

Public Document Pack



MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY AND WELLBEING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE **Tuesday 30 June 2026 at 6.00 pm** **Held as a hybrid meeting in the Conference Hall – Brent Civic Centre**

PRESENT: Councillor Sai Madabhushi (Chair) and Councillors Amandine, Bajwa, Chadha, Clinton, De Souza, Ibrahim and Unger, and co-opted members Ms Rachelle Goldberg and Mr Alloysius Frederick

In attendance: Councillor Muhammed Butt, Councillor Jake Rubin

1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

- Archdeacon Catherine Pickford

2. Declarations of interests

Personal interests were declared as follows:

- Councillor Sai Madabhushi – School Governor
- Councillor Ibrahim – works closely with the Safeguarding Team for a community organisation
- Councillor de Souza – governor for Central and North West London NHS Trust and school governor
- Councillor Unger – outgoing ward panel chair for Queen's Park Safer Neighbourhood Team and Chair of NWL Patient Participation Group

3. Deputations (if any)

There were no deputations received.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2026 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

5. Matters arising (if any)

There were no matters arising.

Prior to moving to the agenda items, the Committee received a short presentation from the Chairs of the Children's and Adult's Safeguarding Partnerships explaining their roles and remits within the context of safeguarding in Brent.

6. Brent Safeguarding Adults Board (Multi-agency safeguarding arrangements) Annual Report April 2025 - March 2026

Councillor Muhammed Butt (Leader of the Council) introduced the report which presented the Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report for the period April 2025 – March 2026,

thanking all partners involved in the safeguarding arrangements in Brent. He advised that, as Leader and the Cabinet Member with oversight for Adult Social Care, he met regularly with the Chief Executive, Director of Adult Social Care, and Chair of the Safeguarding Adults Board to ensure oversight and insight into safeguarding. He believed that the arrangements in place were safe and reflective of the needs of residents, but highlighted that, as demand for Adult Social Care increased, there would be more challenges on the Council, emphasising the importance of continued conversations with key partners in terms of how organisations supported each other and how services were provided to ensure oversight and that services were provided in places residents felt safe. He introduced Will Lexton-Jones (Detective Superintendent, Public Protection – North West Basic Command Unit (NW BCU), Sue Sheldon (Assistant Director for Safeguarding Adults and Children, West and North London Integrated Care Board (WNL ICB) and Nicola Brownjohn (Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Adults Board) to the meeting as key strategic partners to the safeguarding arrangements in place in Brent.

Nicola Brownjohn then introduced the Annual Report, highlighting the following key points:

- One of her highlights across the reporting year was going out into the community to hear directly from people with care and support needs. The engagement that had taken place had supported the planning for undertaking community engagement going forward.
- Work had taken place around the strategic plan priorities of self-neglect, housing and substance misuse, and learning from previous Safeguarding Adult Reviews (SARS), and those priorities had now been closed and incorporated into business as usual.
- In relation to the work done around self-neglect, she highlighted that she had reviewed the referrals for self-neglect and identified the need to develop a multi-agency culture around addressing self-neglect, rather than practitioners making referrals to Adult Social Care where the case did not meet the threshold for statutory safeguarding. She had also worked with practitioners to launch a self-neglect toolkit to ensure the protocol was being followed across partners, and she had heard from partners over the year how that was working in practice through monthly lunch and learn sessions. She would be launching a survey across partner agencies to test how well that toolkit was working soon.
- In relation to the housing and substance misuse strategic priority, that had been established following a thematic review identifying housing as an issue in two safeguarding cases relating to substance misuse. Some good practice in the housing department and public health commissioned substance misuse service had been identified, and she had worked with partners to develop that further.
- In relation to learning from SARS, she confirmed that the Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) had revamped the way referrals were considered, what happened when a SAR was commissioned, how they were publicised and how the learning was taken forward.
- The new strategic plan had been agreed in March 2026 which would act as a short-term plan for one year due to upcoming changes in safeguarding. The priorities included safeguarding people with complex care and support needs, specifically around mental health and homelessness, and prevention of harm to avoid crises, with an underlying 'golden thread' around community engagement.
- The report outlined the timeline of activity across the SAB and its subgroups. She added that the Performance and Audit Subgroup was in its infancy and had been used to do a deep dive into Section 42 safeguarding enquiries to see what

communities might be outliers, which had helped to identify a lack of LGBTQ+ referrals which would be further reviewed in the upcoming year. Additionally, there were low levels of modern slavery referrals which did not match some of the anecdotal data being received from partner agencies, so work would be undertaken to understand that data further. The subgroup would review the conversion rate of referrals to enquiries as well as feedback mechanisms.

- In relation to national data, she highlighted that this was incomplete, as it was only possible to record one primary abuse, such as 'domestic abuse', but not to record underlying abuse such as financial abuse in order to get richer data and identify common themes. As a result, the Performance and Audit Subgroup was looking to establish ways of recording that data in order to deepen the SABs understanding of the types of abuse in Brent.

The Chair thanked colleagues for their introductions and invited comments and questions from those present, with the following points raised:

The Committee was pleased with the level of activity being undertaken by the SAB and thanked partners on behalf of the residents of Brent. Noting that the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee received this report as a standing item every year, the Committee asked how the recommendations from the Committee meeting the previous year had been taken forward. Those recommendations included for the SAB to co-produce one priority with those with lived experience, to commission a multi-agency safeguarding awareness campaign, to identify learnings and how they would be addressed in future reports, and to reflect on national reviews and how they might impact locally in future reports. Additionally, the previous meeting had called for more Key Performance Indicators and data to demonstrate the multi-agency ethos having been embedded into the partnership. Nicola Brownjohn confirmed that the mental health and complex needs priorities had been established directly from speaking to people with lived experience, and awareness campaigns were delivered through National Safeguarding Adults Week. She would be happy to think about further awareness campaigns that the SAB could consider, particularly as the Community Engagement Group was now established. Going forward, she would be looking to have the voice of those with lived experience come through in the Annual Report with the help of the Community Engagement Group. In relation to national reviews and their impact locally, she confirmed that the multi-agency partnership considered the local impact and any learning and actions at regular lunch and learns, and as a member of the National Network of Independent Chairs she was able to disseminate information raised at those meetings also.

The Committee asked whether the Chair of SAB believed that cross-partner working was taking place effectively. Nicola Brownjohn responded that there was multi-agency working but she would want to strengthen that. She felt that partner working may have been weaker over the reporting period due to individual organisational changes across several agencies over the year, but there was always cross-partner attendance at the various subgroups and task and finish groups. Going forward with the additional subgroups introduced, she felt there was a need for strengthening that collaboration for partners to come together around those workstreams, such as transitional safeguarding.

The Committee felt it was difficult to understand some of the assertions made in the report regarding progress on the 3 strategic priorities without baseline data that could then be tracked year on year. They highlighted that baseline data would help the Committee to see where improvements were having an impact and resulting in positive outcomes. Nicola Brownjohn advised that the Performance and Audit Subgroup had been newly established in order to consider ways the SAB could gather and analyse more data. Rachel Crossley (Corporate Director Service Reform and Strategy, Brent Council) added that the Council produced a 6-monthly analysis of safeguarding data across areas of Brent, including an

analysis of demographics and protected characteristics, which could be provided to the Committee.

Of the SARs completed in the reporting year, the Committee asked what the key lessons were and how they could be assured changes were happening on the ground in response to those learnings. Nicola Brownjohn advised that lessons learned around self-neglect focused on assuring residents that agencies were looking to work more collaboratively to support people who might be seen to be self-neglecting earlier and develop a relationship with those people before they developed a more serious risk of harm. For those with complex needs, the High Risk Panel was also looking at how those people could be reached earlier, as well as transitional safeguarding and identifying where there was a need to work more closely with someone to develop a transitional plan. Lessons had also focused on unpaid carers and hearing their voice, and national reviews related to safe discharge from hospital where there was a sole unpaid carer at home. In concluding her response, she assured members and residents that the SAB was there to learn from SARs and listen to partners and people with lived experience, and would challenge areas it was felt had gaps.

Noting the referral to enquiry conversion rate of 25-30%, the Committee asked for a further explanation of why adults were being screened out following a referral. Claudia Brown (Director of Adult Social Care, Brent Council) explained that practitioners had a stronger awareness of safeguarding now and therefore more cases were referred as it was felt safer to refer than ignore a concern. She confirmed that there was an effective triage process using prescribed criteria which needed to be met in order to convert a referral to an enquiry. Some referrals may progress through to care management whereas others may move to a Section 42 enquiry. She confirmed that the referrals that came in that met the criteria for a Section 42 Enquiry were very low. The Committee added that it would be useful to see that data in more detail, including where there were repeat referrals and what their outcomes were in terms of which referrals progressed.

The Committee asked how effective the resourcing of the arrangements were, highlighting the underspend detailed in the report. Nicola Brownjohn explained that it was important to ensure that there were reserves available should the need for a SAR arise, as SARs required a large amount resource, including payment for an independent reviewer and data gathering, which could take up to 20 days. She confirmed that the arrangements were manageable within the budget available, and was grateful for the uplift in contribution from the Met Police which local partnerships had lobbied for across London for several years.

The Committee asked what the SAB had found were the main barriers for effective partnership working, particularly information sharing. Nicola Brownjohn explained that the SAB was not involved with the specifics of a case, but there to question whether the right services were in place and delivering effectively, using a multi-agency approach where necessary. She confirmed that there was good attendance at the SAB with active participation, including some private housing organisations joining the Board which had been positive, particularly given the emerging themes around housing in adult safeguarding. Some challenges identified were within individual organisations where they may be covering multiple boroughs and footprints, to be able to give each SAB in each area dedicated time. In response to that, she had set up a group for Chairs across the health footprint in order to liaise with health. The SAB may then hear that a piece of work had already been done in another area, so Brent learned from that area, and vice versa, such as with the self-neglect toolkit which other areas now used. As such, whilst she and the SAB were focused on Brent and actions were Brent-specific, there was common ground with other areas in order to learn.

Will Lexton-Jones added that he had worked both on a borough-level and the area-based North West Basic Command Unit (BCU) that was the current model, and confirmed it was

easier to work borough-to-borough where the area was smaller and relationships more straightforward, meaning individual officers could focus on a single partnership with better opportunities to invest in those partnerships such as through co-location, which became difficult when the configuration was mismatched. He advised that there was a need to be as cost-effective as possible whilst delivering core statutory responsibilities, and so the way the police was configured with the BCU model had taken those priorities first, and over time improvements had been made across the 10 years that model had been in use. The BCU had iteratively improved the way it worked in the multi-agency space, and he affirmed that there was a commitment to work in a partnership way, attend those meetings and meet partner responsibilities. Some of those improvements had been simple, such as investing in admin to ensure scheduling was effective and efficient, and other areas for improvement had been around IT systems and, linked to that, data sharing. He highlighted that officers had been required to learn a new IT system which had taken time to embed and which had caused multi-agency gaps, for example where the right series of buttons was not correctly selected when putting a vulnerable adult referral onto the system. Improvements were now being seen with officers getting better at using the system and system updates to allow useful automation, and despite those challenges he felt that the NW BCU had always managed to maintain a good borough-based approach to safeguarding.

Sue Sheldon responded that there had been challenges with the newly implemented Integrated Care Board (ICB) changes, but felt the ICB had always maintained a very good borough-based approach to safeguarding. She confirmed that the ICB was present at meetings where there was a need and where they could make a difference and have a view. She was hopeful going forward that the ICB would still have the presence in boroughs that it had previously had with the North West London safeguarding team designated professionals. There was now acknowledgement that Brent did not sit on its own but neighboured with Harrow and Barnet and there were ways some work could be brought together.

The Committee asked how the impact of the self-neglect toolkit would be measured and whether training had been implemented for its use. Nicola Brownjohn explained that training had been open to all agencies on the toolkit. There was a plan to do a survey across agencies to find out how it was being used and if it was found to be helpful. Will Lexton-Jones would discuss the toolkit with a colleague to ensure that it had been disseminated for use and feedback.

As no further issues were raised, the Chair drew the discussion to close and invited the Committee to make recommendations with the following RESOLVED:

- i) To recommend a more specific and overarching strategic priority on multi-agency partnership working.
- ii) For future reports to include additional data in relation to referrals, including demographics and outcomes. This should include infographics and tables for historic data to help visualise trends.
- iii) For future reports to include a section related to communications between agencies, including strengths and weaknesses.
- iv) For the SAB to reach out to all members of the Council to hear their feedback on making referrals and engaging with the safeguarding team.

A number of information requests were also made during the discussion, recorded as follows:

- i) To receive the last three years of safeguarding referral figures.

7. Brent Safeguarding Children Partnership (Multi-agency safeguarding arrangements) Annual Report April 2025 - March 2026

Keith Makin (Independent Scrutineer of the Brent Safeguarding Children Partnership) introduced the Annual Report of the Brent Safeguarding Children Partnership Annual Report covering the period April 2025 – March 2026. In introducing the report, he highlighted the following key points:

- The aim of the partnership was to receive assurance that safeguarding was making a difference and achieving positive outcomes for children and families in Brent.
- Members' attention was drawn to the timeline of activity detailed in the report which described in depth of various meetings and events that had taken place over the reporting period.
- The Committee had previously raised the issue regarding the low number of Rapid Reviews, and he confirmed that the pattern had now changed and assured members that the Case Review Group (CRG) and partnership as a whole was constantly reviewing cases of concern.
- A Multi-Agency Audit Group had been established to undertake audits of cases with particular themes in order to understand the learning from those cases to inform the whole system, with any learnings from audits picked up through the Learning and Development Programme and 7-minute briefings.
- A Section 11 Audit Tool was in development to enable individual agencies to report back on safeguarding activity in an organised way, and next year's annual report would include the results of that audit and what it had informed the partnership.
- Brent had taken a lead in looking at the impact of online safety on children, hearing the views of children and young people through a dedicated young representative as well as families and parents through schools. As a result of the work, a Phone Pledge had been developed so that all schools in the borough took a similar approach to phone use and advice and guidance had been written for parents. Since then, the government had pledged to introduce legislation around phone use in schools.
- In response to the Committee's previous recommendations around the inclusion of data in the report, he advised that it was very difficult to compare boroughs because data may be collected in different ways, and trend data may portray false positives.
- The partnership had worked closely with the Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) around transitional safeguarding, which would continue into the following year.
- The partnership had been involved in the development of the Families First Partnership Programme.
- As Chair of the Safeguarding Children Forum, he was keen to hear the voice of children and young people, which was in the development stages. The next stage would be to appoint young scrutineers where young people were employed by the partnership to network with children and young people across the borough. He had seen this succeed in three other boroughs he worked with.
- The partnership had reviewed the Learning and Development Programme and wanted to improve the relationship between what was being learned from local and national reviews and what services were delivering, jointly with adult partners.

- Over the next 12 months, the partnership would be looking to focus on neglect, the Families First Partnership Programme and capturing the voice of children and young people.

Nigel Chapman (Corporate Director Children, Young People and Community Development, Brent Council) added that there was a lot of policy development initiatives coming through from the Department for Education (DfE) currently, which included the Families First Programme, and there was an expectation to bring safeguarding partners together to create Multi-Agency Child Protection Teams, which would be developed over the next 12 months in collaboration with all statutory partners. Palvinder Kudhail (Director of Early Help and Social Care, Brent Council) further added that Brent was ahead of the game in implementing some of the requirements from the Families First Programme as some of the reforms had been implemented prior to local authorities being asked to do this work. She confirmed that partnership working around this was very strong, and education colleagues also played a key role in governance arrangements and at an operational level going forward. In terms of external validation for the work of the partnership, Nigel Chapman cited the positive Ofsted inspection that happened in April 2026 where the Council was judged 'good' across the board.

The Chair thanked presenters for their introduction and invited comments and questions from those present, with the following issues raised:

The Committee recalled the 6 recommendations made at the previous year's meeting considering the 2024-25 annual report and asked what progress had been made towards them, particularly around working with youth organisations and engaging with Healthwatch. Nigel Chapman advised that much of the work with youth organisations was done through the Young Brent Foundation (YBF) which formed part of the Youth Justice Board, and officers met with them regularly to review the youth offer across Brent. He confirmed that the YBF was the umbrella organisation responsible for youth organisations across the borough and provided support to those organisations. He added that all youth organisations in the borough had access to the Learning and Development offer, of which there was reasonably good take-up. Specifically in relation to safeguarding, some of the youth organisations in the borough were the Jason Roberts Foundation, Hilltop Circle and United Borders, who worked closely with the Community Safety Team to carry out work across the borough and met stringent criteria on safeguarding. He felt it was useful to have community safety closely tied with the children's work. In relation to engagement with Healthwatch, Keith Makin confirmed that this had not yet been actioned, but he would follow up on that.

Noting the intention to bring education in as a fourth safeguarding partner, the Committee asked how that would work in practice and whether there would need to be changes to current arrangements, such as around data sharing. Nigel Chapman confirmed that there was now a dedicated education role within the Brent Family Front Door for issues in schools and settings as a single point of contact, and the partnership already received direct input from education partners at the Safeguarding Forum from Designated Safeguarding Leads in schools. Following the reforms, a lead from the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) Network would be invited onto the Statutory Safeguarding Executive Group which already included the police, health and the local authority. He highlighted the challenge in identifying a representative to speak for education due to its fragmented landscape, so there was a need to invite someone capable of talking across the whole education landscape.

In response to a whether any changes to information sharing were needed across partners, Palvinder Kudhail explained that Phase One of the Social Care redesign to meet the government reforms had been to bring Early Help and Social Care together internally, which had given greater access to Early Help resources and connections with the respective Family Wellbeing Centre (FWC). The next strand had been to implement Family Group Decision

Making which had been done. Now work was being done around Multi-Agency Child Protection Teams. This would mean all new referrals meeting the threshold for a strategy discussion would happen in the front door with all statutory partners situated, as well as additional partners such as adult services, housing services and Advance Domestic Abuse services where required. Standards for information sharing had also been introduced for all agencies, but further work was underway to strengthen that process.

The Committee asked whether there were any particular safeguarding trends or repeated risks over the reporting period. Nigel Chapman confirmed that there had been a range of safeguarding issues across the year. There were four categories of safeguarding considered when deciding whether a child should be on a Child Protection Plan which spanned neglect, physical abuse, emotional abuse and sexual abuse, with no one particular category being more prevalent than the other during the reporting year. As a partnership, the issue of neglect had been prioritised for the following year because it was difficult to tackle effectively when there was no single incident that would result in a service becoming involved with the child or family, and it was a long-term issue that required effective partnership work to tackle. The second cohort he wanted to focus on during the upcoming year was vulnerable adolescents at risk of criminal exploitation or involved in gang-related activity. The Council was working closely with other partners, particularly police colleagues, in that space.

Will Lexton-Jones (Detective Superintendent, NW BCU) agreed that safeguarding themes had not demonstrably changed year-on-year, with chronic risks around criminal and sexual exploitation recognised by partners yearly. He added that another common safeguarding area that the police were looking to address was the prevalence of repeat missing children as a symptom of exploitation, and the police had invested in this area to improve outcomes through the implementation of Local Missing Hubs. The North West Basic Command Unit (NW BCU) had commissioned an analysis into missing children data in order to understand the broader risks around where they were, who they were with, and what other risk factors were contributing to repeat missing episodes. Additionally, investment had been made to appoint a Missing Persons Co-ordinator in each of the three NW boroughs, who liaised with partnerships to raise awareness of how to report and respond to missing episodes. Having one officer per borough would help to better understand the risks and how the partnership could contribute to addressing those and preventing exploitation and repeat missing episodes.

Further discussing exploitation risks, the Committee asked how police liaised with Brent around that. Will Lexton-Jones responded that the NW BCU's Exploitation Team reported to him and he liaised daily with that team. Palvinder Kudhail added that the Council employed a Contextual Safeguarding Lead to work across partners to convene Exploitation, Violence and Vulnerable Panel (EVVP) meetings where all partner agencies discussed individual children at risk of exploitation. That meeting conducted smart mapping for individual children based on their peer networks and reviewed that regularly, whilst commissioning interventions for individual children at risk. Those cases were then reviewed to understand the impact of that bespoke work. Other partners also supported that process, such as disruption activity by the police and location assessments to see what improvements could be made to the environment with co-ordinated work across all partners.

Noting the intention to prioritise neglect over the coming year, the Committee asked how data from that work would be tracked and presented to show progress and outcomes. Nigel Chapman advised that there were various avenues to track data for children subject to Child Protection Plans where neglect was a factor. For example, the number or rate of children still subject to a Child Protection Plan with neglect as the main factor could be reported, and professional confidence and awareness in identifying and responding to neglect could be surveyed. Take-up of Early Help by parents could be an indicator of greater promotion of early prevention work for families. He added that training and development across the

partnership would be key to deliver this priority over the year. In terms of identification of neglect, he advised that this was easier when children were seen and visible and there was professional awareness. Over the age of 5, children were in school where professionals who saw children every day could identify whether children were well-fed, clothed and clean or whether they had become withdrawn or demonstrated a sudden change in behaviour. Under 5s where children were not in nursery or child-minded were much harder to identify and could be hidden, which was why he felt the work by the Early Years teams was key to identifying children who may or may have been seen by health visitors or a GP, with multi-agency work essential to flag those early warning signs.

The Committee asked how Brent's Phone Pledge would differ from the DfE guidance around phone use in schools, and how Brent's pledge could influence neighbouring boroughs to implement similar standards, particularly where Brent children might be attending out of borough schools. Palvinder Kudhail explained that the now statutory guidance from the DfE applied to all schools but was limited to activities taking place at school during lesson time. In Brent, the DSL network had developed the pledge looking at the whole school across all technology, not solely phones, as it was recognised that young people could find other ways to use technology. It was a voluntary pledge that all schools were encouraged to sign up to and follow up work had been delivered in some schools that had requested that. Nigel Chapman added that some Brent children did attend schools out of borough including Westminster, Camden and Hammersmith and Fulham, and Brent worked closely with colleagues in those areas. There were a number of London-wide approaches and initiatives to promote good practice, including through the Safeguarding Adolescents Forum, and practical working with Camden, Westminster and local schools to deliver online safety activities during the summer programme for children. As such, he confirmed there was cross-border work and collaboration around this.

Further discussing online safety and particularly the development of AI, the Committee asked how the partnership was responding to potential safeguarding risks. Keith Makin advised that guidance to parents had been developed to help them navigate their children being online and understand what their children were doing online. Will Lexton-Jones highlighted that the risks around online safety happened behind closed doors and raised concerns that AI lowered the bar to entry for people looking to exploit children. He advocated for guidance to schools and parents. He felt that partners added value here when observing signs and symptoms when in contact with children, asking the right questions of children, parents and schools to identify any risks. Palvinder Kudhail added that the Early Help and Social Care assessment tool was being revised to include prompts around online safety.

In relation to transition from children's to adult's services, the Committee asked how often cases were referred on and how that process worked. Palvinder Kudhail responded that, for children known to the department, such as those known to the disability service, the Council worked with a range of services including education and adult social services to ensure that transition to 18 was smooth. A database tracking children receiving services was in place from 14 years old to enable early planning for the transition to Adult services, including care planning and agreeing a package of care. For care leavers, children's services worked with them up to the age of 25 to support them into independence, with close liaison with housing colleagues to ensure their access to accommodation and early planning for their future lives into adulthood. In terms of other partner involvement, Will Lexton-Jones shared that the police had a light-touch presence on transition but would provide any data necessary. Nicola Brownjohn (Chair of the Brent Safeguarding Adults Board) detailed the joint children's and adult's transitional safeguarding project which was looking at 3 cohorts; care experienced young people; those with additional needs; and those at risk of exploitation. In starting that work, it had been found that care leavers did not experience the same 'cliff edge' from services because they had packages of care in place for additional known needs, and the

project was now looking at those with additional needs where they did not have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) and those at risk of exploitation.

Highlighting the current waiting lists for neurodiversity assessments, the Committee asked how the partnership was managing any safeguarding risks related to that. Nigel Chapman explained that assessment timeliness for EHCPs was a priority for all partners involved. Brent was above the national average for meeting the 20-week timescale for completing EHCP assessments, but he highlighted that the level of growth in the SEND system over the last 5 years had doubled the number of EHCPs, with over 4,000 children now on an EHCP, and many individuals who came to the attention of services at risk of exploitation also had SEND needs. He felt there were more risks at play where children and young people went undiagnosed or where issues were identified as behavioural instead of a SEND need. He added that the government had launched a new initiative for SEND reforms and an 'experts at hand' offer that the Council was working with schools on in order to identify issues as early as primary school, to get support in place much earlier. The Committee asked for the data on waiting times, escalations, and support being offered.

Noting the intention to appoint young scrutineers, the Committee asked how they might influence the partnership's decision making and learning. Keith Makin advised that in the other boroughs where he had worked with young scrutineers, a better connection with children and young people's networks had been achieved and therefore a better understanding of their daily lived experience had been developed. This had influenced the way annual reports were written, with children and young people directly contributing their reflections.

As no further issues were raised the Chair thanked officers for their time and responses and invited members to make recommendations, with the following RESOLVED:

- i) To recommend that partners worked together to agree what data would be useful for the Committee to receive across both the children's and adult's partnership.

8. Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Recommendations Tracker

The Committee noted the recommendations tracker and asked for a more proactive approach to reporting back on recommendations in the future.

9. Any other urgent business

None.

The meeting closed at 8:20 pm
COUNCILLOR SAI MADABHUSHI, Chair