken to and both confirmed that mother planned to leave the Bradford area permanently with the younger children. Both said that they were cared for by an adult brother, that they were happy at home, and were described as well presented on this occasion.

   Given that the children said they were happy at home and described the visits to Portsmouth in their Uncle's car, a letter was sent to Amanda Hutton about the referral. This letter stated that an anonymous referral had been received alleging that the children had been verbally abused and threatened. The letter confirmed that checks had been carried out with school and other agencies, and that a decision had been made that Children's Social Care would take no further action on this occasion. Amanda Hutton later complained to the school that her children had been spoken to without her permission.

8. *I note that the Serious Case Review alludes to 'the extent to which Hamzah was unknown and invisible to services throughout his short life'. The SCR makes clear that local agencies had concerns about the poor attendance of some of Hamzah's siblings and the non-enrolment of others. What actions were taken, and when, to establish the causes of this? What actions were taken to remedy it? What, if any, consideration was given to the possibility of neglectful parenting being a factor in low attendance?*

The Education Welfare Service had considerable involvement with Hamzah's family. Interventions were consistent with Education Welfare Service practice at that time: education social workers from the Education Welfare Service concentrated efforts on enabling and encouraging families to send their children to school regularly.

The children in Hamzah's family had uneven patterns of attendance. Two children had completed the primary phase of education without attracting any attendance concerns. As the family became known to the service, involvement was more frequent as three of the children began in their reception class.

The Education Welfare Service interventions used are highlighted in the report below on Child 7's involvement with the service. There follows a résumé of the involvement of the Education Welfare Service with family members who attended schools in Bradford.

Child 7

Education Welfare social workers were involved with Hamzah's family from the time that the eldest sibling, Child 7, attended secondary school. Child 7's attendance at primary school was acceptable but by the time the child reached Year 8, it had deteriorated to 50%. The Education Social Work service received a referral from Child 7's school on 24 January 2002. Following standard practice at that time the Education Welfare Service undertook intensive monitoring of Child 7's attendance for a period of 4 weeks. [redacted] attendance improved to 89% over that period.

In order to maintain Child 7's attendance, parents were invited to a School Attendance Panel. The panel membership included senior school staff, the education social worker holding the case and a senior education welfare social worker. These panels are 'solution focused', seeking to assist families with parenting skills and the practical help needed to ensure their children attend school regularly. The parents did not engage readily with the School Attendance Panel, so Child 7's case was moved to the Traffic Light Initiative. Under this initiative targets are set, in stages, to improve pupil attendance. Progress against targets is RAG rated. Unsatisfactory (red) progress results in consideration of legal intervention. An unscheduled visit was made to the home and the family was informed that attendance was being carefully monitored. A red flag (indicating that targets had not been met) would result in action from the Courts. Child 7's attendance improved to 92% and the improvement was for a sustained period, until the end of that school year, which was July 2002.

Child 8

The Education Welfare Service took action for Child 8 (the second eldest child), when he was in Year 9. Child 8's attendance at primary school was acceptable. On 11 November 2004, as the family was already known to the Education Welfare Team, Child 8 was entered onto the Traffic Light Initiative rather than attempt more minor interventions. Monitoring commenced on 13 November 2004. Child 8's attendance rose to 87% by 3 January 2005. No further interventions to secure Child 8's attendance were required.

Child 6

Child 6's poor attendance, at 70%, was first noted in the reception class. Although attendance cannot be enforced before statutory school age, parents were informed [redacted] that monitoring would be undertaken. Action was taken from that date, and an intensive period of monitoring took place [redacted] Child 6's attendance improved so intervention was reduced.

In the autumn term 2004, Child 6's attendance was 79%. Monitoring and intervention continued into the spring term of 2005. Child 6's attendance continued at the 78% level. A home visit was made on 9 May 2005 to discuss Child 6's poor attendance. Amanda Hutton did not believe there was a problem and would not enter into discussion with Education Welfare Service. A letter was sent to Amanda Hutton that day advising her that Court action would be taken if she failed to ensure Child 6 was educated appropriately. Child 6's attendance improved and was recorded at 85% by 17 June. Attendance was maintained until the second part of the autumn term when the school contacted the Education Welfare Service with a request for further assistance. Monitoring was put in place and attendance improved, leading to monitoring being withdrawn, a year later in January 2007.

No further interventions were recorded for Child 6 until 10 January 2011 [redacted] Attendance had fallen to 51%. A home visit was attempted on 10 January 2011 but no answer was received. Child 6 returned to school on 12 January 2011, informing school staff that the family had been visiting Portsmouth and therefore unable to attend school in Bradford. A letter threatening legal intervention over Child 6's poor attendance was sent to Amanda Hutton on 2 March 2011. Reasonable attendance was maintained until 12 July 2011. Child 6s attendance was monitored by the Education Welfare Service in September 2011, at the start of the new term.

Child 5

[redacted] Child 5's attendance [redacted] was noted to be 75%. Monitoring of attendance commenced in January 2005. Child 5's recorded attendance on 25 February 2005 had improved to 86%. The Education Welfare Service undertook a home visit to see Amanda Hutton on 18 April 2005 to discuss attendance of Child 5. On this occasion there was no reply and a note was hand delivered requesting contact. A further home visit was made on 9 May 2005 to discuss Child 5 and Child 6's poor attendance. Amanda Hutton did not believe there was a problem and would not enter into discussion with the Education Welfare Service. A letter was sent to Amanda Hutton that day advising her that Court action would be taken if she failed to ensure Child 5 and Child 6 were educated appropriately. Attendance was maintained during the summer term.

School made an additional referral for Child 5 in December 2005 when attendance was recorded at 79%. On 23 January 2006 Amanda Hutton was sent a letter informing her that the attendance of Child 5 would be intensively monitored. Child 5's attendance improved to 84% during the three week

monitoring period. Child 5's attendance was maintained, and was recorded as 85% in February 2007. Child 5's attendance improved to 90% by 24 April 2007 when monitoring was withdrawn.

Although contact was maintained with Amanda Hutton due to attendance issues with other siblings, no further monitoring was initiated solely for Child 5.

Child 4

Education Welfare Service involvement with Child 4 began when in the reception class [redacted] Child 4 was assigned the same Education Welfare Service social worker as Child 5. Case notes indicate that the attendance monitoring of both Child 5 and Child 4 were managed contemporaneously by the Education Welfare Service. File notes do not indicate attendance concerns for Child 4.

Children 3, 2 and 1

Hamzah, Child 2 and Child 3 did not attend school. The Education Welfare service was involved in attempts to establish their whereabouts, as described later in the answer to question nine.

As can be seen from the résumé above, the Education Welfare Service and schools worked jointly to share information about the attendance of children in the family. They worked effectively to monitor attendance when it was poor and their interventions resulted in improvements to attendance, frequently for sustained periods.

The résumé notes that as well as home visits, calls and persuasion, the Education Welfare Service was prepared to use legal sanctions to enforce school attendance. Education Welfare practice was then, and remains now, predicated on the view that persuasion, assistance, challenge and help are more successful in maintaining satisfactory school attendance than Court action. Education Welfare Service social workers always point out to parents that failing to ensure satisfactory school attendance constitutes neglect, as failure to educate demonstrates a failure to meet a child's basic needs.

The interventions undertaken with the family, who had recognised difficulties, resulted in improvements to the attendance of the children. Visits made by Education Welfare Service to the home did not reveal a cause for concern, either due to the physical environment, or the health and wellbeing of the children with whom the Education Welfare Service social workers were working.

9. *The SCR refers to attempts 'to establish the whereabouts of the three youngest children after the Health Visitor initially identified that Hamzah was not registered with a GP'. What form did these attempts take? Given that the children appear never to have left Bradford, what prevented the children's whereabouts being established quickly?*

Bradford Council works to a 'Rising 5s' policy normally admitting children to school before they are 5 years old. However, parents are not obliged to have their children educated until they are of statutory school age. Hamzah would

have reached statutory school age on 1 September 2010. Hamzah died on 15 December 2009.

Local authorities cannot enforce school attendance until a child is of statutory school age. Likewise, attendance at children's centres or associated early years activities is voluntary and parents cannot be made to engage their children in such activities. When a child is enrolled at a school the child is given a Unique Pupil Number (UPN). The number follows the child throughout their school career, facilitating the transfer of records between schools. The UPN is especially useful at the time of primary/secondary transfer, so that records can be shared electronically and also if children move around the country. The UPN is used with the s2s website[2], to trace pupils identified as missing from education. Hamzah and his younger siblings were not registered at a school and therefore had no UPNs.

On 11th October 2010 notification from the Health Visitor initiated the 'Children Missing from Education Protocol' in respect of Hamzah and child 2 and child 3. The Education Welfare Service attempted to locate the children by:

- making contact with family members,
- making enquiries at or in the region of the last known address, and
- circulating descriptions of the children nationally, to see if they have emerged in a local authority in another part of the country.

On the third working day after the referral from the Health Visitor, an Education Welfare Service social worker made a home visit to Hamzah's mother. She informed the education social worker that the children were not with her but staying elsewhere. The education social worker attempted to reach Child 7 (then an adult) at their place of business to corroborate what Hamzah's mother had said but they were unable to locate Child 7.

Enquiries to public agencies were made, including the Welfare Benefits Office, the East Bradford Community Housing Trust, the Health Authority and Children's Social Care. The enquiries did not give any indication of Hamzah's whereabouts. As the enquiries were inconclusive a further visit was made to Hamzah's mother. She said that the younger children were with family members in Portsmouth and direct enquiries were made with Portsmouth local authority. Because the younger children in the family had not been registered with UPNs in Bradford and no electronic search was possible, the Education Welfare Service made contact with their colleagues in Portsmouth.

Every local authority has a nominated officer to deal with enquiries relating to children missing education. Officers from Portsmouth confirmed by telephone on 19 November 2010 that there were no Common Assessment Framework records, the children were not known to Children's Social Care in Portsmouth and there was no record of the children on Portsmouth's school attendance database.

[2] The "s2s" website is the School to School website, which is maintained by the Department for Education. This website offers a number of facilities to schools in England, including a secure facility for the transfer of pupil records when changing school, and a "lost pupil database".

Further attempts were made to establish the children's whereabouts with Amanda Hutton but she declined to cooperate with Education Welfare Service enquiries. Consequently, Child 6 was spoken to at school by a trusted adult and asked about the location of the younger siblings. Child 6 corroborated the story told to the Education Welfare Service by Amanda Hutton. At Hutton's trial it was established that she had used threats and duress with the older children to ensure that they backed up what she said about younger siblings living in Portsmouth.

In summary, attempts to locate the children concentrated on making family contact and checking the facts of the story told. As the younger children were not registered at a school and therefore had no UPNs rapid electronic tracing was impossible. Finally, Education Welfare Service Social Workers were given false information and Amanda Hutton had taken steps to deceive officers from the public services who made enquiries of her and her children.

The Serious Case Review has found that the Education Welfare Service could have followed up the assertion that Hamzah and his siblings were living in Portsmouth more vigorously and this is accepted. This has been taken into account by the service in Bradford with guidelines updated and practice improved in the light of lessons learned from this case for staff.

10. *From the SCR, I can see that Children's Social Care made a number of visits to the children's home. What is unclear is the outcome of these visits, whether any conversations took place with the children and whether there was any follow up. <u>If no action was taken, why not?</u>*

In November 2006, Social Care Social Workers visited the family at the request of the Health Visitor as set out at the beginning of this document.

During the period December 2006 to May 2007 there were five visits by Children's Social Care social workers to the family home. A detailed account of each of these visits is given in the answers to questions one, two and three.

Between June 2007 and December 2009, when Hamzah died, there were no visits by Children's Social Care social workers, although there were enquiries undertaken, and correspondence with mother, which is described in the answer to question four.

On 21 September 2011 Police gained access to the family home, and Children's Social Care social workers also attended. All of the children who were present were made the subjects of Police protection due to neglect arising from the home conditions, and they were taken into the care of the local authority.