

<b>Title of Report</b>	Response to the Joint Living in Hackney and Children and Young People Scrutiny Commissions' investigation into the Child Q Safeguarding Practice Review
<b>For Consideration By</b>	LiH / CYP Scrutiny Commission
<b>Meeting Date</b>	25 April 2023

## 1. Introduction

1.1. In June 2022 the Children and Young People and Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commissions convened a joint meeting to review the strategic response of statutory partners to the recommendations from the [City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership \(CHSCP\) Child Q Local Child Safeguarding Practice Review](#), published in March 2022. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that:

- 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.

1.2. Following that meeting the Commissions identified four outstanding questions for the Metropolitan Police Service and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). The Commissions also made nine wide-ranging recommendations in relation to how the statutory partners might work together to ensure progress is made against the CHSCP recommendations and commitments made in relation to Child Q.

1.3. This report provides a co-ordinated partnership response to those recommendations and the progress that has been made to address public concerns around safeguarding policies and practices, organisational cultures, adultification, trust and confidence and community engagement.

## 2. Outstanding Questions to the Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC

	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Can further data be provided on the outcomes of strip searches (both thorough and intimate) undertaken in	MOPAC and the MPS publish various data dashboards that help to ensure policing is more transparent. The MPS has recently

	<p>Hackney, both for under 18s and adults and ethnicity?</p>	<p>published two new dashboards that contain relevant data. These can be found here: <a href="#">Custody Dashboard   Tableau Public</a> (includes custody strip searches) and <a href="#">Stops and Search - More Thorough Searches Dashboard   Tableau Public</a>.</p> <p>The following MPS data covers March 2022 (since SCR published) to 19th January 2023:</p> <p><u>Under 18's:</u>  More Thorough - 0 (November 2022)  More Thorough Intimate - 0 since March 2022.</p> <p><u>Adults:</u>  More Thorough - 7 (November 2022) (42% Black, 29% white, 29% Other) (100% Male)  Positive outcome 57%.  More Thorough Intimate - 60 (15% Asian, 51.7% Black, 26.7% White, 6.7% other) (95% male) 37 positive outcomes (62%)</p>
2	<p>Can further information be provided in relation to local stop and search data and the reasons put forward for this to take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can video recordings of stop and search incidents routinely be made available via Subject Access Request?</li> <li>• Is there any publicly available analysis of stop and search incidents which are not recorded?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MPS would need to be further understood why this was desired and what was the desired outcome. Video is viewed in the Community Monitoring Group and legal safeguards are in place for this. A Subject Access Request (SAR) would likely be refused as personal information and footage of an individual would be sent to a 'non-interested' party.</li> <li>• There is not currently publicly available analysis of stop and search that is not recorded. This can however be provided. In November 2022 99% of Stop and Search in Hackney had BWV (Body Worn Video) 1% or 7 searches did not. MPS analysis shows that all 7 instances were from one ERPT team, which has allowed this to be brought to the attention of supervisors and officers reminded of their responsibilities.</li> </ul>
3	<p>There has been a relaxation of the Best Use of Stop and Search (BUSS) guidance which means that the police would not need to notify/engage communities ahead of Section 60 being applied. Can the Borough Commander commit to retaining community notification ahead of any Section 60 stop and</p>	<p>While the BUSS Scheme has been relaxed nationally, the MPS still works within those parameters. This includes an ongoing corporate commitment to notify communities where reasonably practicable when a Section 60 order is in place, and MOPAC fully supports this position.</p> <p>The BCU Commander is committed to</p>

	search notice?	continuing to notify and engage with communities where practicable before S.60s are implemented. Central East Command has continued the practice to notify and engage since the relaxation of BUSS.
4	<p>It was noted that the MOPAC Disproportionality Board brings criminal justice partners together to tackle disproportionality across the system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How long has the Board been in place, what is its membership and what is its remit?</li> <li>● The Child Q case was considered by the Board. What was discussed and what were the outcomes?</li> </ul>	<p>The Disproportionality Board was established in October 2021 and brings together Criminal Justice Partners to tackle disproportionality across the Criminal Justice System.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Disproportionality Board sits within the LCRB structure to provide oversight, sharing of best practice and problem solving of work to tackle disproportionality across the Criminal Justice System (CJS).</li> <li>● The Board will seek to align partner interests towards reducing disproportionality across the CJS, to identify and align common themes of disproportionality across the LCRB Boards and to enable partnership leadership and delivery of the Mayor’s Action Plan for transparency, accountability and trust in policing.</li> <li>● The terms of reference, including details of the membership of the Board is outlined below:</li> </ul> <p>It will consider the standing items listed below and any other matters escalated to it from the other LCRB Boards or as put forward by partner agencies:</p> <p><b>Standing Agenda Items</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mayor’s Action Plan (every meeting)</li> <li>● Gangs Matrix (bi-annually)</li> <li>● Youth Justice Action Plan (bi-annually)</li> <li>● Race equality audit (quarterly)</li> </ul> <p>The Board met on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and given the significant issues raised by the case of Child Q, a portion of the agenda had been set aside to discuss the key issues and the partnership response.</p> <p>It was noted that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime had written to the London Safeguarding Board to look at the lessons for</p>

	<p>safeguarding across London, as the issues raised were unlikely to be specific to Hackney only, and that the Mayor had written to the Independent Office for Police Conduct, who are investigating the matter, to highlight stakeholders' concerns that the officers involved should face charges of gross misconduct.</p> <p>As well as broader concerns about MPS data gaps for age and ethnicity of individuals subjected to more intimate searches, Board attendees also discussed the adultification of Black children. The Youth Justice Board acknowledged a theme of adultification in some serious case reviews, with Black children appearing to be considered more culpable than White children and therefore routed through the criminal justice system, rather than supported in other ways.</p> <p>Actions from the meeting were agreed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The MPS to continue work to improve data recording and to increase transparency</li> <li>● The Deputy Mayor to write a further letter to the London Safeguarding Children Board to emphasise the need and the Board's support for a child-centred approaches.</li> <li>● MOPAC to flag this area of concern to the Casey Review Team for consideration as part of their wider work on the culture of the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>● MOPAC and MPS to work with London Councils to improve appropriate adult provision.</li> </ul> <p>Further work is underway to develop child-centred policing both nationally and with key partners in London.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3. Recommendations

#### Coordinated Partner Response to the Scrutiny Recommendations

Recommendation One	Response
--------------------	----------

## **LBH, CHSCP, Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC**

The Commission would welcome the development of a singular partnership wide action plan to coordinate the response to recommendations from Child Q SPR and other commitments stemming from this review. It is hoped that the action plan will clearly set out those priorities for improvement and/or change, together with those agencies who are accountable.

The work plan in response to the Child Q report covers a range of activity that has been broadly structured around four key areas. There has also been an underpinning focus on **active anti-racism**, either by way of distinct action by some organisations or as part of its inclusion within these work strands. Activity has included:

- **The Child Q Action Plan** – the response to the review’s 14 specific recommendations. Led by the CHSCP.
- **Work in Schools** – work focused on practice improvement in schools and joint working with the police. Led by Hackney Children & Education
- **Trust & Confidence in the Police** – work focused on the development and implementation of a shared strategic plan to improve trust and confidence in the police. The Trust and Confidence in Policing Action Plan, which has been co-produced by Community Partners, Police and Council and is overseen by a Police Action Board co-chaired by the CE of Hackney Council and the BCU Commander. The Statutory Officer Group of Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is ultimately responsible for the Trust and Confidence in Policing Action Plan, which is regularly reviewed by the Community Resilience Partnership group of the CSP (which involves a wider range of partners than the statutory officer group including community partners).

### **MOPAC:**

It is clearly preferable to have a single shared action plan for policing improvement and development. Such a joint plan is developing under the Community Resilience Partnership, which MOPAC attends, and we welcome the opportunity to continue to work jointly as relevant.

- **Community Engagement** – activity undertaken following publication to capture the voice of children, young people, parents / carers and community members. Led by Hackney Council in collaboration with other agencies, including those in the voluntary and community sector. Alongside this

activity is the engagement activity being undertaken by the Independent Safeguarding Children Commissioner.

The Council continues to coordinate a wider strategic response group (as outlined to Scrutiny in June). This has enabled the Council to maintain an oversight of all the community engagement that was undertaken in response to the child Q review and to draw out key insights that needed to inform ongoing work. This has now also informed the Council's anti-racism plan - latest update here. The Plan is due to go to Cabinet and Council in July 2023. As part of adopting the plan extensive governance arrangements (outlined in the update) will be established. The ask of all partners will be clearly set out and commitments are already being secured. The plan includes a definition of anti-racism that has been adopted by all London councils but was developed by Hackney.

Whilst the preference for a singular partnership wide action plan is understood, the breadth of work being undertaken could arguably make any such plan unwieldy and blur lines of accountability. At present different local strategic boards are overseeing different elements, with a Pan-London and national focus being applied to others.

For example, the responsibility for how the system learns the lessons from Local Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews is set out in the statutory guidance, Working Together 2018. At a local level, this lies with the statutory safeguarding partners - Hackney Council, the MPS and the NEL ICB. Safeguarding partners are expected to consider how improvements should be implemented locally, in addition to regularly monitoring progress. This is a collective and equal responsibility. In this sense, the governance arrangements comprising a Multi-Agency Core Group overseeing the progress of the specific Child Q action plan and reporting upwards to the CHSCP Executive are entirely appropriate. This plan should not be subsumed.

The plan governing the interface with schools is also considered to be best led via Hackney Education given the mature relationships and the developed forums already in existence. Steered through the Children & Education Directorate, the Group Director is a representative at the CHSCP Executive and a member of the Council's CMT. This governance allows for oversight of the specific progress being made by schools.

In terms of trust and confidence in the police, this is a broader issue that exists beyond the findings of the Child Q review and oversight by Hackney's Community Safety Partnership is deemed appropriate. How this sits alongside the wider [MPS Turnaround Plan 2023-25](#) is now being considered at a local level. MPS and MOPAC both welcome the opportunity to continue to work on improving trust and confidence in policing, in collaboration with community partners and the CSP.

That said, whilst the Child Q incident mainly highlighted issues regarding the police and schools, it has also reinforced the fact that there is a significant absence of trust (expressed by many of the young black people we have spoken to) in all statutory agencies. This means that Child Q needs to be placed in a wider context.

The case is symptomatic of a system that feeds the alienation and isolation felt by many young black people and their families. For this reason, the recommendations in our update report reference the impact of the Child Q incident in this broader context - the need to build trust and confidence in all statutory agencies.

Whilst addressing organisational cultures and adapting policy and practice in the short term are important, improving trust and confidence is a generational issue that will not be easily or rapidly addressed.

It is for this reason that the Independent Safeguarding Children Commissioner of the CHSCP believes it important for there to be a single, authoritative local oversight mechanism

	<p>over the many agencies who have a geographic footprint that is much wider than the London Borough of Hackney and the defined work-strands (and their plans) as they exist and as they emerge.</p> <p>Such arrangements should drive, measure and evaluate progress against the collective recommendations. Such an approach could provide reassurance and evidence the beginning of real change. However, a real investment must be made in early years work, i.e., the early identification of those young people likely to be isolated, alienated and excluded in future.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Recommendation Two</b></p> <p><b>Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC</b></p> <p>Members of the Commission retain strong reservations about the efficacy of the Metropolitan Police Service policy of undertaking strip-searches of children. Whilst additional controls for administering strip searches of children in response to the Child Q SPR have been put in place these do not sufficiently address the need for further protection of children or disproportionate impact on local communities. If this policy is to continue, it is recommended that this is embedded within a safeguarding first approach recognising first and foremost that children being subject to this procedure are children and should be afforded necessary protections to keep them safe, protect their dignity and be effectively safeguarded. In addition, further reassurance will also be required that ongoing use of such an intrusive procedure is appropriately targeted recognising the ethnic disproportionality evident in this data.</p>	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p><b>MPS:</b></p> <p><u>MTIP:</u> Central East BCU have implemented a safeguarding approach to children and More Thorough Intimate Parts (MTIP) searches. Since the publication of the SPR there have been no MTIP searches of children in Hackney. A trial has been created to implement if a child is MTIP searched, that is a trauma based response to safeguard the child's welfare and dignity, together with the presence of an appropriate adult in all cases.</p> <p><u>Strip Search:</u> It is inherently more difficult to track Hackney residents and Strip Search as they could be taken to any custody suite in London. Strip search is also conducted under different legislation and one of the main priorities is to locate items which could cause the individual harm. As with other forms of search, disproportionality has existed with Strip Search, however, efforts by the Commander with responsibility for Met Detention have reduced the instance of disproportionality with youths. In October 2022 31 Black youths and 30 white were strip searched. This is the first time this has been reduced to such a margin. In December 2019 black youths strip searched was 126 and white youths 41.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding:</u></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



	<p>It should be noted that more thorough searches can be a useful tool when safeguarding children who are utilised to carry controlled substances or weapons. The instance of which could increase if it was known that children would never be searched in this way.</p> <p><b>MOPAC:</b>  The Mayor of London is committed to taking a child-centred approach to everything we do and child safeguarding is central to this. The use of 'strip searching' is intrusive, but there may still be circumstances in which it is necessary to use these powers. It is therefore imperative that appropriate safeguards are in place, which are cognisant of child safeguarding and the impact of adultification, the potential negative impact of such powers, and that there is sufficient supervision to ensure officer compliance. Various changes were quite rightly made to MPS policy as a result of the SPR and these have had a positive impact in reducing the use of these powers. MOPAC is working with the MPS and other partners to establish the principles and parameters for a child-centred approach to policing and youth justice, and this includes further work to establish what this means in the context of the use of police powers.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Recommendation Three</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC</b></p> <p>The Commissions endorse the findings of both CHSCP and the Children's Commissioner in noting that the breadth, consistency and quality of data around the strip searching of children is inadequate. The quality and inconsistency of data available does not befit the intrusive nature of the strip search process and the personal impact it has on children or reflect the safeguarding duties and responsibilities of Metropolitan Police. MOPAC should improve monitoring, oversight and transparency of this data to enhance accountability arrangements for these intrusive and</p>	<p><b>MPS:</b>  MPS recording systems capture the full range of stop and search activity, including the different types of more thorough searches and those where intimate parts are exposed. A review of search records however highlighted some over recording of More Thorough searches where Intimate Parts are exposed in custody, through data being inputted both on the custody record system (NSPIS) and the search record system (CrimInt). Briefings have been provided to officers, supervisors and SLT to ensure the data is captured correct first time. Both post arrest custody strip search data and pre arrest More Thorough searches where Intimate Parts are exposed data are now publicly accessible on the internet via the London DataStore.</p>

<p>sensitive procedures and to ensure that children are effectively safeguarded.</p>	<p><b>MOPAC:</b>  Transparency and accountability are important in building trust, and they are central to the Mayor's Action Plan for Transparency, Accountability and Trust in Policing. As a result of our ongoing oversight of strip searching and other police powers, which predated the case of Child Q, the MPS publishes more data than any other police force area, and this now includes data on strip searching and more through intimate parts searching. This will remain a core part of our oversight of the MPS, including through the Disproportionality Board, and through the new approach to local scrutiny and engagement which is currently being developed.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Recommendation Four</b></p> <p><b>CHSCP</b></p> <p>All local agencies that work with children have an important and equal role in the effective safeguarding of children, as it is this broad network of partners which helps to create an environment which maintains oversight of children, promotes their rights, advocates for them and helps keep them safe. The Commission would therefore welcome reassurance from the CHSCP that there is no deference to any agency, and that this local partnership is one of equals in which individual agencies and practitioners are knowledgeable, confident and empowered to challenge and support each other where they see this is in the best interests of children.</p>	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p><b>CHSCP</b></p> <p>All organisations have an important and significant role to play in our safeguarding arrangements. That said, whilst there is a shared responsibility to safeguard and promote the welfare of all children, and whilst the CHSCP applies equal scrutiny and the same high levels of expectation across all, the system is not a partnership of equals.</p> <p>Not all organisations have the same statutory duties inferred upon them, with full details being set out in <a href="#">Chapter 2 of Working Together 2018</a>.</p> <p>For example, because of the changes to the Children Act 2004 (as amended by the Children &amp; Social Work Act 2017), the Local Authority, Integrated Commissioning Board and the Police now have the shared and equal duty to make the arrangements to work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of all children in a local area. These arrangements should produce the best possible outcomes, ensure children and families receive targeted services in a co-ordinated way and avoid fragmented provision that risks disengagement.</p> <p>Safeguarding partners also have the statutory responsibility to act as a strategic leadership group in supporting and engaging others; and to implement local and national learning including from serious child safeguarding incidents.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The responsibility for this activity and this local join-up doesn't rest equally with all organisations, but with the three statutory safeguarding partners.

Furthermore, it is only some organisations that have specific duties inferred upon them by way of Section 11 of the Children Act 2004. Section 11 places duties on agencies and individuals to ensure their functions, and any services that they contract out to others, are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

These (and others) might also be designated as 'relevant agencies' within the CHSCP's safeguarding architecture. Where referenced in part 4 of the Child Safeguarding Practice Review and Relevant Agency (England) Regulations 2018, agencies have a statutory duty to cooperate with the CHSCP's written arrangements. Others can be designated as 'Named Organisations' and whilst an expectation of cooperation exists, they are not under the same duty of cooperation.

On a practitioner level, there will also be significant differences in what is done by whom in the context of safeguarding children and the powers that those practitioners have within the context of applicable law.

In this sense, whilst we expect all organisations to work effectively together, and to adhere to the partnership's overall commitment and principles for safeguarding children, it is important that each organisation and each practitioner is clear about their respective roles and responsibilities within this area of activity.

Responding to the Commission's request for reassurance that there is no deference to any agency, this is best answered through explaining what we do in terms of the CHSCP's strategic and operational arrangements.

With regards to our strategic arrangements, following the implementation of new safeguarding children partnerships, more focus

has been applied nationally on the accountability of the three new statutory safeguarding partners. Whilst seen as broadly positive, these changes also led to a dilution in the expectations for local and independent leadership.

In the previous system of LSCBs, this role was fulfilled by an Independent Chair who would be expected to hold safeguarding partners (and others) to account for how they coordinated services and safeguarded children effectively. In many ways, the role of the Chair was to drive partnership activity, make sure that there was no strategic deference to any one agency and to ensure that all relevant actors were engaged. The Chair also held organisations and their leaders to account where required.

At the time, and as part of our response to the proposed changes, we maintained a clear narrative that there was a need to strengthen independence (beyond the independent scrutiny eventually described in the new statutory guidance). Whilst not every area adopted the same position, this led to the creation of the CHSCP's Independent Safeguarding Children Commissioner (ISCC). This role remains central to our local ability to ensure that all partners (including safeguarding partners) are held to account and that we avoid a system that effectively marks its own homework. This facilitates a system that can mitigate deference at a strategic level.

With regards to our operational arrangements, the need for practitioners to be curious and to professionally challenge have been core messages that are routinely promoted through policy, awareness raising and our multi-agency training programme since 2014. Curiosity and challenge are fundamentally about practitioners not deferring to another agency when they are concerned about a child or unsure what another practitioner might be doing / proposing.

We know that differences in professional opinions, concerns and issues can arise between practitioners and it is important that they are raised in the first instance and then resolved as effectively and swiftly as possible. Having

	<p>different professional perspectives within safeguarding practice is usually a sign of a healthy and well-functioning partnership.</p> <p>These differences of opinion are usually resolved by discussion and negotiation between the practitioners concerned. It is essential that where differences of opinion arise, they do not adversely affect the outcomes for children, young people or adults and are resolved in a constructive and timely manner.</p> <p>For several years, the CHSCP has had in place a defined escalation policy to support practitioners in this respect. The policy continues to be promoted (alongside other activity) to ensure practitioners are knowledgeable, confident and empowered to challenge and support each other where they see this is in the best interests of children.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Recommendation Five</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>CHSCP and Hackney Education</b></p> <p>The Commissions recommend that Hackney Education continues to monitor and audit safeguarding policies and practice across local schools to ensure that the safeguarding learning from the case of Child Q is reflected in annual reviews and updates of child protection policies which they are obliged to undertake. Alongside many parents, the Commission would like further reassurance that these important policies which help to keep children safe away from home are developed in collaboration and are actively and rigorously tested.</p>	<p><b>Hackney Education (HE):</b> HE discharges this recommendation by maintaining an overview of local area school safeguarding policies and practice through the work of the annual S175 Safeguarding audit process, as part of overarching Section 11 of the Children Act 2004 statutory duties.</p> <p>The process places duties on a range of organisations, agencies and individuals to ensure their functions, and any services that they contract out to others, are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. School based designated safeguarding leads (DSLs) are the point of contact with the LA for progressing this area of focus and access a framework of support and challenge activity from the LA and CHSCP to ensure timely updates of safeguarding and children protection policy, information, advice and guidance.</p> <p><b>CHSCP:</b> The CHSCP continues to help all organisations test the sufficiency of their safeguarding arrangements through its process of Safeguarding Self Assessments. This includes</p>

	<p>schools and colleges that are required to complete a specific tool focused on the education sector. This includes a focus on the expectations for policies.</p> <p>In 2023, the CHSCP will be launching a new requirement for Child Safeguarding Statements (CSS). Based on practice in Ireland under Children First 2015, CSS are a simple, yet powerful tool that can help promote transparency and provide a focus on how we collectively safeguard children. They can also help provide parents, carers and children themselves with reassurance that organisations / settings are safe, that risks are actively considered and that appropriate arrangements are in place to help and protect children from harm. Child Safeguarding Statements set out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A summary of the services being provided to children and families.</li> <li>● A statement on the organisation’s commitment to safeguarding children.</li> <li>● The potential risks to children accessing the service(s).</li> <li>● The measures in place (such as the people, policies and procedures) to ensure, as far as practicable, that children are safe from harm.</li> </ul> <p>Child Safeguarding Statements require sign off from Chief Executives / the most senior person within an organisation. This reinforces the need for these key roles to be directly engaged in and sighted on their organisation’s strengths and weaknesses.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Recommendation Six</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>CHSCP, LBH and Metropolitan Police Service</b></p> <p>The Commission would like further reassurance that the planned extension of adultification bias training is consistently applied and reflects the values and principles of the safeguarding partnership. The Commission would also like a commitment from the CHSCP that it will fully evaluate this training across</p>	<p><b>MPS:</b></p> <p>CE BCU continues to be involved in the joint agency training organised by CHSCP. Evaluation of this training would be welcomed. CE have 120 places on the training and so far 70 officers have been trained. Adultification training is also being inserted into new recruit training from 2023. The Leadership Academy will be delivering adultification training to IPLDP officers and first line leaders. Other BCU’s are starting to contact DSU Ghaboos as awareness is raised to discuss adultification training.</p>

<p>the safeguarding partnership to ensure that it is delivering the fundamental but necessary changes to safeguarding practice.</p>	<p>MPS stop and search policy has been reviewed and updated to fully consider the impact of a More Thorough search where Intimate Parts are exposed upon a child.</p> <p>A mandatory Merlin Safeguarding referral must now be submitted for every child that has had a More Thorough search where their Intimate Parts were exposed.</p> <p>Further to the above a trial has been created at CE to provide a trauma based response to those juveniles subject to any form of enhanced search (MTIP or Strip). This pilot is in the early stages and has been amended to include Strip search in custody as there have been no MTIP at CE since March 2022.</p> <p><b>CHSCP:</b> Recognising the need to immediately influence practice from the emerging learning of the Child Q review, the CHSCP commissioned a 12-month programme of Adulthood training in early 2021 (whilst the review was ongoing). Initially delivered to senior leaders across the safeguarding partnership, this training covers the broad concepts of racism, intersectionality and adulthood, helping practitioners understand notions of vulnerability and childhood and how these are applied to some children more than others.</p> <p>The CHSCP later doubled the number of sessions being delivered, to ensure maximum reach and impact to those on the front-line. Between July 21 and December 22, 23 sessions have been delivered, training 346 practitioners from the multi-agency partnership.</p> <p>The CHSCP programme ordinarily caters for a multi-agency audience, and whilst this is the case for the majority of Adulthood courses, a small number have involved bespoke sessions delivered to the police and education sector. Some organisations are also known to have commissioned this training on a single agency basis.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Courses continue to be promoted via the CHSCP Things You Should Know (TUSK) briefings and bookings are generated through the CHSCP's Learning Management System. Sessions are planned and advertised well in advance. The CHSCP training also remains free for all practitioners working with children and families in the City of London and Hackney.

As a theme of focus, Adulthood training is completely aligned to the CHSCP's principles for its safeguarding arrangements to be proactively anti-racist.

As with all CHSCP training, Adulthood sessions are subject to routine evaluation, with progress being reported to the CHSCP Exec and Child Q Core group. From the sessions held so far:

- 97% said the course met their expectations
- 85% rated their knowledge of adulthood as Good, Very Good or Excellent after the training.
- 99% thought the training will enable them to safeguard children and young people more effectively
- 83% of participants said the training has positively influenced their practice with regards to safeguarding children/young people
- 97.3% rated the trainer's skills, teaching style and knowledge as Good, Very Good or Excellent.

Wider testing of the direct impact of this training on anti-racist practice is underway as part of follow up surveys with participants and their managers. This intends to capture evidence and practice examples of how this training has made a difference to children.

Going forward, the CHSCP will be exploring options to mainstream adulthood training as part of its 'in-house' offer. This will help reduce costs to the CHSCP budget and firmly place the training in a local context, with local practitioners delivering.



<b>Recommendation Seven</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p data-bbox="159 246 654 324"><b>Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC</b></p> <p data-bbox="159 358 710 884">The Commissions believe that the Metropolitan Police Service’s current arrangements for consultation and community engagement are opaque, where named local community groups involved, the structures through which they are engaged and how the outcomes of consultations are used, remain unclear. The Commission recommends that the Metropolitan Police Service actively works with Hackney Council to review their arrangements and approach to engagement to ensure:</p> <ul data-bbox="191 896 710 1456" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an agreed understanding between the police, community organisations and other stakeholders on the principles of good local community engagement;</li> <li>• Greater clarity on which groups are consulted, in what capacity and how consultation is used to inform policing;</li> <li>• That those local groups involved in consultation truly represent the diversity of the community in Hackney.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="742 246 821 280"><b>MPS:</b></p> <p data-bbox="742 291 1436 515">It is concerning that there is perception that current arrangements for consultation and community engagement are thought of in this way. Local police are committed to working with Hackney Local Authority to remove the perceived opaqueness.</p> <p data-bbox="742 548 869 582"><b>MOPAC:</b></p> <p data-bbox="742 593 1420 772">MOPAC continues to expect and encourage a strong and consistent partnership between Hackney Police and Hackney Council to ensure effective engagement of local communities and organisations in local policing.</p> <p data-bbox="742 817 1436 1198">The Mayor’s Action Plan for Transparency, Accountability and Trust in Policing contains specific commitments to overhauling the current mechanism/s for community-led engagement and scrutiny of local policing, and MOPAC is working closely with Hackney Council, Hackney Police and Black Thrive CIC to consider how best to build a more inclusive, representative and effective system of community oversight in Hackney and across London.</p> <p data-bbox="742 1232 1013 1265"><b>Hackney Council:</b></p> <p data-bbox="742 1276 1436 2016">As part of the work of the Hackney Community Resilience Partnership, Hackney Council have been working proactively with MPS to develop their community consultation, engagement and scrutiny in the borough. This has included insight and co-production meetings with 40 Hackney community and voluntary organisations to develop a joint Trust and Confidence in Policing Action Plan. The Action Plan includes a specific set of 3, 6 and 12 month actions to increase community engagement - including youth led engagement events, scrutiny panels and Trading Places training, Innovation Hubs with young people and tech partners, wider community led engagement events in local neighbourhoods, and collaboration with MOPAC on a Hackney Local Scrutiny Pilot. The working group has also enabled a refresh of the CE BCU community partners communications list to include a diversity of Hackney representatives, specifically</p>

	<p>Black and Global Majority community groups and youth organisations who are happy to be in regular contact with the police.</p> <p>In February 2023 the Trust and Confidence Working Group, a partnership of community representatives, police and council officers moving the action plan forwards, will begin Police and Community Conversations across the borough - these are informal meetings led and facilitated by community partners to enable wider residents to engage directly with police to discuss community concerns and to hear about the work being undertaken on the T&amp;C plan.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Recommendation Eight</b></p> <p><b>LBH and Metropolitan Police Service</b></p> <p>The Commissions would recommend that Metropolitan Police Service, in collaboration with the London Borough of Hackney, commit to a series of community engagement events after the publication of the IOPC report and work with London Borough of Hackney.</p>	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p><b>MPS:</b> As part of the work identified in the Actively Anti Racist Hackney under the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP), in February the Central East BCU launched 'Community Conversations'.</p> <p>Engagement events following the publication of the IOPC report are in planning stages and facilitators and venues are being sought in advance.</p> <p>MOPAC also supports this recommendation and commits to providing support and assistance where it would be helpful.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Recommendation Nine</b></p> <p><b>LBH</b></p> <p>The Commission recommends that, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, Hackney Education reviews the procedure in which its senior officers are placed on the governing bodies of local schools. If necessary, guidance should be developed to ensure that where appropriate, officers can contribute practically and positively to such educational partnerships yet avoid any conflicts with their duties and responsibilities.</p>	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p><b>Hackney Education:</b> The process has been reviewed and led to the development of new guidance that has been shaped and designed with the work of local education system leaders, including governors and partners. The principles of the learning from the review process are already being adhered to, in order to minimise the potential for future risks in this area of focus. This is due to be shared with the CHSCP membership at the 2023 Summer Term Executive Partnership Board meeting for governance and oversight purposes.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



**Jim Gamble**  
Independent Chair  
City & Hackney Safeguarding Children  
Partnership



**James Conway**  
Detective Chief Superintendent & BCU  
Commander  
MPS



**Kenny Bowie**  
Director of Strategy & MPS Oversight  
MOPAC



**Mark Carroll**  
Chief Executive  
Hackney Council