

Cabinet Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence

CABINET MEETING DATE

24 February 2020

COUNCIL MEETING DATE

26 February 2020

CLASSIFICATION

Open

WARD(S) AFFECTED

All Wards

CABINET MEMBER

Cllr Caroline Selman

Cabinet member for Community Safety, Policy and the Voluntary Sector

KEY DECISION

No

GROUP DIRECTOR

Ajman Ali

Acting Group Director, Neighbourhoods & Housing

1. Cabinet member introduction

- 1.1 I welcome the work of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission, and their review recommendations aimed at supporting the ongoing work to reduce serious violence in our borough whilst supporting people in Hackney to feel safer.
- 1.2 I also acknowledge and support the feedback provided by the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission in recognising the excellent contribution of the Integrated Gangs Unit in making Hackney safer and look forward to supporting the implementation of the findings.
- 1.3 The Hackney IGU is a well-established co-located team, bringing together experience and expertise from a wide range of stakeholders to reduce gang related violence in Hackney. The IGU has adopted a public health approach to reduce serious violence through the implementation of interventions aimed at preventing and diverting those at risk of gang exploitation whilst effectively reducing the recidivism associated with those affiliated to gangs in Hackney.
- 1.4 It is worth highlighting that the IGU is not a "stand alone" team but is one that strives to act as an integrated service to better coordinate supporting activities across the wider community safety partners including engagement with those communities affected by gang violence.
- 1.5 I am pleased to report that many of the recommendations contained within the Living in Hackney report are already being implemented including the recruitment of a mental health professional within the IGU to provide support to young adults who may be at risk of gang exploitation.
- 1.6 The scrutiny recommendations will be incorporated into a development plan for adoption and implementation to optimise the effectiveness of the IGU and wider partnership.
- 1.7 It should be noted that recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 from the review relate to the Council's Scrutiny Commissions receiving updates on or carrying out investigations of various aspects; responses to these recommendations have therefore been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs. These are appended to this report for noting.
- 1.8 Finally, I would like to thank the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission for their oversight and resilience in undertaking a comprehensive series of meetings, with a wide range of stakeholders, to inform their recommendations which will no doubt play a significant part in developing our approach to reducing serious violence in the future.
- 1.9 I commend this report to Cabinet

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. Cabinet is asked to approve the content of this response.
- 2.2. Council is asked to note the Executive response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence

Executive Response to the Scrutiny Recommendations

<p><u>Recommendation 1 – Development of Outcome measures for the Integrated Gangs Unit</u></p> <p>We ask that the next update to the Commission on the Community Safety Partnership Plan includes detail on the revised outcome measures for the IGU, the reasoning for them, and progress against these at that point.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>Provisional IGU measures have been agreed covering the outcomes and outputs of the component parts of the IGU. The indicators then form part of the quarterly report to the Gangs and Serious Violence Board (GSVB) for oversight and scrutiny.</p> <p>The IGU is to be reviewed independently commencing on 1st February 2020. Outcome measures for the IGU will form part of the terms of reference for this review with the findings feeding into the GSVB for sign off and implementation.</p> <p>We will be happy to provide the Commission with an update on this review - including the detail requested - at the appropriate point.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 2 – Improved information management of ‘non-live’ cases</u></p> <p>Full information did not appear to be at hand on what we would define as ‘non-live’ cases’ – those individuals which the IGU had previously worked with but no longer did so.</p> <p>Further to our questions, we heard that the issues would be addressed, including via a review of the referral process which would enable the IGU to provide a greater insight into the sources of referrals, and the results delivered following these. We ask that an update on this work is provided.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>Following the Living in Hackney scrutiny process the IGU has implemented a referral process incorporating both internal and external partners.</p> <p>This process is predicated on identifying those at risk of gang exploitation and ensuring that the risk is assessed and a proportionate response provided.</p> <p>Once an initial assessment has been undertaken the case is referred to either the Extra Familial Risk Panel or through the existing Gang Panel meeting. All cases whether “non-live” or “live” are tracked for progress and involve a wide range of statutory or voluntary sector</p>

	<p>organisations to safeguard the individual(s).</p> <p>The efficacy of the referral process is to form part of the IGU review commencing on 1/4/2020</p>
--	---

<p><u>Recommendation 3 – Greater transparency on the approach of the IGU, the cohort it works with, and how partners can support the work to achieve better outcomes</u></p> <p>We suggest that a starting point for this would be the creation of a dedicated page for the Integrated Gangs Unit, on the Council's website. This appears to be a gap currently, compared with some other boroughs with Integrated Gangs Units – for example Westminster and Islington.</p> <p>We feel this should provide details on its work and approaches, non-identifying information on the broad profile of the cohort, any common challenges faced, and the roles which other services and partners can play in helping to address these.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>Agreed. This recommendation has been incorporated into the IGU Gangs Action Plan to monitor progress.</p> <p>An initial meeting has been arranged with LBH Communications representative and the IGU to scope a terms of reference and to agree timescales for this piece of work.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Recommendation 4 – Greater representation of Children and Families Services in the IGU</u></p> <p>Children aged under 18 make up a significant and increasing share of the IGU cohort. We have heard about the practical benefits of a co-located model, with a range of services based in the same office.</p> <p>We feel that fuller involvement of Children and Families inside the IGU could enable more effective utilisation of the preventative resources in both areas. We saw the positive impacts achieved from part of the (Children and</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The Children and Families Service (CFS) is a significant contributor to the work of the IGU. For example the Youth Offending Team (YOT) has a supervisor and six officers co-located within the IGU.</p> <p>In addition CFS attend all IGU related intelligence, tasking and Panel meetings with the Head of YOT jointly chairing the Gangs Panel meeting, and there is joint attendance from the IGU and CFS at the Extra Familial Risk Panel where those at risk of gang exploitation are allocated to appropriate agencies for safeguarding interventions.</p>
--	---

<p>Families') Youth Justice service being colocated in the unit.</p> <p>We heard about successful join up between the IGU and Children and Families generally; for example in the Contextual Safeguarding Project. However, we feel there is room for a greater co-location of services inside the IGU.</p> <p>We ask that the potential for this is explored by the Executive Members with responsibility for Community Safety and the Children and Families Service.</p>	<p>At a strategic level there is CFS representation at the Gangs and Serious Violence Board and the Community Safety Partnership Statutory Officers Group. A contextual safeguarding representative also attends the IGU Gangs Panel and Intelligence Meeting together with the monthly Partnership Tasking Meeting ensuring that a consistent and joint up approach is evident.</p> <p>With regards to the Commission's specific recommendation, the Council is currently reviewing their Early Help services; this recommendation will be considered as part of the review and consideration will be given to whether there is any scope for further improving how all children who are at risk from gang exploitation and their families are enabled to access an early help offer, including parenting support, that effectively meets their needs.</p> <p>Children & Family Services are also currently carrying out a review of services for vulnerable adolescents as part of their plan to embed contextual safeguarding approaches. This review will be undertaken with a view to ensuring that our responses to all young people that may be at risk of extra-familial harm and exploitation (including those at risk from exploitation in a gang context) receive a coordinated response to their needs. We will consider what the links between any remodelled services for adolescents and the IGU should look like.</p> <p>The Home Office funded Trusted Relationships team within Young Hackney delivers detached outreach services throughout the week (Monday to Friday) with embedded Clinical Provision. The team already works in collaboration with the IGU and partners, but the potential to continue the service beyond the life of the grant and extend the current offer will also be considered as part of the Early Help Review.</p>
---	---

	<p>In terms of immediate actions to respond to this recommendation and also to inform the Early Help Review, the Children and Families Service will be reviewing representation from the Service at key panels, including the weekly Gangs Panel, the Partnership Tasking Panel and the Alternative Provision Panel.</p> <p>The Children and Families Service will review the support offer/services available at times of higher incidences of crime (Friday evenings and Saturday), reflecting initial feedback from the Young Futures Commission.</p> <p>The Children and Families Service will also look at providing trauma-informed practice training within the IGU which would be delivered by the in-house Clinical Service.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Recommendation 5 – For the IGU to report back on mental health services referral pathway for young adults in the IGU cohort</u></p> <p>With no dedicated mental health resource currently based within the IGU, we see the need for assurance around the referral pathways in place setting out the scenarios in which the IGU will seek mental health support for young adults in its cohort, and the routes that it will take to doing so. This assurance should be provided in the form of a formal referral pathway being shared with us.</p> <p>The East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) provides community and inpatient mental health services to children, young people and adults in Hackney. We feel that the referral pathway should be developed in partnership with ELFT, and that regular reviews should be carried out to monitor its effectiveness in brokering</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The IGU has recently made a successful funding application to the Violence Reduction Unit to recruit a mental health professional to work within the IGU to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a service to a number of appropriate cases with a particular focus on the 18 to 25 age group where mental health has been identified. ● Identify appropriate mental health pathways supporting indictable through the process. ● To provide advice and guidance to existing IGU professionals to better identify and respond to mental health concerns. <p>This post is currently proceeding through the recruitment process with the funding being available to 31st March, 2021.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the VRU funded role will be undertaken in six months with the intention of utilising the review to negotiate with the East London</p>
---	--

mental health support for those within the cohort.	<p>Foundation Trust (ELFT) to mainstream the resource in 2021/22.</p> <p>A formal referral pathway will be developed with ELFT and shared with the Commission.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Recommendation 6 – ELFT as partner in IGU</u></p> <p>In the longer term, we feel there should be a mental health specialism inside the IGU¹.</p> <p>We have seen the benefits of a co-located, IGU model. We have also heard about the prevalence of mental health issues among those in the cohort, both among those aged up to 19 and those above this.</p> <p>We ask that the Council seeks to explore with ELFT the feasibility of their becoming a partner agency of the IGU, and for them to provide a dedicated mental health specialist resource.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>This recommendation is intrinsically linked to 5 above.</p> <p>Contact will be made with (ELFT) with the intention of gaining their expertise and support to design the post profile for the IGU mental health professional (funded by VRU to 31/3/21).</p> <p>As a key partner ELFT will be involved in identifying options around how this role will be mainstreamed at the conclusion of the VRU funding allocation.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Recommendation 7 – For the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to explore mental health provision for 19-25s compared to young people aged under 18</u></p> <p>We feel that an item at the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission might explore the differences in mental health provision for those aged up to 18, and those aged 19 to 25.</p> <p>We suggest that to give best focus to the item, that it might explore typical mental health provision and arrangements for 15 to 18s compared to 19 to 25s. This is due to Hackney's</p>	<p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p>
--	---

¹ If enacted, one of our recommendations would see greater involvement of the Children and Families Service within the IGU which we would hope would include the Clinical Service offering specialist psychological support to children aged up to 19 and their families.

Community Safety Partnership's Strategic Assessment findings around the peak (starting) age ranges for involvement in gang flagged crimes and knife flagged crimes.	
---	--

<p><u>Recommendation 8 – Applying learning from pilot delivery of mental health provision in community settings, to the IGU</u></p> <p>Mental ill health is a common issue among both children and adults being worked with by the IGU. A significant share of the cohort is made up of black boys and young men. Evidence shows that tailored approaches can provide more effective pathways to mental health care for this community group, in cases where it is needed. This is due to cultural and structural barriers which can make traditional routes less accessible.</p> <p>We note the pilot led by the East London NHS Foundation Trust which delivered support in community settings. This was found to better enable young black men with mental health needs, to engage, compared to traditional primary care routes.</p> <p>We ask for an assessment – led by the Executive Members with responsibility for Health, Community Safety, and the Improving Outcomes for Young Black Men Programme – to be carried out exploring whether and how learning from this pilot can be applied within the IGU.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>A mental health group exists as part of the Improving Outcomes for Young Black Men Programme that is chaired by Amy Wilkinson, Programme Director for Children Families and Maternity Services Workstream of Integrated Commissioning and Alice Deacon, Assistant Head of Service for Young Hackney.</p> <p>The approach taken by ELFT will inform the work to be undertaken by the IGU Mental Health professional. Links to the YBM initiative are already well established through a variety of forums .</p> <p>Progress towards the adoption of the ELFT pilot will be monitored at the GSVB with an estimated deadline for implementation of the IGU approach being 1 March 2020.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Recommendation 9 – For any future pre-apprenticeship programmes to include the IGU cohort in any ring-fencing arrangement</u></p> <p>We ask that any future pre-apprenticeship programmes by the</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The IGU is undertaking work to scope the likely demand for apprenticeship positions from the IGU cohort and those young people at risk of gang exploitation. This scoping work will also include analysis of the extent to which a pre-</p>
---	---

<p>Council include the IGU cohort within any ring-fencing arrangement, and also that the IGU and the Hackney Works Service explore how the IGU cohort can be best supported to accessing these opportunities.</p>	<p>apprenticeship programme, along the lines of existing traineeship programme developed by the Council, would be required in order to ensure these young people are ready and likely to succeed on an apprenticeship.</p> <p>Once the scoping work has been completed, recommendations will be made to the Gangs and Serious Violence Board (GSVB) outlining the delivery options.</p> <p>The proposed options analysis will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ringfencing apprenticeship posts for this cohort • integrating this cohort within the existing apprenticeship programme • developing a bespoke pre-apprenticeship programme for this cohort, to provide a stepping stone to an apprenticeship, work placement and/or job. <p>The options paper will be produced by 1 April 2020.</p>
---	---

<p><u>Recommendation 10 – For the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission to explore employment and skills support for ex-offenders</u></p> <p>We note the well-known difficulties ex-offenders face in securing work – both those within the IGU cohort and ex-offenders more broadly. We recommend that the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission explores how the Council and its partners (including the private sector) are working to provide employment and skills support to this group generally, and the feasibility of a dedicated support offer by the Hackney Works Service.</p>	<p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Recommendation 11 – For the IGU to consult the community on a possible name change</u></p>	<p>Response</p> <p>From consultation with key individual community networks together with gang</p>
---	---

<p>On a local level we ask the Council considers changing the name of the Integrated Gangs Unit, in consultation with the community. We feel that a name change could give some assurance to those suffering stigmatisation from the careless way in which the term gang is sometimes used.</p>	<p>professionals it was felt that the IGU is becoming a well known brand within affected communities particularly through the work of the IGU Community Co-ordinations.</p> <p>It is our intention to dedicate an agenda item at the IGU Community Forum to consult with key individual community members concerning this recommendation.</p>
---	---

<p><u>Recommendation 12 – To report back on how the findings of mapping exercise are being taken forward</u></p> <p>We welcome the significant work by the Council, partners and the wider community which has enabled the production of the provision mapping resource. We see the challenge now as ensuring continued focus on this area by all partners, and achieving a joined up response to those aspects where improvement / greater focus was needed. For our part, we would suggest that they might be translated into a mutually agreed action plan.</p> <p>We ask that the Council – further to discussions with its partners – reports back to the Commission on how these challenges can be best met.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The Mapping Exercise which was shared with the Commission in November 2018 was used to inform the development of an action plan. Oversight of this action plan sits with the Community Resilience Partnership which is part of the Community Safety Partnership, and brings statutory partners together with a broader range of voluntary and community sector organisations. Their role is to discuss the broader risks and issues related to community safety that require partnership action, cross-cutting themes and community engagement.</p> <p>The priorities in the action plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing our network - improving how we engage and collaborate with the • Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS). • Engaging and involving parents/carers and communities. • Improving confidence and trust in Policing. • Engaging Young people. • Reducing school exclusions. • Improving outcomes for young black men. • Reducing harm. <p>We have also undertaken a piece of work to improve and make our community more systematic in the aftermath of a serious violence incident.</p>
---	---

	<p>Some of the issues which were identified through the mapping related to service improvement. These have been fed back to the relevant services and have informed wider service development. In some cases there will be the opportunity to align this improvement with the outcomes from the Young Futures Commission as well.</p> <p>Many of the issues that were identified call for a greater cross cutting whole systems approach to tackling serious violence; we have been developing this approach and will be taking it forward in 2020.</p> <p>We are happy to report back to the Commission during the next municipal year.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Recommendation 13 – Ongoing engagement between Chief Executive and Inspirational Leaders</u></p> <p>Inspirational leaders of the YBM Programme made a number of points around barriers to opportunities and positive outcomes. We welcomed the response of the Council's Chief Executive to these points.</p> <p>This included a commitment to continued engagement from the Council with Inspirational Leaders.</p> <p>One of the specific barriers mentioned was a lack of facilities and spaces to develop businesses within. On this point, the Chief Executive spoke on the Council seeking to provide more workspaces through utilisation of unused spaces. He felt that shares of these might be made available for</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The leadership and governance of the YBM programme has been reviewed to enable youth leadership over the direction and vision for the programme. In the new structure, oversight of the programme will ultimately be via this community panel. Council officers will be expected to engage and to be accountable for the impact of delivery to this new panel.</p> <p>The Chief Executive is happy to meet with the youth leaders to discuss the new governance for the programme as part of its implementation. It would be helpful to discuss their ideas for how to make the governance as impactful as possible.</p> <p>However, we would also suggest that the engagement with senior officers goes well beyond this, so that there is an emphasis on the systems change and</p>
---	---

<p>young people wanting to start-up businesses.</p> <p>Another barrier mentioned was a lack of advice and guidance for those interested in setting up businesses. In response the Chief Executive said that he would reflect on how the Landing Pad which the Council was seeking to provide for new businesses to the borough (to better enable access to business planning, financial and other advice) could be made available more widely.</p> <p>We ask that the Chief Executive meets Inspirational Leaders to explore how these aspects and any others can be taken forward.</p>	<p>systems leadership within the organisation, rather than relying on the idea that for actions to take place the Chief Executive has to be involved. This would mean that a regular cycle of meetings will be held with leads on delivery of programme work (e.g. Directors or Heads of Service). The youth leaders will be split into project teams and will engage with specific senior officers based on the theme outlined (in this case Serious Youth Violence).</p>
--	--

<p><u>Recommendation 14 – For the Council to continue to make the case for a reversal of local Police Officer reductions</u></p> <p>We call for the Mayor of London to continue to make the case for a fair settlement for the MPS, and for the Council to lobby towards ensuring that any more realistic London wide funding is translated into a greater local police presence in Hackney.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>This will continue to be a political priority informed by the Community Safety Cabinet lead.</p> <p>On 19 October 2019 the government announced that funding will be made available in 2020/21 for an extra 6,000 Police Officers nationally.</p> <p>Although the exact numbers of new recruits within Hackney for this period has not been confirmed it is proposed that any local increase will be dedicated to proactive street based activities, including the reduction in gang related violence.</p>
---	--

<p><u>Recommendation 15 – For the Police and Monitoring Groups to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney Scrutiny on stop and search activity, and the engagement between them</u></p>	<p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p>
--	---

<p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny will seek to re-establish annual updates on stop and search activity, the engagement between the police and monitoring groups, and the outcomes of this. We hope that this can help better ensure on-going engagement.</p> <p>In reflection of our findings from the discussion with the police and monitoring groups, we will include consideration of the points below, within the next item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of body worn camera dip sampling exercises (we heard that these had started only recently) • Engagement of the community in training • Section 60 communications and consultation (both monitoring groups reported that the engagement of the police prior to enacting Section 60 notices fell immediately after the move to the BCU model, and the BCU themselves acknowledged they were working on addressing this issue) 	
<p><u>Recommendation 16 – For Community Safety Partnership to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney on its Trust and Confidence Action Plan</u></p> <p>The Commission will seek annual updates against the Action Plan regarding Trust and Confidence, from the Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>In line with our review findings in this area, as part of the first item we will seek updates on:</p>	<p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status and activities of the BCU-wide Confidence and Satisfaction Board • The BCU's engagement with the Young People's Independent Advisory Group • The BCU's work to maintain active engagement with the community and to improve communication of engagement events • Any action by the BCU to facilitate greater engagement between the community and central MPS units. 	
--	--

Cabinet Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence

Appendix 1 - Responses to recommendations for Scrutiny Commissions

Implementation of four of the recommendations from the review would rely in the first instance on Scrutiny Commissions seeking to incorporate particular items into their work programmes.

This considered, responses to each of these recommendations have been provided by the Chairs of the relevant Scrutiny Commission, and are included in this appendix for Cabinet to note.

It is important to note that implementation would also rely on engagement and facilitation by the Council and external partners. The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission will monitor this engagement and facilitation as appropriate.

<p><u>Recommendation 7 – For the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to explore mental health provision for 19-25s compared to young people aged under 18</u></p> <p>We feel that an item at the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission might explore the differences in mental health provision for those aged up to 18, and those aged 19 to 25.</p> <p>We suggest that to give best focus to the item, that it might explore typical mental health provision and arrangements for 15 to 18s compared to 19 to 25s. This is due to Hackney's Community Safety Partnership's Strategic Assessment findings around the peak (starting) age ranges for involvement in gang flagged crimes and knife flagged crimes.</p>	<p>Response (Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Chair, Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>I am supportive of the value of scrutiny comparing and contrasting the extent and nature of the mental health services available for young people at different times during their adolescence. I will consult Members and the support officer for the Commission on the most appropriate format for any item or review into this area, and on how this can be incorporated into our forward planning.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 10 – For the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission to explore employment and skills support for ex-offenders</u></p> <p>We note the well-known difficulties ex-offenders face in securing work – both those within the IGU cohort and ex-</p>	<p>Response (Cllr Mete Coban, Chair, Skills, Economy and Growth Commission):</p> <p>I am supportive of scrutiny exploring the important topic of skills and employment support for ex offenders. I agree that this should include consideration of the support given to ex offenders in the</p>

<p>offenders more broadly. We recommend that the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission explores how the Council and its partners (including the private sector) are working to provide employment and skills support to this group generally, and the feasibility of a dedicated support offer by the Hackney Works Service.</p>	<p>borough by the Council and its Hackney Works Service specifically, and by our partners. I will consult with Members and the support officer for the Commission on the most appropriate format for any item or review into this area, and on how this can be incorporated into our forward planning.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Recommendation 15 – For the Police and Monitoring Groups to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney Scrutiny on stop and search activity, and the engagement between them</u></p> <p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny will seek to re-establish annual updates on stop and search activity, the engagement between the police and monitoring groups, and the outcomes of this. We hope that this can help better ensure on-going engagement.</p> <p>In reflection of our findings from the discussion with the police and monitoring groups, we will include consideration of the points below, within the next item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of body worn camera dip sampling exercises (we heard that these had started only recently) • Engagement of the community in training • Section 60 communications and consultation (both monitoring groups reported that the engagement of the police prior to enacting Section 60 notices fell immediately after the move to the BCU model, and the BCU themselves acknowledged they were working on addressing this issue) 	<p>Response (Cllr Sharon Patrick, Chair, Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission will liaise with the Police and the Stop and Search Monitoring Groups in order to seek to receive annual updates around stop and search activity, the work of the monitoring groups, and on the extent of engagement between these stakeholders.</p> <p>The first of these annual updates is planned for the Commission’s meeting in March 2020. This will give specific consideration to the points flagged in the recommendation.</p>
---	--

<p><u>Recommendation 16 – For Community Safety Partnership to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney on its Trust and Confidence Action Plan</u></p> <p>The Commission will seek annual updates against the Action Plan regarding Trust and Confidence, from the Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>In line with our review findings in this area, as part of the first item we will seek updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status and activities of the BCU-wide Confidence and Satisfaction Board • The BCU's engagement with the Young People's Independent Advisory Group • The BCU's work to maintain active engagement with the community and to improve communication of engagement events • Any action by the BCU to facilitate greater engagement between the community and central MPS units. 	<p>Response (Cllr Sharon Patrick, Chair, Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>During its review the Commission heard that an action plan on trust and confidence this was being developed within the new Community Safety Partnership Plan.</p> <p>We will liaise with the Co-Chairs of the Community Safety Partnership to seek annual updates against this action plan.</p> <p>The first of these annual updates is planned for the Commission's meeting in March 2020. This will give specific consideration within the item to the points flagged in the recommendation.</p>
--	---