

Minutes

CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND LEARNING POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

26 November 2014

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors John Hensley (Chairman), Brian Crowe (Vice-Chairman), Nick Denys, Jem Duducu, Tony Eginton, Duncan Flynn, Peter Money, Jane Palmer, Jan Sweeting (Labour Lead) and Tony Little</p> <p>Also Present: Inspector Mark Luton (Metropolitan Police Service) (Metropolitan Police Service)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Steven Maiden (Democratic Services Officer), Tom Murphy (Head of Early Intervention Services) and Tony Zaman (Director Adult Social Services / Director Children & Young People Services (Interim))</p>
34.	<p>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2014 <i>(Agenda Item 5)</i></p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2014 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
35.	<p>MAJOR REVIEW: REDUCING THE RISK OF YOUNG PEOPLE ENGAGING IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR - WITNESS SESSION 2 <i>(Agenda Item 6)</i></p> <p>The representative from the Metropolitan Police Service provided a brief presentation on the Borough's response to crime and anti-social behaviour. It was noted that Hillingdon was exceeding the 20% reduction in crime required by the Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime (MOPAC) "20-20-20 Challenge". This was the challenge to cut crime, boost public confidence and cut costs by 20% over a four year period. Figures had been provided on the crime levels in the Borough.</p> <p>Members raised concerns that the data provided did not include many areas of crime that were known to be a problem throughout the Borough. However, the witness stressed that the crime figures outlined were the MOPAC 7 neighbourhood crimes that the service was assessed against.</p> <p>Members were advised that part of the Police's response to crime and anti-social behaviour was through officers who were assigned to schools (comprising a sergeant and 8 officers) and to Brunel University and Uxbridge College (comprising an officer and a PCSO). This was seen to be an effective way of dealing with some forms of youth crime as officers could develop good relationships with young people and staff. The activities undertaken included providing a series of presentations for schools on a range of topics as well as responding to crime at Brunel and Uxbridge College. The Police also offered a junior citizenship scheme which was a successful and less formal</p>

way of engaging with young people.

The witness advised that a peer-review on gangs in the Borough had recently been undertaken. The review had found that there was currently not a holistic approach to youth crime in Hillingdon and it was expected to recommend that there needed to be an overarching policy on the issue and an approach that cut across different agencies. This was an area that the Council and its partner agencies were already progressing and was successfully working with cases of sexual abuse. An early intervention process was also in place that allowed different agencies that had contact with young people to share concerns. However, there were some challenges to developing a multi-agency approach including identifying where responsibility would ultimately sit.

The witness noted that the issue of gangs within the Borough did have dedicated Police officers but there was not considered to be a major gang problem. Most gang-related activity was undertaken by those passing through the area rather than being based in Hillingdon. Where gang nominals did come across from other boroughs, there was an expectation that Police from the originating area would pass across an intelligence package. However, the peer-review had highlighted that there was not sufficient knowledge around the Borough's gangs and that there could be a problem that the various agencies were not be aware of.

The Committee was informed that preventative work around crime and anti-social behaviour was undertaken with young people at far too old an age. However, when young people did engage in such activities, parents were involved in the process. Although there was a very wide range of responses from parents, most were supportive of the Police and generally assisted where possible.

Certain Members of the Committee noted that they had attended a witness session with a young person who had recently been through the youth justice system. He had advised that one of the major allures of crime was the financial rewards that came with it. This would not compare with the money that young people could make through paid work or would receive from parents. It was noted that young people generally started on small crimes but graduated to more serious offences as they grew older.

The session with the young person had also highlighted that, for young men in particular, there was a need for physical activities to divert people from crime. The young person had suggested that construction and military services were the most attractive prospects and a 'boot camp' could be a useful programme to initiate.

With regard to truancy, the Committee was informed that issues with Police resourcing meant that they were not able to monitor school attendance as much as Members may wish. However, the Council's Schools Welfare Team would be notified of significant periods of absence and would respond as necessary. This response would not be able to reach every child but it would flag up to the Council that a young person was at risk.

Officer advised that there appeared to be a lack of understanding amongst headteachers and schools about how the early intervention system worked. Senior Council officers would be meeting with schools in the near future to introduce themselves and to explain how they could better use these processes. Furthermore, the Council would be seeking to engage with young families more in the future. This was expected to be achieved through entering into conversations with partner agencies as well as opening up channels for softer communication.

It was agreed that officers would provide options to the Committee to meet more young

	<p>people and families that had experienced the youth justice system.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officers provide the Committee with more options to meeting with young people and families who had experienced the youth justice system; and 2. The evidence provided be noted.
36.	<p>CONSIDERATION OF TOPICS FOR SINGLE MEETING REVIEW (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Following discussion, it was agreed the single meeting review would focus on the implementation of the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Reforms. It was noted that this was an area that cut across the Committee's Terms of Reference.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That officers produce a scoping report on the implementation of the SEND Reforms for consideration at the following meeting.</p>
37.	<p>FORWARD PLAN (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Forward Plan be noted.</p>
38.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A report on the Additional Need Strategy be added to the work programme for 2015; and 2. The Work Programme be noted.
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.53 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steven Maiden on . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.