

Meeting Information

Title:	Notes of the BHR Safeguarding Partnership Meeting
Date:	15 October 2020
Chair:	Elaine Allegretti, Director of People and Resilience, London Brough of Barking and Dagenham
Secretariat:	Eleanor Parkin, Partnership and Programmes Manager, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Venue:	MS Teams

Attendance

Name	Title	Agency
Attendees:		
Elaine Allegretti (EA)	Director of People and Resilience	LB Barking & Dagenham
Kate Byrne (KB)	Designated Nurse Looked After Children	BHR CCGs
Teresa DeVito (TDV)	Head of Service - Safeguarding & Quality Assurance	LB Barking & Dagenham
Mark Gilbey-Cross (MGC) (for JH)	Deputy Nurse Director (Acting)	BHR CCGs
Gordon Henderson (GH) (attended the meeting for the first hour)	Detective Chief Inspector (DCI) – Safeguarding Children (Attending for John Carroll)	MPS East Area BCU
Adrian Loades (AL)	Corporate Director of People	LB Redbridge
Robert South (RS)	Director of Children's Services	LB Havering
Eleanor Parkin (EP)	Partnerships & Programmes Manager	LB Barking & Dagenham
Lesley Perry (LP)	Partnerships Manager	Redbridge SCP & SAB
Martin Wallace (MW)	Partnerships & Learning Manager	LB Havering
Apologies:		
John Carroll (JC)	Det. Superintendent Safeguarding	MPS East Area BCU
Jacqui Himbury (JH)	Nurse Director	BHR CCGs

Notes

- 1 Welcome**
EA welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies had been received as above. All agencies represented.
- 2 Notes of Previous Meeting – 09 09 2020**
The draft notes of the previous meeting were agreed.
- 3 Action Log 2020 - 2021**
An updated version of the Action Log was presented.

Action 2020/01 - C/F – awaiting confirmation that ToR have been added to B&D SCP and Havering SCP websites.

Action 2020/07 - C/F – awaiting update from AL. Added to October agenda (TBC) and JC added to action.

Action 2020/08 – C/F – Gordon Henderson to remind John Carroll to seek clarification of new timescales for Prevent referral form trail to be discussed outside of the meeting with borough leads.

Action 2020/16 – Report scheduled to be shared with CDR Manager for consideration once in post. Anticipated first week in November. C/F

2020/17 – Gordon Henderson to raise with John Carroll to take forward a meeting between BCU and Borough leads to consider project of engagement with LAC and care home providers in relation to missing.

2020/22 – CDR manager would be in post from mid-November 2020

2020/25 – Comments to be signed off. Action closed.

2020/26 – Action to be closed.

2020/27 – Action to be closed.

2020/28 – Action to be closed.

4. Update from Partners on Impact and Response to COVID-19

BHR CCG:

- 2 key concerns were raised:
- i) Access to phlebotomy services – 38,000 blood tests to be carried out across BHR. It had been raised as a system wide serious incident to be led by Ceri Jacob. It was a significant issue locally and could lead to a potential clinical harm review.
- ii) Emergency Department at Queen’s Hospital – not meeting 4hours target at 35-40% on a daily basis currently.
- Concern was raised about the quality and governance at Queen’s Hospital, it had been taken back into the senior nurses’ group; a new director appointed.
- Serious incidents were ongoing concerns, some were at a more serious level, for example appropriate escalations leading to emergency department admission.
- A rising number of children with mental health needs were presenting at the emergency department at Queen’s, in some cases a small number of young people were noted to have been waiting for up to 5 days. This was highlighted as a safeguarding concern along with mental health needs being significantly higher in Barking & Dagenham
- EA questioned under the compact arrangement, whether the cases were being escalated. MGC noted the issue had been raised in June, there had been no escalation to the director of safeguarding, and it was worrying to hear that the escalation was not working as it should. The audit would reveal where the sticking points were
- A lack of tier 4 beds or linking with social care for social workers was discussed to better understand the issues around escalations. It was noted that some of the issues were relating to housing – multiple occupancy and overcrowding often meant it was not safe to return home
- RS questioned whether there was a higher proportion being seen out of hours, and if fundamentally a different offer was needed. It was hoped the audit would provide the data and information

- Havering were not seeing escalations coming through; there was a rise of young people placing themselves in very high-risk situations and there was a yo-yoing of placements at tier 4
- A trend in Redbridge of 14-15 year old Asian women with no iteration prior to lockdown now presenting was noted
- In summary the escalation process was not working effectively and was linked to NELFT, but not related to social care
- **Action: EA agreed to put the effectiveness of escalations process and issues with MH presentations and waiting times at Queen's Hospital on the agenda at SOCG**

LB Redbridge:

- Mental health needs had gone up across all children and young people, it was part of the environment in the current time. Regarding young Asian women, it was linked to pressures around schools, career prospects, etc.
- The quality of initial health assessments was being discussed at a senior level at BHR CCG. NELFT had agreed an independent audit of initial health assessments
- MGC noted further escalation at BHRUT where the midwife for teenage pregnancy had been seconded elsewhere during lockdown and this had been escalated for the post to be included on the protected posts list
- Internal quality safeguarding issue with Home Office dispersals had been raised recently, for example where health visitors were being linked to hotels.
- MGC reported that BHR had a high level of incidences that were critical or severe but that BHRUT only had 10 patients Covid related and only one on a ventilator; there was a lower number requiring critical care beds.
- The safeguarding activity in Redbridge was seeing a slow increase and it was the complexity of the cases, not the numbers, that was challenging.
- Regarding contextual safeguarding, the places of risk were different, and the nature of exploitation was different since Covid, a need for a refresh was noted.

LB Havering:

- Impact on the workforce of not being in the office and reduced support was raised. Caseloads had not risen but in the system people were feeling more pressured; concern expressed for the workforce wellbeing generally.
- There were many more referrals not known to services before Covid. As the new spike of cases was coming through, the balance between working online with families and face to face was being contrasted.

LB Barking & Dagenham:

- Escalation complexity was similar in Barking & Dagenham
- There was an upsetting neglect case that raised lots of questions; outside looking in – how no one had spotted this case. It was an issue for the local authority and would be a catalyst for step-change, there was a need to push to see a difference.
- KB noted that the neglect case was pre-Covid, the children were removed in March. The issue of supervision was questioned, why the elements of the case had not been put together to identify neglect for escalation.
- Workforce development was needed to ensure concerns were raised as people were not seeing the full spectrum of potential problems
- **Action: It was agreed the learning from the Barking & Dagenham neglect (BS) case would be brought to the BHR safeguarding partnership**

- There was a lack of partnership working in the MASH, it was seen as process driven, there were performance issues due to working virtually. MASH staff were coming back into co-working; GH noted that working from home worked best for the Police
- LP commented that in a recent thresholds meeting one predominant theme had been poor understanding of the different role of social care and education welfare.

MPS:

- It was noted that there was a 300% increase in referrals to MASH in Redbridge compared to last year and the thresholds were questioned.
- In terms of policing issues, there had been an increase in domestic abuse and violence, it was almost higher than this time last year. There had been an increase in sexual assault offences
- **Action: AL agreed to feedback to JC on the drop-off in the quality of Merlins, this may have resulted from thresholds, officers being deployed elsewhere and/or young people being placed in a borough where they know nothing of the area and consequently go missing.**
- AL noted there was a root and branch review of missing being conducted in South London, they were setting up a local team in the interim and the timescales were to conclude next year
- **Action: Redbridge to share the terms of reference for the Thresholds and Referrals Working Group meeting regarding Merlins, to illustrate a model of working together**

5. Joint Working with the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU)

AL gave a verbal updating noting that the BHR partnership may want to take collective action to address youth violence and gang affiliation when placed in our boroughs. AL had asked for a league table of boroughs placing in Redbridge and the numbers of missing. Consequently health, police and youth offending were working together.

Action: AL to share the league table of boroughs placing in BHR and the numbers of missing with EA and RS

EA noted there was lots of relocation, particularly SEND where for example, one group had travelled through Europe on Italian passports; there was a question over how it would be funded particularly with Brexit.

Agreed: EA and RS supported the proposal by AL to work collectively across BHR to address youth violence and gang affiliation.

6. Themed Learning Review Consideration – Adolescent Suicide

LP reported a repaid review had been undertaken in Redbridge, involving a young man known to CAMHS who took his own life. There were research and case studies on suicide and discussion held over whether it should be a Local Learning Review. Key issues to focus on were:

- Manchester research review
- Kent Safeguarding Children Partnership thematic review
- What the options are – off the back of the rapid review
- Themed audit

MGC noted the North East London Collaborative had very recently been set up and would be looking at tier 4 CAMHS beds. He agreed to supporting the process to go through CDOP and CDR process

RS noted transitional work had been a challenge. Suicide idealisation in the past, then death had occurred when they were a care leaver. The Kent report was helpful, it came back to workforce – knowledge and recognition – and how to draw staff together.

Suicide idealisation could be an area for collective audit, almost an assurance of mental health needs generally, focusing on transition. B&D were in the process of setting up a transitions team locally. NELFT had conducted a themed audit

Actions:

- 1) **it was agreed that adolescent suicide ideation would be adopted as the area of focus for multi-agency themed audit with a view to upping the profile through the Integrated Care System (ICS). It was further noted Domestic Abuse work had moved on rapidly and was therefore dropped as the theme for multi-agency audit.**
- 2) **LP to draft a letter with EA, as the BHR CYP transformation lead and from the BHR Safeguarding Partnership, to NELFT to ask for audit assurance on themes that came from Kent.**
- 3) **The scope of what the BHR Safeguarding Partnership is going to do on a themed audit of suicide is to be reported to the next meeting in November.**
- 4) **AL to task Judy Daniels, Head of Safeguarding and QA Redbridge, to lead on instigating the MA audit.**
- 5) **From Barking & Dagenham, Teresa DeVito was to link in Claire Brutton for the themed audit.**

7. Redbridge LSCB SCR Recommendations – Baby T

In relation to the recommendation on interpretation and translation services, JC had provided a comment that there was no issue for the Police. From the CCG perspective, it was not thought that there was an issue with translation services.

Action: LP to send letter to the Home Office as drafted and add a paragraph ‘as partners we are looking at this issue and would welcome their input’.

8. BHR Case Review Guidance, Process and Forms

Action: it was agreed that any comments on the documents should be circulated by correspondence to TDV within 2 weeks of the meeting. If there were no comments received, the protocol and documents were taken as agreed.

9 BHR Case Review tracker – was noted. No additional cases to add.

10. Phase 1 report – Multi-Agency Arrangements – Expert Review by Sir Alan Wood – Steps

The unique structure of the BHR Safeguarding Partnership was noted as likely to come to the attention of Sir Alan Wood.

Action: it was agreed the group would discuss its narrative and check its understanding of how the BHR Safeguarding Partnership links to local safeguarding partnerships, and to have a candid discussion at the next meeting in November.

11. Agenda Forward Plan – was noted as reported with the addition of the following agenda items to be scheduled as raised in the meeting:

1. Learning from the Barking & Dagenham neglect case (BS) - to be scheduled to a future meeting - date tbc on completion.
2. Paul Archer (Havering) to be invited to the BHR Safeguarding meeting to present findings on Neglect case - November
3. Collective work across BHR to address youth violence and gang affiliation – Develop the proposal made by DCS Redbridge and supported by Havering DCS and Barking & Dagenham DCS to be scheduled to a future meeting date tbc
4. Alan Wood Review – the group to discuss its narrative and understanding of the BHR safeguarding partnership and links to local safeguarding partnerships – November
5. MA themed audit on suicide: scope – Judy Daniels to lead on instigating the MA audit and report on the scope in November

12. AOB

RS referred to the previous conversation on neglect cases and taking forward practice review. A case where a girl had died with severe obesity was raised and Paul Archer was leading on the review, the casework was influencing the agenda locally.

Action: Paul Archer to be invited to the next BHR meeting to present the findings. It was suggested that both neglect cases would be used to test BHR priorities.

13 Dates of Future meetings via MS Teams

- 27 November 2020 @ 10:00
- 8 January 2021 @ 15:00
- 12 February 2021 @ 10:00
- 26 March 2021 @ 14:00