

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CHILD Q - SPECIAL JOINT SCRUTINY
(LIVING IN HACKNEY SCRUTINY COMMISSION AND CHILDREN & YOUNG
PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMISSION)**

MONDAY 13 JUNE 2022

- Councillors Present:** Councillor Soraya Adejare in the Chair
- Cllr Alastair Binnie-Lubbock, Cllr Zoe Garbett,
Cllr Margaret Gordon (Vice-Chair), Cllr Lee Laudat-
Scott, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Sam Pallis,
Cllr Midnight Ross, Cllr Ali Sadek,
Cllr Lynne Troughton, Cllr Claudia Turbet-Delof,
Cllr Penny Wrouth and Cllr Sarah Young
- Connected Virtually:** Councillor Anya Sizer; Councillor Sheila Suso-
Runge and Councillor Caroline Selman
- Apologies:** Councillor Sophie Conway, Councillor Clare
Joseph, Councillor Joseph Ogundemuren and
Councillor Ian Rathbone
- Officers in Attendance:** Mark Carroll, Chief Executive; Jacquie Burke,
Group Director Children and Education; Annie
Gammon, Director of Education; Diane Benjamin
Director of Children's Social Care, and Sonia Khan,
Head of Policy & Strategic Delivery
- Also in Attendance:** Mayor Philip Glanville; Councillor Susan Fajana
Thomas, Cabinet Member for Community Safety &
Regulatory Services; Councillor Anntionette
Bramble, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for
Education, Young People & Children's Social Care;
Borough Commander Marcus Barnett, Central East
Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower
Hamlets); Area Commander Paul Brogden,
Frontline Policing Crime and Public Protection, Met
HQ; Detective Superintendent Adam Ghaboos,
Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and
Tower Hamlets); Chief Inspector Lucky Singh,
Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and
Tower Hamlets); Jim Gamble, Independent Chair of
City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership;
Rory McCallum, Senior Professional Adviser,
Safeguarding & Learning - London Borough of
Hackney.

1 Welcome (Election of Chair)

Councillor Adejare was duly elected as Chair of the meeting.

Councillor Gordon was duly elected as Vice-Chair of the meeting.

2 Apologies for Absence

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joseph, Rathbone, Conway and Ogundemuren. Apologies for absence were also received from co-opted Members Salmah Kansara and Michael Lobenstein.

2.2 Councillors Sizer, Suso-Runge and Selman were in virtual attendance.

3 Urgent Items

3.1 There were no urgent items, and the order of business was as set out as in the agenda.

4 Declarations of Interest

4.1 The following declarations were received:

- Co-opted Member Jo Macleod, Councillor Fajana-Thomas, Councillor Sadek and Councillor Ross declared that they were school governors.
- Councillor Pallis declared that he was a former school governor.
- Councillor Lee Laudat-Scott declared that he was a school governor and member of the Schools Forum.

5 Scrutiny of Strategic Response to Child Q (19.05)

5.1 The Chair commenced by explaining that the jointly convened meeting had been called to review the strategic response of statutory partners to the recommendations from the safeguarding practice review by the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP). The meeting was undertaking statutory functions in relation to accountability of crime and disorder and oversight of education and child safeguarding arrangements.

5.2 The Chair outlined the reasons for the meeting which were to ensure:

- There was a strategic and coordinated response by the statutory bodies to the recommendations and actions arising from the safeguarding practice review report.
- There were effective accountability and monitoring structures in place to oversee progress against the recommendations and the various agreed action plans
- That there were plans to engage, involve and reassure the community in relation to the progress of the recommendations and that there is public accountability in the process.

5.3 The Chair explained that an amended paper had been received by the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) and had been distributed to all attendees. The amended paper is attached as an appendix to these minutes.

5.4 Commission Members would reflect after the meeting on the evidence heard and make recommendations for improvement to the organisations for consideration.

5.5 The Chair went on to highlight some of the work that the Living in Hackney and Children and Young People Scrutiny Commissions had undertaken which aligned with the outcomes and recommendations of the Child Q Serious Case Review. The Chair also highlighted some of the work that the Cabinet had undertaken in regard to anti-racism, from over policing of global majority residents through to the over sanctioning of black children and disparities in school exclusions. She explained that the meeting would seek to help local safeguarding agencies to develop safeguarding practice to a point where residents would trust safeguarding agencies to ensure that what happened to Child Q never happened again.

6 Serious Case Review (SCR) of Child Q (19.10)

6.1 The Chair invited Councillor Gordon to open the item.

6.2 Councillor Gordon explained that the Child Q incident had put a spotlight on Hackney's schools and policing and it was therefore vital that there be robust, independent scrutiny as well as transparent accountability for the response by the relevant authorities.

6.3 Many members of the community did not see Child Q's experience as isolated, and pointed to the Living in Hackney and Children and Young People Scrutiny Commissions' work and recommendations on the topic particularly with regard to exclusions, safeguarding, anti-racism and inclusion & behaviour management that was summarised in the agenda pack. The discussion would cover the timeline of events relating to Child Q and the key conclusions and recommendations following the serious case review (SCR).

6.4 Attending for this item was:

- Jim Gamble, Independent Chair - City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership
- Rory McCallum, Senior Professional Adviser, Safeguarding & Learning - London Borough of Hackney

6.5 The Chair invited the Independent Chair of the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP) to give a short verbal presentation to compliment the reports received and included in the agenda pack. The main points from the presentation are outlined below.

- It was explained that the initial ambiguity over the timeline was because the review kept information relating to the background and context of Child Q's lived experiences to a minimum to protect Child Q's identity and that of her family.
- In terms of the overall timeline for the review, there had been delays due to an inability to access the police officers involved in the search due to the internal investigative processes of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and the requirement not to undermine their investigation.

- Child Q first came to the Independent CHSCP's attention on 11 January 2021 and that the MPS and London Borough of Hackney were notified the following day. A Rapid Review report and the reasoning for the instigation of a SCR was submitted to the national Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel (the national panel) on 15 January 2021.
- The national panel wrote back questioning whether a SCR was necessary as it felt that the case was not notifiable and did not meet the criteria for a local child safeguarding practice review.
- The Independent Chair expressed his disappointment that the national panel had not yet publicly recognised that it was wrong to do so, and assured those in attendance that he would continue to press the national panel for public recognition that their initial response was wrong and would not happen again.
- It was explained that in the New Year fact checking was complete and final rounds of engagement were undertaken, including with the family, the reference group, the Metropolitan Police Service and the Independent Office for Police Conduct.
- The Child Q report made eight findings and fourteen recommendations for practice improvement.
- The finding that racism (whether deliberately or not) was likely to have been an influencing factor in the decision to undertake a strip search and that there was a high level of probability that practitioners were influenced by 'adultification' bias was highlighted.

Questions from Commissions

6.6 Key local agencies including the MPS, Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) and London Borough of Hackney had all been aware of the serious nature of the incident in January 2021, and had all received regular updates from the CHSCP. A Commission Member asked what action had been taken in the intervening period between January 2021 and the SCR being published in March 2022.

- In response, the Independent Chair of the CHSCP explained that in the immediate aftermath the MPS reissued guidance clarifying when searches could and could not take place. The school also undertook a review commissioned by its own governors to look at what happened and the lessons that could be learned, and the London Borough of Hackney introduced and then accelerated adultification training.
- It was highlighted that there was a hesitation amongst safeguarding partners about taking any further action at that stage without exposing the serious nature of the incident at a time in which Child Q and her family were still processing their trauma.

6.7 A Commission Member asked whether the Independent Chair of the CHSCP had had any communication with the national panel to understand why it took the view that the case was not notifiable and did not meet the criteria for a local safeguarding practice review.

- In response the Independent Chair of the CHSCP confirmed that he had since met with the Chair of the national panel who accepted in that discussion that the initial response had been wrong and that it would publicly acknowledge that error at an appropriate time.
- The report sets out a number of barriers which delayed the progress of the SCR, particularly those issues related to the national panel, the MPS and the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) investigation.

6.8 A Commission Member asked whether more could have been done by key local agencies to overcome the barriers experienced in gathering information in the early stages of the SCR.

- In response, the Independent Chair of the CHSCP explained that the barriers to getting access to information from the MPS was due to its internal investigative processes and the requirement not to undermine their investigation. He felt it important to emphasise that it was not due to the resistance of individual officers, and highlighted the importance of the first recommendation of the review which advocates the development of national guidance on the IOPC's interface with the local safeguarding practice review process.
- The Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police Central East Borough Command Unit also responded to the question by reemphasising that the IOPC's processes and procedures precluded the MPS from providing the information requested by the CHSCP, and accepted that it was a barrier which delayed the progress of the SCR process.
- The review report states that "25 children under the age of 18 were subject to 'further searches'" by the Central East Borough Command Unit during 2020/21.

6.9 A Commission Member asked whether MOPAC held further data on the nature of those searches, namely whether any were undertaken in schools, how old the children were and whether an appropriate adult was present. If not, the Commission Member asked whether any steps were being taken to record this data to ensure meaningful and effective monitoring.

- In response, the Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight, MOPAC explained that a 'strip search' was a practice related to the overall stop and search powers of the police. There were two distinct types of strip search, namely more thorough searches and searches involving exposure of intimate parts of the body.
- The Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MOPAC had set up a strategic response Gold group to review strip search cases across London, and assured the Commission that the MPS and MOPAC would be happy to share this data once available.
- The Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police Central East Borough Command Unit also responded to the question by explaining to those in attendance that in 2020/21 there were 228,000 searches across London, of which 4,300 were more thorough searches.

Monday 13 June 2022

- In Hackney (as opposed to the Central East BCU as a whole) there were 162 more thorough intimate part searches of all age ranges, and seven more thorough intimate part searches of children aged 10 to 17.

6.10 A Commission Member asked how CHSCP assured itself that local safeguarding agencies were confident and able to challenge each other when appropriate safeguarding action was not taken.

- In response, the Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police Central East Borough Command Unit explained that there was a statutory body which sat alongside and worked together with the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership to ensure there was a joined up and focused approach to safeguarding children in Hackney.
- The statutory partners were in constant dialogue and fully engaged with the safeguarding oversight procedures in place, and fully supported the local safeguarding practice review process.
- The Senior Professional Advisor, Safeguarding and Learning, Hackney Council added that the CHSCP had an escalation policy which defined the process for resolving professional differences in which one agency feels that the actions, inaction or decisions of another agency do not adequately safeguard a child.
- Where professionals considered that the practice of other professionals was placing children at risk of harm, they must be assertive, act swiftly and ensure that they challenge the relevant professionals in line with this policy.
- The Independent Chair of the CHSCP also responded to the question by explaining to those in attendance that the CHSCP had formed a core working group and a number of other working groups to monitor progress and improvement in regard to the findings and recommendations of the SCR and that a report outlining that progress would be published later in the year.

6.11 A Commission Member asked which safeguarding policies and procedures schools in Hackney adhered to on a day-to-day basis and what was being done to ensure that best practice in relation to safeguarding was followed across all schools in the borough.

- In response, the Director of Education, London Borough of Hackney explained that all schools in the UK must follow the guidelines set out in 'Keeping children safe in education', which was statutory guidance for schools and colleges on safeguarding children and safer recruitment published annually by the Department for Education.
- London Borough of Hackney also provided an annual model policy on safeguarding which included any updates to the statutory guidance to all schools in the borough. The expectation was that all local authority schools use that policy.
- Academies had slightly different approaches but did have to follow the statutory guidance and take on board the findings of local safeguarding practice reviews. London Borough of Hackney also undertook a regular audit which reviewed the

safeguarding practices of local schools and took account of recent developments and approaches being used.

7 Strategic Response of Statutory Partners to Child Q (19.35)

7.1 The item would cover the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), London Borough of Hackney and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to set out its response to the serious case review (SCR) in relation to:

- The initial response and actions taken
- Lessons learnt and identified priorities for the future
- Actions taken (or planned) to engage, involve and reassure the local community and other stakeholders

7.2 Attending for this item was:

- Representing the MPS - Met HQ and Central East Borough Command Unit Borough Commander Marcus Barnett, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets), Area Commander Paul Brogden, Frontline Policing Crime and Public Protection, Met HQ Detective Superintendent Adam Ghaboos, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets) Chief Inspector Lucky Singh, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets)
- Representing London Borough of Hackney Mayor Philip Glanville, Councillor Susan Fajana Thomas, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services, Councillor Anntoinette Bramble, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care, Mark Carroll, Chief Executive, Jacquie Burke, Group Director Children and Education, Annie Gammon, Director of Education, Sonia Khan, Head of Policy & Strategic Delivery.
- Representing MOPAC, Kenny Bowie, Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight

7.3 The Chair invited the Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit to give a short verbal presentation to compliment the reports received and included in the agenda pack. The main points from the presentation are outlined below.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit began by reiterating the MPS' apologies for what had happened to Child Q and the effect it had had on her family and the wider community.
- The MPS was committed to implementing the recommendations made by the SCR in full, learning from the incident and working with partners to respond to the criticisms and concerns that had been raised.
- An action plan had been developed with local safeguarding partners and other stakeholders to implement the recommendations set out by the SCR.
- The MPS had also begun work to review its processes in relation to strip searches and action had already been taken to ensure officers and staff had a refreshed understanding of the policy for conducting strip searches and advice for dealing with schools and ensuring that children are treated as children.
- Community engagement work undertaken thus far included engagement and outreach work with children and young people, as well as the development of

Monday 13 June 2022

the Independent Advisory Group and Safer Neighbourhoods Board to facilitate dialogue around the recent events and tensions and to ensure its impacts were addressed.

- A pilot scheme was currently underway whereby letters were sent to the parents of any child who had experienced a S.23 MDA stop and search but drugs were not located. It was felt this would help to ensure that the MPS was more transparent with parents in keeping them informed of events involving their child.
- Another pilot scheme had been introduced in the Hackney and Tower Hamlets area whereby, in addition to the current position requiring a conversation with a supervisor and the presence of an appropriate adult in the case of a child being subjected to a more thorough intimate part searches, Inspector authority would also be required to ensure appropriate oversight of the search.
- 'Adultification' training would be delivered to all front line officers in the Central East Borough Command Unit which would seek to raise awareness of structural racism and reinforce the need to view children as children with a safeguarding lens alongside the use of police powers.

7.4 The Chair then invited the Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight, MOPAC to give a short verbal presentation to compliment the reports received and included in the agenda pack. The main points from the presentation are outlined below.

- The Mayor's Action Plan for Transparency, Accountability and Trust in Policing had been developed to address community concerns, particularly from Black Londoners, about disproportionality in the use of certain police powers including stop and search, the use of force and taser.
- Whilst the Action Plan predated the case of Child Q, it focused on a number of areas relevant to the case of Child Q including the better use of police powers, making Black communities safer, representing and understanding Black communities and holding the police to account for what they do.
- MOPAC worked with community leaders and children and young people across several pilot areas in London to develop a new scrutiny framework so that local communities could effectively hold the police to account.
- This involved months of consultation during which the ideas and experiences of children, young people and youth leaders informed the delivery of the work.
- Arrangements had also been put into place to routinely publish London-wide MPS data on strip searching to enable transparency and accountability.

7.5 The Chair then invited the Mayor of London Borough of Hackney to give a short verbal presentation to compliment the reports received and included in the agenda pack. The main points from the presentation are outlined below.

- It was explained that in the immediate aftermath of the publication of the SCR, the Council established a weekly GOLD group under the Council's Critical Incident Management Structure.

Monday 13 June 2022

- The group was set up to coordinate immediate responses and the impacts of the report on Child Q and her family, staff and the wider community.
- From May 2022, a Strategic Response Group had met on a fortnightly basis to continue to oversee the response, chaired by the Chief Executive and attended by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services and key senior officers.
- Whilst the Council was not named in any of the 14 SCR recommendations, it did have a responsibility for leadership and accountability.
- Its role included ensuring partners implemented the recommendations and that progress and outcomes be communicated widely, understanding the impact of the SCR on staff and communities and engaging with the wider issues raised in response to the SCR.
- The Chair then invited the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care to comment on London Borough of Hackney's response to the SCR.
- The hurt that the Child Q incident had caused the local community and that many of them did not see it as an isolated incident, especially in regards to racism and disproportionality towards the Black community, was highlighted.
- The Council had a sustained workstream on anti-racism, including a Four Day Anti-Racism Praxis Conference in May 2022 and a number of training sessions on adultification, trauma and cultural competency and awareness.
- There were also strands of work underway to help develop the voice of children and parents/carers in Hackney to afford them the opportunity to shape the Council's work.
- There was a need to capture the voices of those who were most likely to experience a sense of exclusion and frustration in particular, and to have difficult and honest conversations about racism and disproportionality.
- The Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services was then invited to comment on London Borough of Hackney's response to the SCR.
- The Council had committed to building towards making the organisation truly anti-racist and rebuilding trust and confidence in public organisations in Hackney.
- The Council would work with the MPS on a shared strategic action plan to restore trust and confidence.
- This would be delivered through the creation of a Police Action Plan Board which would consider progress and discuss the development of the plan, a meeting of the Community Resilience Partnership to help shape the plan and finally the meeting of the Statutory Community Safety Partnership on 24 June 2022 which would be asked to ratify the plan.

Monday 13 June 2022

- The partnership was chaired by the Chief Executive, London Borough of Hackney and Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services and Mayor of London Borough of Hackney would be closely involved and sit on the Police Action Plan Board.
- The Community Resilience Partnership meeting in particular would bring together a range of community partners (including young people), the MPS, the Council and statutory partners.

Questions from Commissions

7.6 A Commission Member asked how local police training initiatives would focus on and address local disproportionalities given the continued recurrence of safeguarding incidents in the MPS.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by outlining the typical training programme that a police officer would go through before being posted to a Borough Command Unit.
- This included cultural awareness training which touched on areas such as diversity and culture within London's communities and the history of policing in London. Once an officer arrived at a Borough Command Unit they would also get further, more localised cultural awareness training.
- For example, Central East Borough Command Unit brought in community members from across the local area to discuss their lived experience and help officers to understand what it was like to live within the area.
- There was an MPS Policy Review underway in response to a number of incidents that had dented trust and confidence in the MPS, which would include a review of training standards across London.

The Chair then invited the Detective Superintendent, Central East Borough Command Unit to respond to some of the issues highlighted.

- A training programme had been developed in Hackney alongside the London Borough of Hackney which would equip new officers with an understanding of the history of the borough including lived experience, cultural history and policing history.
- The Chief Inspector, Central East Borough Command Unit also commented on the training offered to police officers in Hackney by reiterating the importance of new officers understanding the lived experience of those that live within the borough, and especially those communities that were most likely to experience a sense of exclusion and frustration.

The Chair then brought the Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight, MOPAC in to comment on the issues raised.

- MOPAC's Disproportionality Board had members from all criminal justice agencies (including the MPS) and community representatives sitting on it.

Monday 13 June 2022

- It aimed to understand why there was disproportionality across the criminal justice system in London and the scale of the issue, which would then help to address the issue in the longer term.

The Chair then invited the Mayor of London Borough of Hackney to make any final comments on the issues raised.

- Support had been given by the Council to the Central East Borough Command Unit in regard to practical learning and training such as cultural competency and anti-racism. Pan London work had also been undertaken alongside the MPS and local and national politicians, recognising that the issues raised by the Child Q incident were not limited to Hackney and required institutional change to address.
- It was acknowledged that it was overwhelmingly Black communities that were disproportionately targeted by the MPS and as such training should reflect the Black community's lived experience first and foremost.

7.7 A Commission Member queried the circumstances in which a police officer could carry out a search involving the exposure of more intimate body parts outside of a police station.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by explaining that there was a legal basis for searches involving exposure of intimate parts of the body to be undertaken and that the police were allowed to require compliance in particular circumstances.
- A pilot scheme had recently been introduced across Hackney in which Inspector authority would be needed prior to such a search to ensure appropriate oversight of such an intervention.
- A circumstance in which this type of search may be deemed appropriate may be if the person was suspected of concealing evidence such as a weapon or drugs. These searches should be carried out at a nearby police station or other nearby location which was out of public view.
- The Child Q search should not have been undertaken in the way that it was and that there should have been a number of safeguarding arrangements in place, including the presence of an appropriate adult present, that were not adhered to.
- Since the Child Q incident a dedicated room for more thorough intimate part searches had been opened at Stoke Newington Station to ensure officers could transport people into a safe environment and carry out such searches in the appropriate manner.
- MOPAC's submission (provided as an appendix to these minutes) referred to reviewing data on strip searches across London but did not refer specifically to reviewing data in regard to strip searches undertaken on children under the age of 18.

7.8 A Commission Member asked whether MOPAC and the MPS recognised the overuse of strip searches on people under the age of 18, particularly from the global

majority, and whether they were assured that the listed actions were enough to have an impact on these numbers.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by explaining that the positive outcome rate of stop and searches across London was around 28%, and for more thorough intimate parts searches the positive outcome rate was around 50%.
- In Hackney there were around 6,500 stop and searches with a positive outcome rate of around 29% compared to around 11,000 stop and searches 18 months ago.
- Whilst he was not seeking to minimise the experience of those seven children under the age of 18 that had been subject to a more thorough intimate part search, the MPS did need to maintain a level of capability to be able to undertake stop and searches and more thorough intimate part searches in particular circumstances particularly when a child was being criminally exploited and was suspected of concealing a weapon or drugs.

7.9 In 2020, following a legal challenge made in response to the concerns around the disproportionate impact on children from Black and other ethnic backgrounds of police in schools, the MPS indicated that it would review the Safer Schools Partnership and the role of the Safer Schools Officer. A Commission Member asked whether this review had been completed and, if so, what the outcome of the review was.

- The Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight, MOPAC responded by explaining that the review was underway and the report was currently being drafted and would form part of the Mayor's Action Plan for Transparency, Accountability and Trust in Policing. The review, in part, sought to ensure that the work of Safer Schools Officers did not have a disproportionate impact on Black children.

The Chair then invited the Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services, London Borough of Hackney to respond to the issues raised.

- She outlined the work underway to revise the protocols on Safer Schools Officers, for which a working group had been created and included the safeguarding partnership, the police, education, headteacher representatives and councillors.
- Following its first meeting the Director of Education wrote to secondary schools with interim guidance on police in schools and the Mayor, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services and Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care, London Borough of Hackney wrote to MOPAC to recommend that the role of parents play a much greater role in this protocol.
- The Mayor of London Borough of Hackney commented on the issues raised by assuring those in attendance that there were a wide range of resources available to schools including mental health and wellbeing support.
- A close partnership between all relevant agencies and stakeholders regarding wellbeing in schools was important, in which all stakeholders understand the

context and experience of children and parents and the role of the police in education settings.

7.10 A Commission Member asked what mental health and wellbeing support was in place for children subjected to stop and search in Hackney, particularly in those cases where no further action was taken.

- The Chief Inspector, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by explaining that the Central East Borough Command Unit worked closely with children and adolescent mental health support (CAMHS) services in Hackney, especially within education settings.
- In street settings, police officers had to follow the GOWISELY policy which outlined the minimum information that should be given to the person detained for the purpose of a search. This included, amongst other things, the grounds for the search, object of the search, identity of the officer and the legal power being exercised.
- Police officers attached to the Central East Borough Command Unit were also encouraged to give further explanations on the grounds, object and conduct of the search should no further action be taken.
- Central East Borough Command Unit police officers undertook Adverse Childhood Experience (ACEs) training to help them understand what adverse childhood experiences were and how they may affect children growing up.
- There was also a commitment to ensuring that adultification training was delivered to all front line officers which would raise awareness of structural racism and reinforce the need to view children as children with a safeguarding mindset.

The Chair then invited the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care, London Borough of Hackney to comment on the issues raised.

- She explained that Hackney Education had worked closely with the schools community to respond to the SCR and the wider issues that it and the community response had raised. Immediate actions had been taken in regard to the mental health and wellbeing of Child Q and her family, the school and other children and parents.
- There were also wider pieces of work ongoing such as grant funding for community groups to undertake initiatives with children and young people in Hackney around mental health and wellbeing.
- A key recommendation from the SCR was that where any suspicion of harm arises from substance misuse with a child, a safeguarding first approach should be adopted.
- A Commission Member asked how the key safeguarding partners intended to coordinate their response to that, and whether the Council had set out what resource issues may arise if children were referred to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH).

- The Group Director Children and Education, London Borough of Hackney responded by reassuring those in attendance the MASH responded to all cases of a safeguarding concern being raised by stop and searches.
- The MASH had a number of options to allow it to respond appropriately to a safeguarding concern including a consultation line, the Early Health Hub, Young Hackney and the Contextual Safeguarding Unit.

7.11 A Commission Member asked what practical actions local schools had already undertaken in response to the recommendations in the SCR. In particular, whether schools are reviewing their searching screening and confiscation policies, had ensured that their safeguarding training is up to date and whether any additional guidance and advice had been provided to school governing bodies.

- The Director of Education, London Borough of Hackney responded by explaining that the school involved in the Child Q case received additional leadership and support in the immediate aftermath of the incident. Other schools had received additional advice, guidance and materials following the publication of the SCR which included briefings for headteachers and governors on the recommendations.
- Local schools had made a commitment to follow up the issues emerging from the Child Q case, particularly in relation to the safeguarding first and anti-racist approaches, and that they were being supported to do so by the Council.
- The Council was currently scoping how to take forward a Hackney inclusion charter for schools, which all schools would be expected to have or be working towards by April 2023.

7.12 A Commission Member asked a follow-up question on whether additional support had been provided to schools on the issue of parental consent as raised by the Child Q case.

- The Director of Education, London Borough of Hackney explained that the Council had been clear in the advice, guidance and materials sent out to schools that there should be no police visits to schools without reason (apart from the presence of the Safer Schools Officers) and that there should be parental and headteacher permission for a police officer to speak to a child in an educational setting.

8 Accountability & Monitoring Arrangements (20.35)

8.1 The item would cover what structures were in place to plan, coordinate and monitor the responses to recommendations and actions set out in:

- The Serious Case Review (SCR)
- Correspondence between the Chief Executive of London Borough of Hackney and the Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit
- The Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) (once published)

8.2 The item would also cover how partners would ensure that such accountability and monitoring structures were open, transparent, and accountable to local communities.

8.3 Attending for this item was:

- Jim Gamble, Independent Chair - City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership
- Rory McCallum, Senior Professional Adviser, Safeguarding & Learning - London Borough of Hackney
- Borough Commander Marcus Barnett, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets)
- Area Commander Paul Brogden, Frontline Policing Crime and Public Protection Met HQ
- Detective Superintendent Adam Ghaboos, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets)
- Chief Inspector Lucky Singh, Central East Borough Command Unit (Hackney and Tower Hamlets)
- Mayor Philip Glanville
- Councillor Susan Fajana Thomas, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services
- Councillor Anntoinette Bramble, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care
- Mark Carroll, Chief Executive,
- Jacquie Burke, Group Director Children and Education
- Annie Gammon, Director of Education
- Sonia Khan, Head of Policy & Strategic Delivery
- Kenny Bowie, Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight MOPAC)

8.4 In the interest of time, the Chair noted the reports received and included in the agenda pack and invited Commission Members to put any questions related to the information received to those guests in attendance.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

8.5 Hackney Education operated an approach in which senior officers were placed on the governing bodies of local maintained schools and some academies. A Commission Member asked what the purpose of such an approach was, and whether the approach would give rise to potential conflicts of interest. The accountability structures in place across academies in Hackney in regard to safeguarding were also queried. .

- The Director of Education, London Borough of Hackney responded by explaining that having Council officers or Members sit on academy governing bodies or trust boards began when academies were first introduced in Hackney as a means of maintaining constructive dialogue whilst respecting the differing governance structures of academies.
- All schools and academies in Hackney had their own safeguarding policy that they were ultimately accountable for. Hackney's schools and academies were also required to identify safeguarding leads for both school staff and governors, and that the school or academy headteacher had overall responsibility for safeguarding.
- Safeguarding training undertaken by schools and academies was also assessed at regular intervals through Ofsted visits and the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership. She explained that regular audits are

Monday 13 June 2022

carried out by Hackney Education and, when particular issues or concerns were identified, safeguarding reviews would be carried out.

The Mayor of London Borough of Hackney was then invited by the Chair to comment on the issues raised.

- He pointed to the work undertaken by the Council to promote anti-discriminatory practices with school governors, with a range of work ongoing including diversifying governing board and developing a culture of inclusive governance.

8.6 A Member of Hackney Youth Parliament asked whether a community-led group would be established to hold the relevant safeguarding organisations to account in implementing the recommendations made in the SCR.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by outlining the MPS' commitment to ensuring local communities were more involved in scrutinising the MPS, and recognised the role that communities played in policing.
- A Youth Engagement Plan was under development and other engagement work was already in train such as stop and search role play scenarios where young people and police would get to change places and the virtual application 'A different view' which would give young people a realistic experience of an officer's response and duty for stop and search.

8.7 A Commission Member expressed concern about the community engagement structures in place within the MPS and sought reassurance that local community and consultative structures would be fully independent of the MPS and include genuine representation of communities from Hackney.

- The Borough Commander, Central East Borough Command Unit responded by outlining the various engagement and consultative groups used, such as the Independent Advisory Group and Safer Neighbourhood Board.
- Work was underway to make these structures more representative, but it was accepted that much more work should be done to ensure that these groups truly mirror the communities that they serve.

8.8 A Member of Hackney Youth Parliament asked how the relationship between the Youth Parliament and the Council would be strengthened to ensure that the Youth Parliament was more directly involved in representing children and young people and scrutinising local organisations.

The Mayor of London Borough of Hackney was invited by the Chair to respond.

- He began by saying that, due to the nature of the Child Q incident and the SCR process, it would have been difficult to involve Hackney Youth Parliament in the initial conversations following the incident.
- The Council's role since then had been to coordinate a wide range of community engagement activity and ensure that insight was analysed, synthesised and informed policy responses.

Monday 13 June 2022

- It had coordinated a series of workshops about the SCR, the recommendations and how they would be implemented, which included workshops with young people reached through youth and community settings.
- The Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Regulatory Services, London Borough of Hackney then responded to the issues raised by explaining that MOPAC was currently developing a scrutiny and community engagement framework and that local young people, particularly from the Black and global majority community were involved in this process.
- Following the initial stakeholder workshops as mentioned above, a Community and Stakeholder Engagement Group had been established for further conversations about specific insights and solutions needed.
- The Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care, London Borough of Hackney then added that work was underway to set up a staff network for Black and global majority staff and to work alongside schools to champion, recruit and develop Black and global majority staff.
- City & Hackney Safeguarding Partnership had indicated that a Core Group within the safeguarding partnership would monitor and oversee the response and implementation of the SCR recommendations.

8.9 A Commission Member asked what structures were in place to ensure the local community would know that partners were making timely and effective progress in response to the recommendations given that the group did not report publically.

- The Chief Executive, London Borough of Hackney began by highlighting that the Independent Convenor, City & Hackney Safeguarding Partnership would provide critical challenge and appraisal of the response to the SCR recommendations.

The Chair then invited the Senior Professional Adviser, Safeguarding & Learning, London Borough of Hackney to respond to the question.

- He advised that an update report would be published by the City & Hackney Safeguarding Partnership on the progress made against the SCR recommendations, and that the Child Q incident would feature heavily in its Annual Report.
- The update report would be written by the Independent Convenor and would provide a comprehensive account of the progress made in the 6-9 months following the publication of the SCR.

The Mayor, London Borough of Hackney was then invited to comment on the issues raised.

- He highlighted the extensive community engagement work undertaken by key stakeholders to provide ongoing information and updates on the implementation of the SCR recommendations and to ensure insight about the wider issues raised inform the policy response.

Monday 13 June 2022

- Community engagement work would take many forms, from meetings with local community groups to taking reports to the Health & Wellbeing Board and Scrutiny Commissions.

9 Summary and Next Steps (21.00)

9.1 The Chair opened the item by explaining that the Scrutiny Commissions would reflect on the evidence submitted and write to the respective Cabinet Members and statutory organisations outlining recommendations for consideration.

9.2 The Chair highlighted that, following the publication of the Independent Office for Police Conduct report, the individual Scrutiny Commissions would review in more detail the specific actions, plans and work undertaken in respect of the Serious Case Review recommendations and medium to long term objectives to address public concerns around safeguarding policies and practices, organisational cultures, adultification, trust and confidence and community engagement.

9.3 The Chair proposed to hold a follow-up joint meeting to review the progress of monitoring and accountability for the recommendations, partnership working and the coordination of responses in March or April 2023.

10 Background Papers and Reports

10.1 The background papers and reports were noted by members.

11 Any Other Business

11.1 There was no other business and the meeting closed at 21.30.

Duration of the meeting: 2hrs 30mins