

Meeting Information

Title:	Notes of the BHR Safeguarding Partnership Meeting		
Date:	07 May 2021	Time:	14:00 – 16:00
Chair:	Elaine Allegretti, Director of People and Resilience, LBBD		
Secretariat:	Martin Wallace, Partnerships and Learning Manager, LBH		
Online Platform:	MS Teams		

Attendance

Name	Title	Agency
Attendees:		
Elaine Allegretti (EA) (Chair)	Director of People and Resilience	LB Barking & Dagenham
Jemma Breslin (JB)	Business Manager	B&D MA Safeguarding Children Partnership
Kate Dempsey (KD)	Principal Social Worker	LB Havering
Teresa DeVito (TDV)	Head of Service - Safeguarding & Quality Assurance	LB Barking & Dagenham
Mark Gilbey-Cross (MGC)	Deputy Nurse Director	North East London (NEL) CCG
Adrian Loades (AL)	Corporate Director of People	LB Redbridge
Eleanor Parkin (EP)	Partnerships and Programmes Manager	LB Barking & Dagenham
Lesley Perry (LP)	Partnerships Manager	Redbridge SCP & SAB
Robert South (RS)	Director of Children's Services	LB Havering
Martin Wallace (MW)	Partnerships and Learning Manager	LB Havering
Guests: N/A		
Apologies:		
John Carroll (JC)	Det. Supt. Public Protection	East Area, BCU, MPS

Notes

1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

EA welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies from John Carroll were noted.

2 Notes of Previous Meeting on 26 March 2021

The notes of the meeting held on 26 March 2021 were agreed.

3 Action Log 2020 – 2021

An updated version of the Action Log was reviewed as follows:

- 2020/08 – Prevent Referral Form – TDV advised that a further update was still awaited. C/F

- 2020/17 – Work with Care Homes LAC going missing – JC unable to attend today’s meeting and provide an update. C/F
- 2020/22 – TDV to meet with Jeanette Ford, manager of the BHR CDOP, next week to discuss the information about the CDOP needed to complete the BHR case review procedures. C/F
- 2020/33 – AL to share with EA and RS info on children placed in BHR by other boroughs. C/F
- 2020/40 – Redbridge SCR Baby T – Response from the Home Office still awaited. C/F
- 2020/46 – Gangs and serious youth violence cross borough working – AL recently spoke about this with Anna Watson, who will now co-ordinate a meeting. C/F
- 2020/51 – Development of obesity pathway – MGC to chase up Paul Archer for an update. C/F
- 2021/56 – Capacity of Interact, or other solution, for support to schools – EA noted issues with Interact not always running until 10pm, sometimes only until 6pm. MGC noted this had been picked up by Doug Tanner, as Interact were given additional funding to extend their hours of operation. MGC and Kate Byrne to confirm the service level agreement and update the next meeting. C/F
- 2021/57 – LBBD restraint escalation policy to be shared – Although each individual school in B&D has its own escalation policy, the local authority has a restraint audit process, which can be shared. C/F
- 2021/58 - Provision of Section 136 data relating to schools if possible – Update still required. C/F
- 2021/59 – Government projections for demographic change – On today’s agenda (item 9).
- 2021/60 – Raising placements out of borough within the national independent review of children’s social care – AL noted that the national review was still in the process of being established but, once the time is right, this issue will be raised. C/F
- 2021/63 – Havering and Redbridge participating in B&D’s DV-Flag initiative – HNS to email AL and RS to explain what further decisions and actions need to be taken to enable this. C/F
- 2021/65 – Propose appointing the principal social worker from Redbridge to the BHR membership – AL advised that staffing issues had caused delays, but that it would be moved forward. C/F
- 2021/66, 67 & 68 – On today’s agenda (item 5)
- 2021/69 – Health inequality and impact of covid-19 on safeguarding across a range of protective characteristics – To be included on the agenda for the next meeting in June. B&D already have data available on this to monitor the surge in demand. Template to be made available to MW and LP so that comparative data for Havering and Redbridge can be produced in time for the next meeting. C/F
- 2021/70 – Inclusion of 5 cases from health in the audit of adolescent suicide ideation – TDV confirmed that this had been completed.
- 2021/71 – On today’s agenda (item 8).

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

LB Redbridge

AL: Redbridge is incredibly busy, having seen a significant surge in activity since schools reopened. There have been increases both in volume and in complexity, particularly in relation to parental mental health. There are also more concerns being raised about the impact of poverty, and there are worrying trends around suicidal ideation and self-harming. Safeguarding services are under pressure and work is currently underway with partners on thresholds and how to make a good referral.

LB Havering

RS: Havering is similar to Redbridge in terms of current demand, particularly in terms of complexity. Although referral volumes are not always higher, rates of conversion to assessment are higher. Ofsted will undertake a two-day focused visit next week, which is generating a lot of activity. The service is experiencing a challenge with staff and the availability of even locums to fill essential vacancies within assessment teams and longer-term social work teams. This is particularly challenging given the complexity of cases currently in the system, and is likely to be an issue across the region and sub-region. There may also be an issue for health and police partners around the impact of Covid on staffing, for example the police seem to have a reduced capacity in the Sapphire Unit.

AL: In Redbridge there is a growing concern in about lack of police participation in strategy meetings.

RS: There are similar issues in Havering. It might be helpful to look at data on this.

EA: This issue has been raised with JC for several months but has not moved forward. B&D data suggests that sometimes days go by with no police involvement. It appears to be a BHR issue rather than a London one.

ACTION: Concern about reduced police participation in strategy meetings across BHR to be discussed at the next meeting in June, and JC to ensure police representation.

LB Barking & Dagenham

EA: B&D has not stopped seeing demand, and Havering and Redbridge seem now to be experiencing the volumes that B&D has seen since November. There are 1000 more children in the system now compared to last year. There has been a significant rise in CIN at B&D, due in part to the Early Help system which is undergoing change to become a more strengthening and robust system. A referral has been submitted for a learning review about how the local multi-agency system – including schools and health – is functioning, and there is likely to be a second one.

TDV: There have been large volumes of LADO referrals since the schools reopened, and the complexity of cases coming through to child protection has also increased.

EA: B&D has appointed an independent scrutineer, to be discussed further later in the meeting.

North East London CCG

MGC: The decrease in active Covid cases has had a positive impact on the capacity of the acute trust. The general unwell are now returning to hospital, and the volume

of children and young people presenting with mental health issues is a concern across the tri-borough patch. There are delays in CAMHS assessment and a significant number of children and young people are being accommodated on inpatient units. This is the best that can be achieved at present given the issues around access to tier-4 beds, but assurances have been received that cases are being escalated appropriately. Attendance at Emergency Departments and Urgent Treatment Centres is increasing, some of which is due to concerns of recipients of the AstraZeneca vaccination about potential blood clots.

5. Update on work by local SCP business managers and independent scrutineers to review and develop BHR arrangements

MW: A meeting between the local business managers and independent scrutineers was held on 21st April to scope out a reviewed terms of reference, annual report and formal work plan for the BHR partnership. The scrutineers were of the view that, before these pieces of development work could be undertaken, the wider review of the BHR arrangements would need to be completed. Following the meeting, the scrutineers wrote to the BHR Safeguarding Partners expressing their view.

RS: There seems to be a consensus view between the three independent scrutineers. At the last BHR Safeguarding Partnership meeting there was a commitment to making the tri-borough arrangements stronger.

AL: The independent scrutineers' letter was a surprising response to the work that had been requested. It can be taken as a view of some of the stakeholders in the arrangements.

RS: The letter has raised issues that remain unresolved.

EA: Sometimes a wider footprint can be enabling, but sometimes it is not helpful to add another level of governance. The letter from the scrutineers proposes a review, which does not seem a priority, although others may disagree.

AL: Reviewing the BHR arrangements is not a priority, given the pressures on the service. It would have been hoped that the independent scrutineers could be more cognisant of the current situation.

EA: B&D's newly appointed independent scrutineer is focused more on the community than on process and governance.

MGC raised concerns, following a conversation with the Havering independent scrutineers yesterday, about how this has been conducted and how the letter has been put together.

ACTION: MGC and RS to have a conversation about the Havering scrutiny issue

AL suggested that there be a discussion between the BHR safeguarding partners and the independent scrutineers rather than a formal exchange of letters.

RS agreed that a conversation would be helpful and expressed support for a review of the BHR arrangements, as originally committed to, although the timing and format for the review would obviously have to be carefully considered. It is important for

independent scrutiny to have rigour, which may have been lacking from Havering's previous multi-agency safeguarding arrangements.

ACTION: EP, MW and LP to arrange a meeting between the BHR Safeguarding Partners and Independent Scrutineers.

6. Recommendations from LBD Neglect case; and plans for assurance exercise to ensure appropriate BHR response

EA asked for this item to be carried forward to the next meeting.

7. Learning from LBR Safeguarding Adult Review: 'Alice'

AL: Alice was a young woman who sadly took her own life after being placed in Redbridge by another local authority. Although Alice did not come into contact with Redbridge services before her death, the SAR – undertaken by the Social Care Institute for Excellence – raises issues about her experiences as a care leaver, and of being rejected by her mother. Alice had an extensive history of involvement with services and experienced frequent moves to different local authority areas. The SAR also raises stark issues about transitional safeguarding and support for young people beyond an experience of Children's Services into adulthood. Alice tragic story emphasises the work the Redbridge multi-agency partnerships need to do around this.

LP: The review report makes for difficult reading but provides very rich learning. Alice's case features almost every safeguarding issue imaginable, but the key one is how multi-agency partnerships can support very complex young people through the transition from childhood to adulthood and ensure a continuity of services.

RS: Havering published a SAR in 2017 about a young woman who experienced some similar issues to Alice. The review was undertaken by Michael Preston Shoot and was very influential in driving the development of new transitional safeguarding services. The learning from this could be shared across the BHR footprint if that would be helpful.

KD: Havering are in the process of commissioning Michael Preston Shoot to undertake a new piece of work that will revisit his original SAR and advise on how to develop local transitional safeguarding arrangements even further.

EA: B&D are currently thinking about what the offer for vulnerable adults is and the Redbridge SAR report may help with disseminating learning. Perhaps Children's and Adult Services across BHR could be brought together for a shared learning event on this theme.

RS: Michael Preston Shoot's original SAR led to fundamental change in how Children's and Adult Services work together in Havering, for example much closer collaborative work between the Heads of Service for Learning Care and Adult Social Care.

ACTION: Local learning on transitional safeguarding to be shared across the BHR partnership; and a tri-borough learning event on this theme, perhaps involving both Children's and Adult Services, to be added to the agenda forward plan.

8. Review of multi-agency arrangements in place across BHR to safeguard and promote the welfare of babies born during the pandemic

EA asked why this item was on the agenda.

MW: In response to the letter sent by Vicky Ford MP to local Safeguarding Partners last November highlighting this as an issue, John Goldup requested that it be addressed at a tri-borough level on the basis that statutory responsibility lays with the BHR partnership rather than the local partnerships.

AL: This could be a very literal interpretation of this group and its role, and where it is best placed for this work to be done. This group could ask its local partnerships to do this work and report back.

EA: This has been a significant improvement area for B&D and one on which they have had to give Ofsted a lot of assurances.

TDV: After the last Serious Case Review on the death of a baby, B&D have done a lot of work, including developing a specialist pre-birth team, which has had an impact across the local partnership system.

RS: Some assurance work has been done in Havering after the receipt of Vicky Ford's letter. Perhaps this group could be provided with assurances from each of the local areas on what they have done.

TDV agreed to circulate a briefing paper on pre-birth work produced by London network of Named Midwives for Safeguarding.

AL: Redbridge are currently undertaking work on unborns heading for removal to reduce that risk, following a lot of removals of newborns lately. This group can be informed on the development of this work and its impact.

EA: There is no need for a BHR review of multi-agency arrangements for babies because this is being done locally, and there should only be tri-borough collaboration where it makes sense. Assurances received at a local level will be fed back to the next BHR meeting.

ACTION: Each borough to update next BHR meeting on their local reviews of multi-agency arrangements for safeguarding babies.

9. Government projections for demographic change across BHR

RS: Some locally produced data on projected demographic change was circulated with the papers for this meeting, and – although it is not immediately urgent – it could be useful to produce comparative data across the three boroughs to help anticipate the impact on services.

AL agreed that it would be helpful to look at this, as the demography is getting more complex.

EA: B&D has just completed school projections, which suggest significant growing demand.

ACTION: Projected demographic change across BHR and the impact on services to be discussed next meeting; and EP, MW and LP to work on developing a comparative data set to facilitate the discussion.

ACTION: MGC to check with Doug Tanner whether the data work commissioned by NEL is relevant to this discussion.

ACTION: EA to check with Mark Ansell whether the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment is relevant to this discussion.

10. BHR Case Review tracker

TDV: The historical case currently being reviewed in B&D originally came in as a complaint but is now being dealt with as a local case review, conducted by Charlie Spencer, who has a background in adolescent safeguarding. The review is currently at the stage of all the involved services producing their single-agency reports. Once Charlie has spoken to the young person's mother for a second time, he will produce an overview report. The final report can be brought to this group for the learning to be shared.

AL: Redbridge have a meeting with the National Panel on 30th May to discuss whether a Child Safeguarding Practice Review is required on case EB.

11. Agenda Forward Plan Update

Items on the forward plan for inclusion in the agenda for the meeting in June were reviewed and agreed.

ACTION: Prior to the next meeting, partners to send JC and LP topic areas and questions for Detective Superintendent Jane Corrigan of SO15.

ACTION: MGC to deliver a presentation to the next meeting on the formation of the North East London CCG

12. Any Other Business

Renewal of joint BHR membership of TASP

LP asked if each partner agency – the three local authorities, the CCG and the police – were happy to invest £350 each in a joint membership to The Association of Safeguarding Partners (TASP) for a second year. TASP has put on some useful webinars, including hosting Sir Alan Wood twice; and, although they have so far allowed non-members to participate, this could change if they don't get enough paid members. TASP allow individual member partnerships to advertise on their website, and they are currently in the process of developing a national network for business managers.

AL, EA, MGC and RS agreed to renewing the joint membership to TASP.

ACTION: Agreement to be sought from JC for renewing the joint membership to TASP.

13. Date of next meeting and confirmation of chair

18 June 2021, 12pm