



Inspecting policing
in the public interest

This supplementary report contains more detailed information on the police-specific issues identified within the joint report – **‘Inspection of progress made in the provision of safeguarding services in the London Borough of Haringey’** – together with feedback on those areas of relevance to the MPS, but excluded from the scope of the joint inspection.

AFI 1

Improve case file management across all CAITs

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has introduced the Child Risk Assessment Matrix (CRAM) across the force and it has been in place in Haringey Borough since November 2009. Social Services and the Haringey Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) have been briefed.

The CRAM is a structured, documented process which has been devised to provide a single, comprehensive assessment process for all referrals to CAITs throughout the MPS. It is used to identify the risk factors that would indicate that a child is at risk, together with any intelligence gaps, the control measures in place to manage the identified risks, and decisions and actions. Specified review periods have been set, which prompt further checks of MPS systems for any new information that may have come to light since the last research was completed and a review of the risk factors. One of these review periods has been set at 42 days to coincide with timescales for Core Group meetings (which the police do not attend), the intention being that the police will share any new information proactively with Social Services. In addition, a CRAM risk assessment is completed prior to every child protection Case Conference (both initial and review), which, again, ensures that the most up-to-date police information is available to the conference.

Although the CRAM has only been implemented in the Haringey CAIT for approximately six weeks prior to the inspection, application of the CRAM was evident and a number of the anticipated benefits were already being realised. The process also encourages – and prompts – the proactive exchange of information between the police and Social Services. In addition, the CRAM process has been widely welcomed by all Haringey CAIT staff as delivering a more structured and systematic approach to identification and management of risk.

AFI 2

Improve quality of information in case files

There has been a concerted effort to move from paper to electronic CAIT records across the MPS and improve consistency in the way that information is recorded. A business case for CRIS enhancement to further support the CRAM is currently under active consideration. These developments are strongly supported by HMIC.

Prior to the introduction of the CRAM process, police information about a child could be held on a number of systems, including paper files, making it difficult to track the chronology of events and decision making in each case. At the time of the second

inspection in June 2009, this had been addressed within the Haringey CAIT through the introduction of recorded chronologies in case files. However, the MPS identified the need to ensure a systemic and consistent approach across the whole force, with improved accessibility of information. Under the CRAM process, an electronic Crime Recording Information System (CRIS) report is now raised for each referral, irrespective of whether the referral will require a criminal investigation, and that report is used to log all information, decisions and actions relating to the child and/or case, thereby providing a single point of reference for collated information and up-to-date chronologies

The record remains 'open' until all police actions have completed and there is sufficient information to indicate that there are no unmanaged risks to a child, or, in the case of an ongoing criminal investigation, until the court case is concluded. The CRAM process, therefore, also prompts the police to be proactive in seeking information and updates on progress from Social Services, where required.

In addition, every referral received by the CAIT Referral Desk (irrespective of the source or reason) is now logged electronically (using an Excel spreadsheet – this was previously recorded on a paper-based system) and allocated a Unique Reference Number. All referrals from Social Services are also now received electronically to a dedicated CAIT mail-box (previously done by phone and/or fax). Urgent referrals can still be made by telephone, but must be followed-up by email. The Referral Desk Detective Sergeant makes an assessment of whether urgent action is required. Depending on the circumstances and/or whether further information is required, an initial telephone discussion will take place between the DS and Social Services and a decision made as to whether a strategy meeting/discussion is required (if not already agreed). The CRAM process is then followed and recorded on the CRIS report. If it is decided that a Social Services only response is appropriate, an update from Social Services is requested within 14 days. This, again, prompts the police to be proactive in seeking information to ensure that circumstances have not changed to the extent that direct police involvement is required, before the CRIS report is closed.

Although, again, the CRAM process has only been in place in Haringey for a short period of time (six weeks), there were a small number of cases in the file reading sample which had been updated following CRAM introduction. The quality of information in those cases (including that received from partners) showed marked improvement when compared to pre-CRAM records, decision making and actions were much easier to track and audit, and there was good evidence of compliance with the CRAM.

AFI 3
Single point of reference to obtain management oversight of cases
See AFI 1 and AFI 2

AFI 4
CRIS and MERLIN – improve ease of effective supervision
See AFI 2
Overall, supervision was found to be more structured and consistent, particularly in relation to the referral and child protection plan processes. However, there was some evidence of 'tension' between the timescales set for supervisory reviews under

the CRAM and existing requirements under MPS supervision policy relating to the work of the investigation teams. The MPS should explore this further under this AFI to ensure that the new and current supervisory timescales complement one another.

MERLIN was not examined during this inspection.

AFI 5
Improve supervisory capacity in Haringey CAIT

Police CAIT staffing levels are generally good and overall workload was described as manageable. There has been a further increase in Detective Sergeants (from five posts to six) to allow for two Referral Desk supervisors, two for Child Protection Plan supervision, and two for supervision of the two investigation teams. This is not yet working in practice due to recent sickness absences, annual leave, and the abstraction of one DS to the MAT Pilot Project. The latter abstraction, in particular, has left a gap in supervision on the investigation teams which will not be sustainable in the longer term (see AFI 30).

That said, supervisory gaps are being actively managed, with anticipated return of the DS on sickness absence and the planned reduction in CAIT Detective Sergeant commitments to the MAT Pilot Project. When the CAIT returns to full establishment, the supervisory levels will also be good. However, there are indications that the impact of projected CAIT commitments to the MAT Project (three meetings per week) on Haringey CAIT supervisory levels may have been under-estimated. It is essential that this is monitored through the MPS Modernisation Project during development and after implementation in April 2010.

At the time of the inspection, there were 261 children on child protection plans in Haringey. Of these, approximately 40 cases had been updated and were being actively managed under the CRAM following its implementation approximately six weeks prior to the start of the inspection. Due to the previously highlighted abstraction and vacancy, supervisory oversight had rested with one Detective Sergeant until supplemented by a part-time Acting Detective Sergeant (0.5 FTE). Although workload thereafter was described as manageable, as the number of cases updated (and, consequently, actively managed) under the CRAM increases, it will be important to monitor capacity to ensure that the CRAM effectiveness is not compromised.

AFI 6
Supervisors to attend referral and strategy meetings

The first inspection in 2008 found that police referral desk structure ensured that managers were involved at the child protection referral stage and that they participated in telephone strategy discussions. However, supervisors were not normally involved in subsequent strategy meetings, and there was evidence of inconsistency in management decision making, primarily in relation to those cases initially assessed as low risk and/or where limited information was available.

Although it remains the case that supervisors do not routinely attend strategy meetings, all referrals are now subject to the CRAM process at the point of receipt by the police. The CRAM is completed by the Referral Desk Detective Sergeant, and there was early evidence that the process is beginning to prompt a more consistent and systematic level of supervisory scrutiny. The supervisory reviews built into the

CRAM process are considered to be essential safeguards in quality assuring decision making, and their quality and timeliness should form a specific part of the wider MPS evaluation of the CRAM.

AFI 7

DSs within CAITs not to carry own investigative workload

Supervisors still carry some investigative workload. However, a more measured approach has been adopted, with Detective Sergeants commenting that cases now tend to be restricted to more complex investigations or those involving professionals, where a greater degree of direct supervisory involvement is required.

AFI 8

Insufficient PCLO staff at Haringey due to long term sickness

At the time of the initial inspection in 2008, the Police Conference Liaison Officer staffing levels were found to insufficient, compounded by unresolved issues in relation to sickness absence and workload management. Significant improvements were found during the current inspection of progress.

PCLO staffing levels have been increased (from one to two), and although one post became vacant during the inspection, arrangements were in hand to immediately fill the vacancy. In addition, further support has been provided to this area of work with the introduction of the Researcher post (a new role for carrying out intelligence and background checks) and two Office Managers, one of whom alternates as a Researcher. The profile of the Police Conference Liaison Officer and Researcher roles has also been raised since the introduction of the CRAM and support for these staff has improved substantially with the introduction of dedicated supervision.

It is MPS policy that the police will attend all Initial Case Conferences and the MPS has set a performance target of 95% attendance. As of December 2009, Haringey was achieving 100% attendance. Review Case Conferences are attended on a case by case basis but, where there is no police attendance, a report is completed for the conference. In the latter instance, the Detective Sergeant endorses the police report requesting that any concerns arising from the conference are brought their attention. A briefing meeting between the Detective Sergeant and the Police Conference Liaison Officer is also held prior to attendance, together with a post-conference debriefing following each.

At the time of the second inspection in June 2009, police attendance at Initial Case Conferences had improved and there was increased attendance at Review Case Conferences. The current inspection has found further progress, with police attendance being more consistent and structured, and with greatly improved planning, preparation and supervision.

AFI 9

Develop standard procedure/checklist for managing rotation of staff on current investigations

An 'exit interview' checklist has recently been introduced within the Haringey CAIT. These interviews are carried out by the Haringey Detective Inspector and address, amongst other things, outstanding investigations, investigations retained and the rationale for doing so, court cases pending and their position. Due to low staff turnover, implementation could not be tested during this inspection.

--

AFI 10**Develop flexible staffing model for SCD5 to cope with demographics and temporary local pressures**

SCD5 Detective Constables and Detective Sergeants are now employed on a pan-London basis to provide flexibility across the Directorate. Although this was not tested during the current review, there was some evidence of this being implemented to assist the Haringey CAIT with the short-term PCLO vacancy.

AFI 11**Insufficient strategic leadership and management oversight of safeguarding children from Haringey by senior officers in the strategic partnership evidenced by failure to fully comply with recommendations from Climbie Inquiry**

There was consensus across Haringey CAIT staff at all levels that child protection is a much more visible priority for senior management. The increases in staffing and the introduction of more structured risk identification and supervisory processes in particular are regarded by staff as signs of greater awareness and recognition of the risks associated with this area of work.

The establishment of the Modernisation Programme to oversee implementation of the changes and growth emerging from the action plan developed following the inspection in 2008, and the associated evidence provided for this inspection, demonstrate the strategic commitment to achieving improvement across the MPS. Real progress has been made, and it essential that the momentum and commitment is maintained.

AFI 12**Improve CAIT staff willingness to and skill in challenging partner agencies when appropriate**

There was good evidence from CAIT staff and from within the files examined during the inspection of appropriate challenge of partner agencies. The MPS has also now introduced 'Confidence in Communication' training. See also AFI 24.

AFI 13**Inconsistency in initial management assessment of cases**

See AFI 1, 2 and 6

AFI 14**Role specific training for referral desk sergeants**

Role specific training is now provided for referral desk sergeants. This training is planned to coincide with turnover of staff, consequently, not all CAIT Detective Sergeants have completed the training as yet. Those who had, however, described the course as beneficial in understanding the requirements of the role.

AFI 15**Training provision can lag behind investigative responsibility being given to staff**

Current low staff turnover within the Haringey CAIT means that the majority of staff have completed the relevant training courses. As a result, it was not possible to test progress in relation to timeliness of training. However, new post-holders carrying out Police Conference Liaison Officer and Researcher roles reported that they had received prompt access to training and had been effectively supported during induction.

AFI 16**Test workability of existing child abuse investigation SOPs**

SOPs have been examined in relation to the AFIs and evidence was provided on the process carried out. It was not possible, however, to test the impact further during this inspection.

AFI 17**Evidence of social workers carrying out initial assessments on behalf of the police**

See AFI 1, 2 and 6.

AFI 18**Agencies working in isolation/lack of co-ordination in Haringey**

The MAT Pilot has developed from the previously held weekly multi-agency monitoring meetings. The terms of reference cover child protection strategy discussions; exchange of information regarding non-urgent cases; requests for information regarding non-urgent cases; examination of chronic cases and re-referrals.

Core MAT membership comprises – Children and Families Social Work and Screening Team; the police Public Protection Desk; Health Visitors – child protection specialists.

The First Response Multi-Agency Team will assess and prioritise all enquiries directed to the First Response using an agreed framework. They will identify and access any additional information required as part of the assessment, planning and intervention decision making process. They will also review progress and ensure appropriate action has been taken. Contacts will be screened by the screening team within the MAT and Framework1 and police checks will be completed. The contact will then be assigned a designated First Response Level.

It is anticipated that only a minority of cases will be CAIT cases, with most being routed from the police Public Protection Desk. As a result, it is envisaged that there will be no requirement for dedicated CAIT resourcing. However, in practice, one of the CAIT Detective Sergeants is currently working almost full-time on development and, although the plan is to greatly reduce that commitment, there are indications that the impact of that commitment on the CAIT may have been under-estimated (see AFI 5).

AFI 19**Social workers not always updating CAITs with outcomes of CYPS assessments**

See AFI 1 and 2. Although Social Services have been briefed on the CRAM, it will take time for the new process to become fully embedded in joint working practices. As already highlighted, the CRAM now prompts the police to seek updates where these have not already been provided by social workers. For example, where it is decided following referral that a Social Services only response is appropriate, the CRIS report remains open until an update is provided by Social Services (within 14 days). There is a risk, however, of an over-reliance on police supervisors developing to follow-up on the progress of Social Services enquiries and assessments. This should also be considered as part of the wider CRAM evaluation to ensure that the benefits in terms of joint working are being fully realised.

AFI 20**Need to improve management of strategic operational intelligence flows under NIM in relation to potentially vulnerable people and link to tasking at all levels**

Not tested during this inspection.

AFI 21**Improve the use of analysis and intelligence across four PVP areas**

Not tested during this inspection.

AFI 22**Improve information exchange and liaison between CAITs and PPDs**

See AFI 18

AFI 23**Quality of assessment of risk to children contained within notifications of incidents of domestic violence is too variable and are not sent to partners in a timely way (include: Improve information exchange and liaison between CAITs and PPDs)**

See AFI 18

AFI 24**Greater proactivity needed in communication with other professions re outcomes of protection plan visits, health visits**

Relationships were described as good, as were lines of communication. The police now have single points of contact locally in both social services and health at a senior level for either addressing urgent matters in individual cases, or resolving issues promptly that start to emerge as trends. From a police perspective, this has been a significant step forward, particularly in relation to working with health.

There were, however, examples given of difficulties (although not endemic or widespread) in individual investigations where the police need to take immediate action – for example, to ensure that potential evidence is not lost – has not been properly understood or recognised by Social Services. This has also led to occasions where there has been a delay in notifying the police of potential crimes.

Although this was being addressed locally at the time of the inspection, it is important that the escalation process is monitored more widely across the MPS to ensure the early identification and resolution of such issues.

AFI 25

Attendance of police at medical examinations in cases of physical abuse

Whilst CAIT staff attend all examinations in relation to potential sexual abuse, it remains MPS policy that police attendance at medical examinations involving potential NAI/physical abuse is determined according to the circumstances of the case. The MPS has issued guidance to assist with decision making.

Although an informed decision has been made in arriving at this policy, taking into account the potential impact on CAIT capacity elsewhere, organisational risks remain which need to be managed at an organisational level. Currently, whilst the risks are acknowledged and understood, the expectation is that they will be managed at supervisory level. It is essential, therefore, that the MPS identify a means of monitoring decision making, particularly in those cases where the police do not attend the medical examination, to enable an assessment to be made of the impact of policy and to ensure that associated risks are identified and managed at an organisational level.

AFI 26

Review SCD5 performance management framework and monthly management report to include more qualitative measures

Police progress in the development of performance management systems was satisfactory at the time of the last inspection. However, although robust steps had been taken to put in place systems to manage and monitor individual cases, the consistent application of these systems was not yet evident. As already described, although recent, there has been marked improvement in processes with the introduction of the CRAM, the impact of which is now being seen.

SCD5 has a number of performance measures in place and monthly performance reports are produced. SCD5 is also one of six pilot sites for new national performance indicators currently under development and the SCD5 Detective Superintendent is on the national working group. This has been supplemented by bi-monthly reviews of individual CAITs (rolling programme with each CAIT being reviewed annually) which are carried out by the SCD5 Continuous Improvement Team, and which examine a range of issues from staffing levels and workload to investigations and case management. Shortfalls in practice, together with learning, are addressed at bi-monthly Detective Inspectors' meetings, chaired by the Operational Command Unit Commanders.

The Haringey child abuse investigation team has been the subject of ongoing management scrutiny over the last year and for this reason, together with the timing of this inspection of progress, it has not yet been inspected under the new programme. Although the impact of the MPS reviews, therefore, could not be assessed, HMIC considers the review process to be an important development in improving strategic oversight of CAIT performance and in ensuring that the lessons

learned from Haringey are transferred across the force.

AFI 27

Programme of audits, reviews or health checks focussing specifically on supervisory engagement, capability and capacity on CAIT teams

See AFI 26

AFI 28

Implementation of Common Assessment Framework has not been evaluated, understanding of CAF is under developed

Police use of the CAF is a national issue which is being managed within the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Children and Young People Business Area. The ACPO position is that the police will not routinely complete the CAF in every suitable case. However, it has also been agreed that the police should, as far as possible, complete the CAF Pre-Assessment Check List as a prompt for another locally negotiated partner agency to complete the full CAF.

The MPS has addressed this issue on a force-wide basis. As of December 2009, the MPS Territorial Policing Service Delivery Team Commander had met with key partners in London to discuss whether Merlin Pre-Assessment Checks (completed for children coming to the notice of the police) were sufficient to support the CAF. This was agreed and confirmed through a selection of borough visits to establish the views of the CAF co-ordinators.

AFI 29

Introduce a system of crime allocation based on skills and experience of staff, not on a simple rota basis

This was not tested during this inspection. However, see AFI 1 and 9.

**AFI 30 (from recommendation from follow-up review of progress June 2009)
Incorporate Haringey BOCU Action Plan into the SCD5 Modernisation Governance Programme**

The main issue at the time of the last inspection was that, although borough police activity was consistent with the Metropolitan Police Service action plan, it had not been formally incorporated into the action plan and was, therefore, not subject to the same level of monitoring and evaluation. It was not the intention that all borough-based activity within Haringey would automatically be considered for wider development or implementation across the MPS. However, there was a need to ensure that, where local activity had the potential to impact on the CAIT, it would be monitored through SCD5. This was particularly important in relation to the development of the (then) Multi Disciplinary Task Force – now called the Multi Agency Team First Response Pilot Project (MAT Pilot) – as it required an initial resourcing commitment from one CAIT Detective Sergeant. Although the MAT Pilot continues to be developed locally and the pilot lead is the borough Detective Inspector, by incorporating the pilot into the MPS Modernisation Project, this should ensure that SCD5 retains oversight and control of any longer term demands on CAIT resources.

More broadly, activity under the MPS Plan is now being progressed under the SCD5 Modernisation Project, which has incorporated all police actions from the two Haringey reviews, as well as those from Lord Laming's report. There are 30

identified areas for improvement, which have been 'brigaded' under themed headings. There is a named individual with responsibility for each themed area and delivery of the associated work to address the areas for improvement. Each responsible officer is also a member of the Modernisation Project Board, which is chaired by the SCD5 Detective Superintendent. The Haringey Borough DI (who reports directly to the Borough Commander) is also a member of the Modernisation Project Board, thereby providing the link between SCD5 and borough activity. In addition, the SCD5 Detective Chief Inspector, as well as the BOCU Commander, attends the Haringey LSCB meetings. SCD5 have also provided corporate presentations to subgroups of the London Safeguarding Board.

This recommendation has been met.

Superintendent Lesley Warrender, HMIC Joint Inspection Team
17 March 2010