



## **MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY AND WELLBEING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** **Wednesday 28 November 2018 at 6.00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ketan Sheth (Chair), Colwill (Vice-Chair), Afzal, Hector, Knight, Mashari, Shahzad and Thakkar

Co-opted Members Mr A Frederick and Ms Askwith

**Also Present:** Councillors Hylton, McLennan and M Patel

**Absent:** Mr Milani and Ms Yaqub

### **1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members**

The following apologies for absence were received:

- Councillor Conneely (with Councillor Mashari substituting)
- Simon Goulden (Co-opted Member)
- Lesley Gouldbourne (Appointed observer - Brent Teachers' Association)
- Ms Sotira Michael (Appointed observer – Brent Teachers' Association)
- Jean Roberts (Appointed observer - Brent Teachers' Association)

Gail Tolley (Strategic Director of Children and Young People, Brent Council) informed the Committee that she would leave the meeting at 6:30 pm in order to attend a meeting of the Teachers' Joint Consultative Committee, following which she would return to the room.

### **2. Declarations of interests**

The following personal interests were declared:

- Councillor Ketan Sheth declared that he was a Lead Governor at Central and North West London National Health Service Trust; a Governor of the federation of St Joseph's Infant School and St Joseph's Junior School; a member of the Board of Harrow College and a Director at Daniel's Den Ltd;
- Councillor Colwill declared that he was a Governor at St Gregory's Catholic Science College;
- Councillor Knight declared that she was a Governor at Wykeham Primary School and a Co-founding Trustee of The Promise Foundation;
- Councillor Mashari declared that she was a Governor at Wykeham Primary School;
- Councillor Thakkar declared that she had recently been appointed as a Governor at Phoenix Arch School;
- Co-opted Member Alloysius Frederick declared that he was Chair of Governors at St Gregory's Catholic Science College; Chair of the All Saints Trust; and a National Leader of Governance; and

- Co-opted Member Helen Askwith declared that she was Governor at Wembley Primary School.

### 3. **Deputations (if any)**

There were no deputations received.

### 4. **Matters arising from the previous meeting**

It was noted that the minutes of the special meeting on the London Borough of Culture, held on Wednesday 21 November 2018, would be approved at the Committee meeting on Thursday 13 December 2018

There were no matters arising from this meeting.

### 5. **Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services Update**

Duncan Ambrose (Assistant Director, Brent Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)) introduced the report which provided an overview of the current Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) offer in Brent and the improvements and investments identified in the CAMHS Local Transformation Plan. Mr Ambrose pointed out that two out of three children with mental health conditions did not receive the support they needed. In order to address this, the National Health Service (NHS) had set up a plan for investment in CAMHS which was refreshed on an annual basis.

Mr Ambrose directed Members' attention to section three of the report which provided an update on progress against the CAMHS Scrutiny Task Group recommendations. In relation to increasing investment in mental health support in schools, it was noted that the Brent CCG had submitted a bid for School CAMHS service and was awaiting the outcome.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, Brent CCG had engaged with schools directly and through partnership fora to confirm the referral processes, leading to a positive impact in referrals. Work on developing a programme of peer and staff support in schools was ongoing as well as the engagement and recruitment of community champions.

Jackie Shaw (CAMHS and Eating Disorders Service Director, Central and North West London (CNWL) NHS Trust) added that Brent Council and Brent CCG had been successful in developing a children's eating disorder service which had the ability to assess urgent cases on the day of referral. She added that commissioning arrangements had been under review as services had to become more responsive to the needs of children and the increasing demand. A potential option to achieve this would be the commissioning of joint providers to operate in a similar way to Autism diagnosis support services. Furthermore, an urgent crisis service had been introduced which enabled children who presented themselves at hospitals to access specialist support 24 hours a day, seven days a week, while new discharge arrangements had made referrals to local services quicker. Nevertheless, the CNWL NHS Trust would continue to work closely with local communities in order to prevent children from going to hospitals unless this was strictly necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> The outcome of the application was expected by 15 October 2018, but it had not been made available yet.

The Committee welcomed the report and enquired whether the CAMHS in Brent were at crisis point. Mr Ambrose said that there had been a reduction in the number of children on waiting lists – 90% of children were seen within the target of 18 weeks which had reduced waiting lists by approximately 50%. Although the total number of children accessing CAMHS continued to increase, the service was not at a crisis point, but there had been concerns related to falling mental health workforce numbers. A number of professionals were leaving because it had not been affordable for them to live in London which caused issues related to the development and expansion of staff. Brent CCG held weekly conference calls with the CAMHS team to monitor recruitment to vacant posts and in cases where recruitment rounds had not been successful, relocation support and training had been offered to prospective candidates. Ms Shaw added that there was a retention group looking at recruitment and retention and examining the specialist roles the service needed. The issues with workforce recruitment and retention had an effect on the ability of Brent CCG and the Trust to transform the service and there had been reports of high levels of stress among staff. This had been addressed through supervision, support and staff wellbeing events. Apprenticeships for nurses and therapists as well as training contracts, along with internal promotions, had been considered where practical and initiatives such as rotating nursing staff between children and adolescent wards had been introduced. Moreover, peer support for young people who did not have diagnosable conditions was expected to reduce the need for specialist interventions. Furthermore, the Trust had put in place a number of measures such as using temporary staff, offering extra hours, addressing staff expectations and altering the service model. The way people entered the system, received support and were discharged was managed in a stricter way to address the discrepancies in the number of appointments children were given. The CAMHS gateway had been revised to ensure that it provided a consistent access route for all commissioned CAMHS in Brent, enabling referrals to be assessed in a timely manner.

A Member of the Committee enquired about the awareness of neurodevelopment disorders among General Practitioners (GPs), teachers and parents, as the majority of the referrals to CAMHS were made by GPs, parents and schools. Dr Ketana Halai (Clinical Director – Willesden, Brent CCG) explained that GPs relied heavily on reports received by schools as the 10-minute appointments they offered did not provide sufficient time to assess children in detail. Mr Ambrose added that often children referred to CAMHS had communication problems. Therefore, although speech and language support was provided promptly, diagnosis could be delayed. In addition to the specialist Youth Offending CAMHS worker, Brent CCG was working with schools to put in place specialist CAMHS workers alongside the education psychology team.

Mr Ambrose said that there were various teams working on the prevention of anxiety, depression and negative impacts of social media. Local communities had been engaged in tackling stigma and encouraging an early diagnosis (prior to a formal referral being made), but this had been challenging due to the fact that people moved frequently. There was a wide range of activities focused in schools, with greater amount of psychotherapy being available at schools for pupils with Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Zoe Kattah (Representative, Healthwatch Brent) said that the Thrive Plan for 2018/19 was linked to CAMHS in schools and included proposals to establish community champion roles to promote good mental health and wellbeing among children and young people. Nine

champions had been recruited to develop a social media engagement platform that could be used by young people to help them find out more about their mental health and there were plans to create a video to be shown in schools.

A specific question raised by the Brent Youth Parliament Observers on the Committee concerned the measures Brent CCG and the Council had put in place to ensure that young people throughout the Borough could access the same quality of support irrespective of where they lived and studied. Mr Ambrose explained that under the current arrangements some schools procured CAMHS themselves. Brent CCG had been actively trying to link schools up so they could achieve better value for money through joint commissioning which would also facilitate transitions between services. It was noted that while some schools had been very good at maximising the benefits of the offer in the Borough, others had not engaged as well and the Committee enquired about the measures that had been taken to encourage collaboration. Mr Ambrose responded that if the bid for School CAMHS service was successful, it would benefit all schools and colleges in the Borough as it would supplement the existing provision and would ensure that mental health support would be available to children even if some schools did not procure services.

Responding to a question about the link between childhood obesity and mental health, Mr Ambrose pointed out that this correlation had already been discussed at previous meetings of the Committee. He said that risks related to eating disorders were more acute than those linked to obesity, i.e. it was more immediately dangerous for a child to be anorexic than obese. Furthermore, obesity was not generally seen as a mental illness despite the fact that there was a link between mood and food and food was part of the cultural identity of many Brent residents.

Members of the Committee enquired about the support available to parents and Mr Ambrose said that an event for parents and relevant stakeholders had taken place in October 2017, with another one planned to take place in February 2019. Work with parents started at very early stages when children had displayed early signs of having a mental health condition and a number of indicators were examined if they struggled. A series of events targeted at young people had allowed commissioners to hear their views and had led to the development of an online counselling service which offered initial learning support and direct online counselling. In addition, as part of their work, Healthwatch Brent attended school assemblies and parental evenings to raise awareness about the importance of maintaining good mental health.

Mr Ambrose acknowledged that there were gaps in the existing provision and that certain communities found it difficult to access the offer. The support that was offered in the Borough relied on a multiagency approach to tackle stigmas associated with some communities living in Brent. For example, the Brent CCG was aware of the number of people who found it difficult to ask for help in their communities and it had linked up with Public Health England in relation to Thrive LDN - city-wide movement aspiring to promote mental wellbeing, prevent illness and eliminate suicide in London. Its approach relied on having a conversation in the community about mental health and it could be adapted for the needs of CAMHS as representatives of local communities could be trained to offer low level support.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) The contents of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services Update report, be noted;
- (ii) The multiagency CAMHS steering group be encouraged to liaise with organisations such as the National Autistic Society to capture the symptoms of neurodevelopment disorders early;
- (iii) The issue of staff retention be examined in a report on the workforce involved in delivering the CAMHS provision in Brent; and
- (iv) A report on gaps in services and fragmentation of delivery, along with the associated risks, be provided.

*Gail Tolley left the meeting at 6:26 pm in order to attend a meeting of the Teachers' Joint Consultative Committee.*

**6. Brent Council's Youth Offer**

Councillor Mili Patel (Lead Member for Children's Safeguarding, Early Help and Social Care) introduced the report which provided an overview of the youth offer in Brent and included detailed information about the Connexions service, Brent Youth Parliament (BYP), services delivered from the Roundwood Youth Centre and the newly established Brent Youth Zone website. She pointed out that the Council had not fully recovered from the cuts it was forced to make in 2015 so the majority of services for young people were targeted at specific groups. Nigel Chapman (Operational Director – Integration and Improved Outcomes, Brent Council) provided more detail on specific services and future proposals. He noted that the outcomes for young people from the Connexions service<sup>2</sup> had been positive, with performance being in the top 25% nationally. The contract for this service was due for recommissioning in April 2019 and officers had been looking into ways of combining the in-house provision with the commissioned contract as per the recommendations of recent Outcome Based Reviews focused on Gangs and Children on the Edge of Care.

Mr Chapman informed Members that although the scope of the youth offer in the Borough would be reduced, arrangements were expected to be enhanced by delivering services differently. For example, the online youth offer (Brent Youth Zone) had been launched on 23 November 2018 (the Children's Commissioner's Takeover day). It had been developed in collaboration with young people across the Borough including BYP and users of Roundwood Youth Centre. It provided information on work and learning; help, safety and advice; things to do; and ways of getting involved. Future plans were being developed to create a Youth App to further the use of Brent Youth Zone and expand its reach.

Sandra White (Sector Development Director, Young Brent Foundation (YBF) delivered a presentation on the charity's history, current activity and future plans to work with Brent Council. Members heard that YBF had been set up in 2016 with the aim to support voluntary sector organisations, working with children and young people in Brent, at a time of severe challenges and funding cuts. She directed the

---

<sup>2</sup> The Connexions service met the legislative duties of the Local Authority under the Education and Skills Act 2008 and the Education Act 2011.

Committee's attention to the findings of the Young Brent Survey which had identified the key needs, challenges and opportunities for voluntary organisations supporting young people in Brent. There had been 120 groups and organisations, primarily focused on education, community development, arts and sports, working in the Borough supporting approximately 5,000 young people a month. One of the main challenges identified had been the lack of affordable space to be used by young people. The demand for it had been highlighted by the successful Midnight University initiative organised by The Hyde Group – Hyde Housing when the Yellow Pavilion in Wembley had stayed open until midnight. A further issue related to lack of signposting and coherence between the work of various groups and organisations as a number of them were operating in silos. Ms White said that YBF acknowledged the need to invest resources in building the capacity of organisations and enable them to become contract ready.

In relation to the rising violence and youth offending in the Borough, Members heard that YBF had been one of the 18 organisations appointed by the National Citizens Service Trust to deliver a new £2 million pilot programme to reach more young people. In addition, eight local community organisations, members of the Foundation, had joined together to offer free places to families with inactive 5 to 10-year-olds on the Fun Fit Families programme funded by Sport England and the National Lottery. The Foundation would also participate in consortium development as 15 organisations had been vetted to bid for a large amounts of money and it would support the Young Londoners Group to ensure that they delivered the bid they had won. Ms White said that YBF realised the importance of children having safe spaces and she would be working with Housing Associations and the Local Authority to identify hubs in the Borough which could be accessed by children from across Brent.

The Committee enquired about the stakeholders' assessment of the youth offer in Brent. Ms White commented that from the perspective of YBF, the offer required improvement as closer collaboration between organisations supporting young people and the Local Authority was needed. However, she noted that the situation in Brent was similar to the arrangements in other boroughs as funding for children services had been reduced across the country. Mr Chapman acknowledged that there was work to be done to improve provision. He highlighted that the Council's perspective on the youth offer was related to coordinating activities and providing information on what was available locally rather than delivering services directly. He said that the Local Authority was looking forward to working closely with YBF – in fact, Gail Tolley (Strategic Director of Children and Young People, Brent Council) would be meeting representatives of John Lyon's Charity (one of YBF's funders) to look at ways the existing relationship between the Council and YBF could be developed.

Brent Youth Parliament observers referred to the options to redesign services from the Roundwood Youth Centre and questioned whether the revised model would meet the need of residents. Councillor Mili Patel explained that as the Centre was currently underused, the intention was to change its use to an Alternative Education Provision for young people aged 11-16 during the school day and use it as a hub for youth and community activities outside these times. The collaboration with YBF was expected to improve provision by maximising the number of organisations delivering services from the site. As provision for secondary school children not in mainstream education had to be sought outside of Brent, providing alternative

education from Roundwood Youth Centre would facilitate access and save travel time.

A specific concern raised related to the fact whether existing users had been consulted. Mr Chapman said that a consultation on alternative use of the site had been part of the tender procedure for the delivery of Youth services that had been conducted in 2015/2016. However, no specific consultation on the current proposal had been carried out as it was subject to approval by Cabinet. Councillor Mili Patel added that one of the reasons why the Roundwood Youth Centre was currently underused might be the fact that some young people did not feel safe moving around the Borough so satellite hubs might address their needs better. Once a decision had been made, the Local Authority would work closely with YBF to identify potential sites. Ms White added that the John Lyon's Charity had looked at a number a spaces and had proposed to develop a venue bank which would allow organisations to book spaces. She noted that once the link to it became operational, it could be circulated to the Committee.

Members commented that it had been three years since cuts to the provision of youth services had been made and asked whether assessment of the impact of the changes on the youth offer had been carried out. Gail Tolley emphasised that the paper described the youth provision at the present time, adding that the Children and Young People Department had not received a request neither had the resources necessary to assess the impact of the closures over time. She explained that Elected Members had made a decision to close youth centres in 2015/2016 and impact assessments had been made according to the guidance provided at the time. Furthermore, YBF had been created to provide a lead on community led youth services and Brent Council had been working closely with YBF which engaged young people and supported them to design services that met their needs. Gail Tolley assured Members that she had been involved in regular discussions on youth provision through BYP and the Children's Commissioner's Takeover day.

Members referred to academic literature suggesting a connection between the reduction of children services and the increase in youth offending. Mr Chapman explained that there had not been sufficient empirical evidence to suggest such a correlation although the Council's did not deny its existence.

It was noted that even if Cabinet approved to change the use of Roundwood Youth Centre to an Alternative Education Provision site, the Department for Education had to agree that such a use would be sustainable in the long term. Therefore, the transformation of the site would not be finalised prior to the autumn of 2019. This led to a discussion of potential interim measures that could be put in place to increase the number of activities taking place at the site. Members enquired whether it could be possible to receive a copy of the current calendar of bookings, along with an action plan to increase the usage of the building in the short term. Mr Chapman responded that it was possible to share the current timetable which reflected the fact that most children were at school during the day and the majority of services had been concentrated in school holidays. He reminded the Committee that there had been discussions with YBF aimed at increasing the number of services delivered from the Roundwood Youth Centre.

A member of the public addressed the Committee in her capacity of a volunteer at Roundwood Youth Centre youth club sessions. She stated that these had been

very well attended by hard to reach young people and asked whether the Local Authority could guarantee that existing service users would be supported by continuing the club sessions during the transition period and under the new arrangements. Mr Chapman responded that the Local Authority's intention was not to end the provision of any existing services, but to enhance the offer delivered from the site. Therefore, the youth club sessions were expected to continue operating under the new service delivery model as the Council wanted to do its best to support young people.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) The contents of the Brent Council's Youth Offer report, be noted;
- (ii) The following recommendations were made to the Council's Cabinet:
  - Collaboration between Young Brent Foundation and Brent Council be encouraged with the aim to improve services available to young people;
  - Brent Council be encouraged to support Young Brent Foundation in developing satellite hubs for youth provision in the Borough;
  - An impact assessment in relation to the future changes outlined in the paper be carried out;
  - An update on future plans for the Roundwood Youth Centre be provided in six months time;
  - An update report on changes to Brent's youth offer be provided; and
  - An update report on the way Young Brent Foundation utilised funds to deliver services be provided

*Gail Tolley re-joined the meeting at 7:35 pm.*

*Helen Askwith, Councillor Wilhelmina Mitchell-Murray (in attendance) and Councillor McLennan (in attendance) left the meeting at 8:00 pm.*

*The meeting was adjourned between 8:00 pm and 8:09 pm for a comfort break.*

**7. The Development of Family Hubs in Brent**

Councillor Mili Patel (Lead Member for Children's Safeguarding, Early Help and Social Care) introduced the topic and reminded Members that the proposals outlined in the paper were subject to consultation and pending a decision by Cabinet. Therefore, she proposed that the financial aspects of the Family Hub model could be discussed at the special Budget Scrutiny meeting scheduled to take place in early December 2018.

Nigel Chapman (Operational Director - Integration and Improved Outcomes, Brent Council) presented the report which included details of what the introduction of a Family Hub model in Brent could provide, building on the current provision of services offered by the Borough's children centres. He directed Members' attention to paragraphs 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10 of the report (pages 57-58 of the Agenda pack)



which summarised the changing nature of service demand and the necessity to think differently about the way services would be delivered to the most vulnerable families in Brent. Mr Chapman pointed out that information about other parts of the country where the Family Hub model had been in operation was also included in the paper.

The Chair spoke of a site visit to a Children and Family Hub run by Westminster City Council which had provided Members with a good insight into what the model looked like once developed and enquired about the ways it was expected to improve existing provision in Brent. Mr Chapman explained that children centres had been successful in engaging families with children aged 0-5 which had led to a number of positive outcomes such as a greater proportion of children being school ready; building resilience amongst families at risk; greater engagement of fathers, etc. However, there was currently a 'cut off' of services once children turned 5 which the Family Hub model would address by moving towards a whole family approach as issues like late diagnosis of mental health conditions and risk of youth violence, often arose with older children.

Service delivery under the Family Hub model would take into account the research carried out as part of the Council's Outcome Based Reviews (OBRs) on domestic abuse, children on the edge of care and reducing the impact of gang activity. It would enable services to be co-located and delivered to families with children of all ages including vulnerable adolescents. Sue Gates (Head of Early Help, Brent Council) explained that at present children centres were used predominantly during school hours (9 am to 3 pm). Under the new model, there would be fewer centres, but timetabling of activities would be improved to enable a wider range of services to be offered. This would take into account the outcomes of the OBRs, the results of the children centres annual satisfaction survey and the outcome of the consultation on the Family Hub model. She explained that it might be possible that not all services would be delivered from all centres, with others such as employment support and housing advice, rotating between the sites. Furthermore, service provision would be flexible, including weekends, depending on demand – in fact, at present there were activities taking place on Saturdays and Citizen Advice Brent used some of the sites to deliver sessions in the evenings.

Members expressed concern that accessibility could be affected as the number of children centres could be reduced from 17 to eight which represented a reduction of more than 50%. They enquired whether geographic considerations had been taken into account when developing the proposal and whether an impact assessment covering travel time and costs had been carried out. Gail Tolley (Strategic Director of Children and Young People, Brent Council) said that an impact assessment would be carried out prior to deciding on the locations of the Family Hubs, subject to Cabinet approving proposal CYP008 as outlined in the [consultation report presented in October 2018](#). Mr Chapman added that the Family Hub model was more targeted than existing provision and referred to Westminster City Council and Coventry City Council which had chosen to locate services in areas of greatest need. He said that Brent would be considering the lessons learned from other authorities when developing the model and every effort would be made to ensure that children and families were not excluded.

Ms Gates emphasised the importance of making contact with all families with young children so they could be provided with the support they needed. She said that the

Family Hubs would also provide a universal offer which would include health, development and mental health services, employment support and childcare, and supporting families with complex needs. Dr Melanie Smith (Director of Public Health, Brent Council) noted that, as well as the Healthy Child Programme, the current children's centres programmes on childhood obesity, oral health and immunisation would be included Family. She added that the Council had been successful in negotiation with Public Health England and NHS England to have immunisations delivered at Children's Centres as a back-up option for children who had missed vaccinations. Members acknowledged that although it was useful to offer all of these services, although currently they were targeted at the youngest members of a family members commented that problems such as obesity often affected the whole family so it was important to engage everyone.

Referring to their visit to the Family Hub in Westminster, Members noted that a large building would be needed to accommodate all services that might be provided from a Family Hub and enquired whether the Council possessed a site with sufficient capacity. Ms Gates said that although some of the existing children centres were considerable in size, it was important to situate Family Hubs in the right location. Mr Chapman explained that Brent's proposal included more Family Hubs than the model in Westminster which relied on three sites. He assured Members that resources would be used as efficiently as possible to maximise the number of services on offer. Gail Tolley commented that it was important to deliver high quality services that would have taken into account the outcomes of the consultation process. She reminded Members that consultation on the proposal had not started yet and expressed confidence that the Local Authority would be able to develop a strong Family Hub model despite the fact that sites might not be identical to the ones in Westminster.<sup>3</sup> However, the locations of the Family Hubs had not been determined yet. Gail Tolley clarified that the Council owned some of the buildings which housed the existing children centres, with the rest located on school sites. The Local Authority would be allowed to change their use providing that they were still designated to supporting children and families.

The Committee discussed the involvement of schools in matters relating to school nursing and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). Gail Tolley said that Local Authority would be talking to schools about their engagement and support for the Family Hub Model. Members questioned the Council's approach to the hard to reach adolescents and asked what measures would be taken to re-engage them. Ms Gates said that the Hubs would be instrumental in identifying those young people as their families were likely to visit them. However, officers recognised that some adolescents would not be interested in the offer so alternative methods and venues such as outreach work delivered from sport centres had been considered.

The Committee heard that a reduction in the number of older children coming into care would be a clear indicator for the success of the Family Hub model. This would mean that adolescents had been able to develop better relations with their families. Furthermore, it was expected that more young people would remain in mainstream education and would not become known to the Youth Offending Service. In addition, the age until which services would be offered would increase from 5 to 18 and the model would enable more early intervention work to take place. This raised

---

<sup>3</sup> Gail Tolley clarified that she had not visited the Family Hub in Westminster to which Councillors referred.

a concern how services covering the need for such a wide range of ages could be provided from the hubs. Mr Chapman explained that the model would be centred on the needs of the whole family. In fact, often parents attending children centres were asking questions about their older children. He acknowledged that it would be challenging to bring various services together and although this had already been done in children centres, there was more work to be completed prior to integrating services completely.

In relation to engaging residents in the next steps of the process, Gail Tolley emphasised that the community would be involved through all stages of developing the Family Hub model and lessons learned from the current service delivery model would be taken into account. In addition, members of staff, service users and ward Councillors would be consulted and would be involved in the design of the new model.

**RESOLVED:**

(i) The contents of The Development of Family Hubs in Brent report, be noted;

(ii) The following recommendations were made to the Council's Cabinet:

- Greater consideration be given in relation to the way an integrated workforce would be managed under the proposed family hub model;
- Greater consideration be given in relation to how the Family Hub model would function taking into account the location of the buildings available; and
- Front line staff, parents and ward Councillors be engaged in the consultation process on the Family Hub model.

**8. Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19 Update**

James Diamond (Scrutiny Officer, Brent Council) informed the Committee that the Chair of the Task and Finish Group reviewing contextual safeguarding would present an interim report back to the Committee on 30 January 2019 to allow Members to discuss potential recommendations. A full report with final recommendations would be presented at the meeting on 18 March 2019.

**RESOLVED** that the contents of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Work Programme 2018/2019 Update report, be noted.

**9. Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 8:53 pm

COUNCILLOR KETAN SHETH  
Chair