

# Adult Social Care Case-load Management and Weighting Practice Guidance

Date March 2025

With thanks to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Operational owner:	Kwai Mo & Linda Richardson
Author:	Amanda Bannister
Version number:	2
Date written/ reviewed:	March 2025
Date of equalities impact assessment:	
Impact assessor:	
Ratified by:	SLT meeting
Date ratified:	23 April 2025
Date for next review:	June 2026



Barnsley – the place  
of possibilities.



**BARNLSLEY**  
Metropolitan Borough Council

## ASC Caseload Management and Weighting Practice Guidance

This Caseload Management Practice Guidance has been developed to enable you to understand the complexity, ambiguity, diversity and demands placed upon yourself to undertake your social care statutory duties.

Prior to your supervision, you should use this practice guidance to provide an overview of each of your cases in preparation of your case load discussion with your supervisor.

This tool provides a transparent method for escalating any significant demands or unmet needs to your manager, ensuring your concerns are addressed and promoting safe working practices.

Whilst there is no direct number that constitutes a safe case load for example high volume/lower complexity, low volume/high complexity, short-term/long-term, the Procedure for Caseloads & Prioritisation [caseloads-and-prioritisation-procedure.pdf](#) aimed to support safe caseloads for practitioners, this guidance builds on the aims to take a holistic view of case-load weightings for practitioners.

In addition, this practice guidance enables:

1. Effective and equitable caseload management
2. Consideration of staffing capacity against resources and demand
3. Pro-active workflow management
4. Having the right tools to do the job – work life balance.
5. A healthy workplace – provides greater resilience and ownership.
6. Effective service delivery through a happier and more resilient workforce

Within caseload management it is also important to consider the impact cases may have on individual practitioners. One case may be more emotive or challenging to a practitioner due to other pertinent circumstance. When undertaking the personal scoring practitioners should consider complexity, risk, emotional and psychological impact as well as wider determinant factors. Practitioners may like to consider a RAG rating in terms of personal impact ahead of a planned supervision and then review this with their supervisor alongside the overall case RAG rating. **1-4 Green, 5-7, Amber, 8-10, Red**

## Caseload Management Scoring Matrix

Domain	Score
<p><b>Complexity</b> Complexity is not just around the nature of the case, or risk management, it is also around the volume and intensity of a case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of professional involved</li> <li>• Number of contacts with service user, family, other stakeholders, professional</li> <li>• Level of professional skills required</li> </ul>	<p><b>1 Point</b> – Contact with other agencies either minimal or operating as regularised / unproblematic or standard.</p> <p><b>2 Points</b> – Contact with other agencies changeable, requiring initiation and/or maintenance.</p> <p><b>3 Points</b> – Multiple or complex contact with other agencies requiring careful negotiation / advocacy/ development or other high input.</p>
<p><b>Risk</b> Risks management relates to your open cases but also relates to you and the emotional drain that could be present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiagency risk management protocol</li> <li>• CMARRAC/VARM/VAP</li> <li>• MAPPA/MARRAC</li> <li>• Safeguarding</li> <li>• Assertive outreach approach</li> <li>• Reputational risk</li> <li>• Resources pressures – extra duties placed upon yourself.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1 Point</b> – No current risk involved /risk assessment known and understood by all parties, with consequent decisions and actions, including contingency plans negotiated.</p> <p><b>2 Points</b> – Risk assessment in process of being undertaken, with options for action and decision ready to be put into place.</p> <p><b>3 Points</b> – Current risk not assessed / change of circumstances requiring new assessment OR high level of risks identified</p>
<p><b>Travel/Time</b> Travelling appreciable distances to undertake the work for example, placements in another part of the country. Certain cases, such as court cases and safeguarding, require more time due to their nature. Consideration should be given to the past month's work since the last supervision.</p>	<p><b>1 Point</b> – No travelling outside usual agency area involved, and/or not requiring more than 2 hours per week since last supervision.</p> <p><b>2 Points</b> – Regular, planned travel, no more than 3 times per year, and/or not requiring more than between 2-4 hours per week since the last supervision.</p> <p><b>3 Points</b> – Unexpected travel on an occasional basis and/or regular travel more than 3 times per year, and/or requiring more than half a day per week since the last supervision</p>
<p><b>Personal Impact:</b> For example, the stress / impact placed upon yourself due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your other professional responsibilities (AMHP, BIA, PE)</li> <li>• Tight time scales to complete task i.e. documents/ reports</li> <li>• Professional confidence to manage the case effectively.</li> <li>• Repetitive contacts</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to your overall well-being, score yourself on a RAG rating (<b>Red / Amber / Green</b>).</p> <p><b>Agreed actions:</b> to be discussed and agreed between yourself and your supervisor.</p> <p><i>Any case management concerns should be escalated by the Team Manager to the Service Manager for their information and to action accordingly</i></p>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supporting peers with complex cases or practice issues (legal framework COP/DOL, Complex contextual SG)</li><li>• Verbal abuse from others</li><li>• Increased demands</li><li>• Other emotive or trigger factors.</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|

## Case Example

Mrs Miggins is an 82-year-old woman living alone. Last winter she fell leaving the house and broke her hip; she made a good recovery and was discharged from hospital to home, with reablement. An assessment and care plan were undertaken then. As a result, grab rails were fitted at the front door and in the bathroom; Mrs. Miggins began to attend a local club twice a week. At the time, Mrs. Miggins' son was concerned that his mother should not return home alone but be admitted to residential care. Mr. Miggins lives in another part of the country and has said that he is not able to provide the regular contact he would like to give. The assessing social worker ascertained that Mrs. Miggins wanted to return home from hospital. Mr. Miggins has contacted your team to say that his mother is no longer able to look after herself: she is being treated for a recurrent chest infection by her GP and is becoming forgetful. Mr. Miggins says his mother is not eating properly and has not been attending her local club. The GP also writes to your team recommending residential care for Mrs. Miggins. In supervision, the case is rated as follows:

### Complexity:

Multiple or complex contact with other agencies requiring careful negotiation / advocacy / development or other high input (2).

### Risk:

Current risk not assessed / change of circumstances requiring new assessment (2).

### Travel:

No travelling outside usual agency area involved, and/or not requiring more than 2 hours per week since last supervision. (1).

Total: 5/10 overall RAG rating **Amber**.

Overall Score RAG rating, 1-4 **Green**, 5-7, **Amber**, 8-10, **Red**.

*In discussion, both the manager and practitioner agree that this rating should have lessened by the time of the next supervision. The anticipated changes through the worker's interventions are:*

- *A clearer picture about Mrs. Miggins' state of health and causes of current distress, the risks to her well-being and what this implies about her ability to continue living at home. Potential to move to weighting 1.*
- *Renewed contact with Mrs. Miggins, her son and her GP to negotiate the options available to her, dependent on her wishes. Addressing Mr. Miggins' concerns as legitimate may be a major part of this. Potential to remain at weighting 2 for the present time.*

## Caseload Management & Weighing Tool

Name:	
Date of Caseload review:	
Total Allocated Cases:	

Erica ID	Personal Impact	Case Overview & Agreed Actions	Score	RAG Rating
	(Red/Amber/Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/Green)
	(Red/Amber/Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/Green)
	(Red/Amber/Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/Green)
	(Red/Amber/Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/Green)
	(Red/Amber/Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/Green)

	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)

		Management Comments/agreed actions		
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)

		Management Comments/agreed actions		
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)

	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)

	/Green)	Management Comments/agreed actions		Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)
	(Red/Amber /Green)	Case Overview:  Management Comments/agreed actions		(Red/Amber/ Green)

**Notes:**

*The caseload weighting tool should be completed in advance of supervision. The completed form should be discussed at each supervision session to aid the practitioner and manager in ensuring appropriate case oversight, staff wellbeing and delivery of the Council's core statutory duties.*