

**West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting**

**19 September 2016**

**MINUTES**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Brian Walsh – BW (Chair)	Natalie Madden – NM (Business Manager)	Rebecca Flynn - RF (Reading BC)
	Wendy Fabbro – WF (Reading BC)	Kathy Kelly - KK (CCG)	Sue Brain – SB (West Berkshire Council)
	Sarah O'Connor – SO'C (Wokingham BC)	Lynn McFetridge – LM (Wokingham BC)	Rachel Eden – RE (Elected Member, Reading BC)
	Nancy Barber – NB (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)	Patricia Pease - PP (Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)	Jane Lawlor – JL (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)
	Stuart Rowbotham – SR (Wokingham BC)	Graham Wilkin – GW (Reading BC)	Johan Baker – JB (Safeguarding Forum, Wokingham)
<b>Apologies:</b>	Simon Leslie – SL (Joint Legal Team)	Norma Kueberuwa – NK (National Probation Service)	Clare Rebbeck – CR (Involve, Wokingham)
	June Graves – JG (West Berkshire Council)	Dave Myers - (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)	Rick Jones – RJ (Elected Member, West Berkshire Council)
	Abbie Murr – AM (Emergency Duty Service)	Mandeep Kaur Singh – MS (HealthWatch Reading)	Rachael Wardell – RW (West Berkshire Council)
	Stan Gilmour – SG (Thames Valley Police)	Tony Heselton – TH (South Central Ambulance Service)	
<b>Dates of future meetings:</b>	Date of next meeting: Monday 5th December, 1200-1500, Shaw House, Church Road, Shaw, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2DR		

Item	Discussion	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	As above.	
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	<p>The minutes of the Safeguarding Adults Board meeting held on 20 June 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting. Board members reviewed the matters arising on the previously circulated progress sheet, with further discussion on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members endorsed a proposal to develop a podcast to raise awareness for Making Safeguarding Personal, to be presented by the Independent Chair and a representative service user group. JB suggested that should CLASP be used to help the Board with communication material and easy read versions of documents, a contribution to the charity may be required. Board members agreed with this proposal.</li> <li>SR confirmed that he had made representation to Thames Valley Police regarding a press release about a significant incident in a care home in Wokingham and its potential destabilising impact on the home. A function of the SAB is to ensure partner organisations do not work in a unilateral way; there is a Communication Strategy and due processes to ensure one organisation's public communication does not negatively impact on another agency. The outstanding issue of joint communication and partnership working to be addressed by BW and SG.</li> <li>Format for the presentation of LA safeguarding data: Data Analysts are liaising across the three Councils to agree a common approach to the presentation of safeguarding performance data for the Council's safeguarding annual reports.</li> </ul>	<p><b>KK lead on development of a podcast to raise awareness for Making Safeguarding Personal.</b></p> <p><b>BW initiate conversation with SG about the outstanding issue of joint communication and partnership working.</b></p>
<b>Themed discussion: Priority 1 Governance and Accountability</b>		
3. Priority 1 Progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality Assurance Framework</li> <li>Self-Assessment audit tool</li> <li>Berkshire Policy and Procedures</li> </ul>	<p><b>Quality Assurance Framework</b></p> <p>The Board's Quality Assurance Framework has been reviewed in line with Priority 1.1 of the Business Plan. Board members endorsed changes made to the Framework and agreed to develop its annual Business Planning day into a Challenge and Support event to enable partners to present what they are doing well and areas where they are working to improve outcomes. Such an event would enable the Board to evidence how partners have challenged each other and would also enable partners to identify priorities for next year's Business Plan.</p>	

	<p>Consideration was given to how the Board will improve mechanisms by which it collates and uses feedback to understand if safeguarding arrangements deliver the outcomes people want and make a difference. This will be the focus of the next meeting of the Effectiveness Subgroup (18 October) and confirmation regarding what is included in current contracts between the Councils and HealthWatch is required in time for this meeting.</p> <p><b>Self-Assessment Audit Tool</b> Board members endorsed the revised Self-Assessment Audit Tool and committed to completing the audit by the end of the year on an annual basis.</p> <p>Making Safeguarding Personal is not specifically reflected in the current audit tool used by health agencies, although there are other similar elements that support the principles of empowerment. The Health audit tool encompasses Section 11 requirements, children and adult safeguarding so elements could be aligned although it is unlikely the whole tool could be replaced. The aspiration is that agencies streamline processes from 2017-18.</p> <p>Local Authorities in the east of Berkshire have expressed interest in using this audit tool and the Quality Assurance Framework. A Berkshire wide approach would be welcomed by partners.</p> <p><b>Berkshire Policy and Procedures</b> Board members endorsed the amended version previously circulated. JB requested consistent use of terminology throughout the Policy and Procedures and the Board's website.</p>	<p><b>RW / WF/ SR to confirm what is included in existing contracts with HealthWatch in time for the next meeting of the Effectiveness Subgroup in October.</b></p> <p><b>NM to ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the document and the website.</b></p>
<b>4. Wokingham Peer Review</b>	<p>SO'C presented findings from the Wokingham BC peer review. The review focused on: safeguarding, care governance and commissioning; service users views of the framework; Care Act compliance; arrangements for safeguarding in the proposed integration programme with the NHS.</p> <p>The peer review gave positive feedback about Wokingham's innovative care governance systems and matrix management.</p> <p>Council had previously identified safeguarding developments that were required and 11 further pieces of work have been embedded into an action plan.</p> <p>The reviewers noticed the unique set of circumstances in Wokingham, where a provider</p>	

	<p>(Optalis) has social care function providing long term support, noting a disconnect between the way these functions worked. SR confirmed that improvements have been made since the review.</p> <p>LM confirmed that learning gained through the process outweighed the effort and time. Staff and customers valued the opportunity of being involved.</p> <p>Review confirmed that clarified the right decision had been made to base the Principle Social worker in the safeguarding service and the role provides an element of challenge; the PSW role is well embedded.</p> <p>NM to review Wokingham's and West Berkshire's peer reviews reports and present common themes at the next Board meeting.</p>	<p><b>NM present common themes at the next Board meeting.</b></p>
<p><b>5. Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust Mental Health Benchmarking</b></p>	<p>NB introduced a paper to provide the Board with an update on safeguarding within Mental Health inpatient services at Prospect Park Hospital. The report presented benchmarking data taken from the NHS 2015 benchmarking project for mental health services, with analysis performed on data for 2014/15.</p> <p>NB confirmed there have been no suicides on a ward; an event where a patient has left the ward and committed suicide is part of the significant incident review process. BHFT has a safeguarding plan for adults, which has been previously shared with colleagues in Reading BC. BW commented that the report provided good context to activity.</p> <p>RF commented that systems and relationships are improving on an operational level, but can still be further improved to make patients safer.</p> <p>SR confirmed that colleagues in Wokingham BC have not expressed particular concerns about in-patients.</p> <p>PP outlined that the management of mental health patients in crisis is a real issue in Reading. The A&amp;E department receives increasingly more complex cases and PP's job remit has changed in order to focus on this.</p> <p>The purpose of the paper was to benchmark BHFT against national data and was not intended to meet other concerns that have unfolded since this paper was requested.</p> <p>KK assured the Board that there are Serious Incident processes within the CCG whereby if an <b>incident was felt to be preventable or predictable there is a system where these case be considered for a SAR.</b></p> <p>BW requested that a shared understanding between BHFT and Reading BC is required. A</p>	

	<p>meeting between relevant managers to be convened immediately to explore relevant data, activities and processes across the whole system. Reading BC colleagues to share substantiated concerns so that BHFT can respond accordingly. A report to be provided for the Independent Chair's scrutiny within a month. A joint report to be presented to the Board about processes and areas for improvement in December.</p> <p>Any relevant data is to be shared with other local authorities so the necessary analysis can be undertaken and fed in.</p>	<p><b>NB / RF lead on arranging a meeting of relevant colleagues and producing report for BW within a month.</b></p> <p><b>For further discussion at Board in December.</b></p>
<p><b>6. Governance Subgroup function and purpose</b></p>	<p>It is evident to SR and members of the Governance subgroup that there is a lack of clarity about functions of the subgroup and some duplication with the Board's Terms of Reference. The purpose and functions of the Governance subgroup are fundamental to the Board's role and should not be delegated to a subgroup.</p> <p>Board members agreed to disband the Governance Subgroup.</p> <p>All funding partners should continue to be involved in decisions around, for example, funding or recruitment.</p> <p>BW impressed upon Board members that commitment will be required for specific pieces of work that would normally sit within the remit of the Governance Subgroup.</p> <p>Outstanding activities within Priority 1 of the Business Plan that relate to Quality Assurance to be overseen by the Performance and Quality Subgroup which SR will chair.</p>	<p><b>NM remove references to the Governance Subgroup from all Board documents and the website.</b></p> <p><b>BW and NM review and re-allocate actions in the Business Plan to other subgroups.</b></p>
<p><b>7. Documents for endorsement</b></p>	<p><b>Annual Report 2015-16</b></p> <p>Board members endorsed the draft Annual <b>Report and agreed with the following proposals, to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Delegate responsibility to Directors to approve</b> the Councils' annual safeguarding performance reports and ensure they are completed within the agreed timeframe.</li> <li>• Include links to annual reports produced by partner agencies.</li> <li>• Delegate responsibility to the Business Manager to produce the remaining appendices as set out on page 10.</li> </ul>	<p><b>RW, SR, WF ensure Councils' annual safeguarding performance reports are produced.</b></p> <p><b>NB and PP forward annual report to NM.</b></p> <p><b>NM produce remaining appendices.</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to commission the production of an easy read version of the Annual Report. JB suggested CLASP may be approached to produce an easy read version but this is likely to have a cost implication as they are a charity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Board's Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>Board members endorsed the amended Terms of Reference which reflect the Care Act and other recent changes to the Board's mechanisms and clarify ownership of the functions.</p> <p><b>Communication Protocol</b></p> <p>The Board considered this document in June. TVP subsequently requested that an exception be included for cases where the police are involved in a live investigation of a safeguarding incident. In such cases, TVP would take primacy in the communications process.</p> <p>In light of previous discussion under item 2, Board members agreed they could not endorse this document until BW has reached agreement with TVP.</p> <p><b>Induction Pack for new Board members</b></p> <p>Board members endorsed the Induction Pack for new Board members.</p>	<p><b>NM liaise with JB and CLASP to produce easy read version of the annual report.</b></p> <p><b>NM bring forward for December Board meeting.</b></p> <p><b>NM to publish Induction Pack on website and circulate to new Board members.</b></p>
<b>STANDING ITMES</b>		
<p><b>8. Safeguarding Adults Reviews</b></p> <p><b>Action Plan to embed learning from Case of Mrs H and Case of Mr I</b></p>	<p>Board members reviewed the action plan to embed the findings prioritised by the Board on 12 July. The SAR Panel aimed to develop an achievable and meaningful action plan that wherever possible draws together existing streams of work.</p> <p>Findings reflect evidence of practice at the time period under review and so are written in the present tense, even though considerable improvements may have been made since then. NM confirmed that wording had been included in the final Mr I report to clarify this. Specific reference to single agencies in the findings to be removed.</p> <p>Delivery of the action plan to be monitored by the Effectiveness Subgroup.</p> <p>Full report on the Case of Mr I to be published on the website and shared with Hampshire Council for inclusion in their depository of SARs. Headline findings to be included in Board's briefing note.</p>	<p><b>NM bring forward as standing item for Effectiveness Subgroup to.</b></p> <p><b>NM publish Mr I full report on Board's website and forward to Hampshire CC.</b></p>

<p><b>9. Business Plan 2016-17</b></p>	<p>Expected progress is being made in all areas, with the exception of: 4.2 Service user feedback indicates that clients' desired outcomes are met, in line with MSP and the well-being principle.</p> <p>The Effectiveness Subgroup has identified the need for partner agencies to consider developing internal mechanisms to ensure service user feedback is gained as part of standard practice, and for the KPI set to include measures for MSP. The next Effectiveness Subgroup meeting is dedicated to this priority area.</p> <p>Clarity about what the three councils already commission from HealthWatch is required.</p> <p>PP confirmed that patient and <b>carers' feedback is gained by Health agencies who already produce reports about patient experience: not safeguarding</b> specific, but safeguarding in its widest context.</p> <p>Development work is needed if an additional KPI around MSP is included. Mechanisms need to be established to enable the correct data to be collected from April.</p>	
<p><b>10. Quarterly report from subgroups</b></p>	<p>The work of the five subgroups is largely focused on the actions contained within the Business Plan. Board members considered additional issues presented for their attention.</p> <p><b>Mental Capacity Act conferences</b> – Board members agreed this is a priority area that requires Board action. MCA is priority finding from the two SARs. The conferences organised by the CCG and Wokingham BC received excellent feedback and were oversubscribed. A further grant may be available but if not, the Board needs to consider providing funding for further events, at least on an annual basis. The three SABs in the east of Berkshire could be approached for a Berkshire wide event.</p> <p>Board members agreed to withdraw the <b>Threshold Guidance</b> document which is not in line with the Care Act. The Berkshire Policy and Procedures should provide sufficient guidance for practitioners; the Effectiveness Subgroup to consider whether a further document needs to be produced.</p> <p><b>Case file audit</b> – the peer review of case file audits was a very useful process and revealed common themes that were presented in an overview report for the Board's attention. An action plan focused on the following priority areas for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise awareness of Empowerment in Safeguarding via a briefing note.</li> </ul>	<p><b>B/f for next Learning and Development Subgroup meeting.</b></p> <p><b>B/f for future Effectiveness Subgroup meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Relevant colleagues note actions</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritisation of recording skills training for frontline workers.</li> <li>• Improve use of advocates.</li> <li>• SAB develop better understanding of service user voice in regards to protection.</li> <li>• LAs to focus on areas not achieved in S42 audit.</li> <li>• Re-audit to show improvement against the findings.</li> </ul> <p>Board members confirmed that <b>Source of Referral</b> data is meaningful and should continue to be included in the KPI set for Wokingham and Reading. West Berkshire review and collect the data in a different way and could not share on a quarterly basis. SB to consider how the information collected by West Berkshire could be presented to the Board and on what frequency.</p>	<p><b>allocated to them in action plan.</b></p> <p><b>SB to consider.</b></p>
<p><b>11. Key Performance Indicators – Q1 data</b></p>	<p>Read properly and make comments virtually. Helpful to have commentary has not been possible Q1 and 2 commentary in December. Emerging trends for half a year.</p> <p>Thanks to colleagues in Wokingham</p>	
<p><b>12. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards</b></p>	<p>West b Rise by %. currently keeping up because using external assessors, unlikely to be sustainable.</p> <p>Reading same continued risks, long business processes can . capped figure for ext BIAs to £200 per assessments.</p> <p>Wok has always had cap of £200, a uniform approach would be useful.</p> <p>West Berks payments fluctuate – start at £200, may fluctuate for out of Board placements. consistent approach w</p> <p>added to adass screeing tool urgent by need rather than urgent by process. Internal capacity increasing, rota, wkfo dev strat. Shortage of external BIAs, standardised payment s had led to movement of ex outside borders.</p>	<p><b>assessment</b></p>



	<p>CoP - numbers seem very low. West Bks don't have capacity within legal services to focus on community dols, trying to priorities comm dols where there are restrictions. Legally sist within operational services so may not fall under DoLS statutory services. Some issues with progression of cases how they are getting through to court process.</p> <p>CHC point of view looking at system to look at community DoLS. Cost . some GP practice ies will not charge fo a diagnosis , KK to feedback in Dec, highest they can charge is £25.</p> <p>RBC working hard on comm dols and moving forward</p>	
<b>13. Risk and Mitigation Log</b>	BW requested that all Board members give due attention to this important document and feedback any comments to NM within two weeks.	<b>Board members review the Risk and Mitigation Log and feedback any comments to NM within two weeks.</b>
<b>14. Regional and National Developments</b>	<p>BW updated Board members on regional and national developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges on the whole Health and Social Care system.</li> <li>• Implementation of the Sustainability and Transformation Plans.</li> <li>• Launch of the King's Fund.</li> <li>• National scarcity of SAR lead reviewers and authors.</li> </ul>	
<b>15. Communication items</b>	<p>Board members agreed the following items to be communicated in the Board's Briefing Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service user involvement and feedback.</li> <li>• Streamlining of Board's governance processes.</li> <li>• Quality Assurance.</li> <li>• SAR findings.</li> </ul>	
<b>16. Any other urgent business</b>	Reading BC to begin the appointment process for a new Independent Chair so that a clear handover of responsibilities can take place before March.	

<b>17. Information items:</b>	<p>Board members were asked to note the following information items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A guide for people on how to reduce the risk of skin breakdown</li> <li>• Government response to the Confidential Inquiry into premature deaths of people with learning disabilities</li> <li>• Berkshire West CCGs Federation Safeguarding Team</li> </ul>	
<b>18. Closing thanks</b>	Brian thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 1500.	
<b>19. Dates of future meetings</b>	Monday 5th December, 1200-1500, Shaw House, Church Road, Shaw, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2DR	