



West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

1 September 2015

MINUTES

Attendees:	Wendy Fabbro – WF (Reading BC Chair)	Natalie Madden – NM (Business Manager)	Rachel Eden – RE (Elected Member, Reading BC)
	Sarah O'Connor – SO'C (Wokingham BC)	Nancy Barber – NB (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)	Simon McGurk - SMcG (Reading BC)
	Debbie Daly – DD (CCG)	Jenny Selim – JS (CCG)	Sue Brain – SB (West Berkshire Council)
	Lynn McFetridge – LM (Wokingham BC)	Linda York – LY (Thames Valley Police)	Stan Gilmour - SG (Thames Valley Police)
	Dr Shona Morrison – SM (Police and Crime Commissioner's Office - Item 4)	Brian Walsh – BW (Interim Independent Chair from 30.09.15 - Observer)	Steve Beard – SBe (Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)
	Hilary Cole – HC (Elected Member, West Berkshire Council)	Rachael Wardell – RW (Director – West Berkshire Council)	Victoria Hunter – VH (Alliance for Cohesion and Racial Equality - Item 3)
	Mandeep Kaur Singh – MS (Healthwatch Reading)	Tracey Dawes – TD (Reading BC- Minutes)	
Apologies / did not attend:	Dave Phillips – DP (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)	Simon Leslie – SL (Joint Legal Team)	June Graves – JG (West Berkshire Council)
	Melanie O'Rourke – MO'R (Reading BC)	Andrew Burnett – AB (Reading BC)	Gabriel Amahwe - GA (Thames Valley Community Rehabilitation Company)
	Tony Hesleton – TH (South Central Ambulance Service)	Debbie Johnson – DJ (Probation)	Patricia Pease - PP (Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)
	Rebecca Norris – RN (HealthWatch Reading)	Kat Jenkin - KJ (South Central Ambulance Service)	Elizabeth Rhodes – ER (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)

Date of future meetings:	Tuesday 1 December 2015 – 1000 - 1200 - Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham	
Item	Discussion	Action
1. Welcome and Chair's Announcements	<p>WF explained the background to Teresa Bell having to resign as Chair of the Board. Brian Walsh has been offered a one year interim Chair position from 1 October and WF will hold the post until then. BW aims to meet as many Board members as possible before the next Board meeting.</p> <p>WF said that the three local Authority arrangements for the SAB are new to her. She has some concerns about the separate strands that sit beneath this Board and there needs to be clarity about how arrangements apply to each local authority.</p>	
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	<p>Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 2 June 2015 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Progress on actions agreed at last meeting were reviewed, with further discussion about the following points:</p> <p><i>LM, JG, SM liaise with Lead Members about including their names on the business plan and feedback to NM.</i> LM reported that she has escalated to lead member but not heard back as yet. RE reported that she is happy to have her name on the business plan but lead members will have to “own” the actions, not just be a tick box exercise. NM proposed that, since it will be difficult to change the plan 6 months into its delivery, the Business Plan for next year be presented in a format that makes it easier to include names of lead members.</p> <p><i>TB have discussion with Directors about expectations and attendance at Board meetings.</i> Board agreed that Lead Councillors and Directors are very welcome to attend every Board meeting, not just the meeting held in their area.</p>	
Presentations		
3. Female Genital Mutilation	<p>Victoria Hunter (Alliance for Cohesion and Racial Equality) reported that the main aim was to raise awareness and monitor FGM locally. Reading is listed as one of 11 hotspots for FGM in the country. Two conferences have been held, both well attended, with champions offering to speak. The Police and Crime Commissioner opening the second conference.</p> <p>From September there will be a real multi-agency push for FGM with the focus on engaging with communities. A symposium will take place on 22 November with a partnership event two weeks</p>	

	<p>before that.</p> <p>VH aims to report to RBC's Health and Wellbeing Board in January 2016 and ACE Committee in March 2016. A LSCB Task and Finish Group has created an action plan and plans to set up a training package.</p> <p>RE highlighted the pressures and inter-generational issues. There is a need to ensure that individual staff and social worker teams are ready to pick up this work.</p> <p>There needs to be more joint working with a single agency / Board taking responsibility for leadership.</p> <p>Agreed that the Board could not make a full decision today and a Task and Finish Group needed to be established to take actions to the Partnership and Best Practice Subgroup. SG was concerned that if it did this it would delay the important work further. It was felt a subgroup/task and finish group could give a fuller rationale and paper to help make a decision on what to do next.</p> <p>RE confirmed that the Health and Wellbeing Board had taken leadership on FGM issues within Reading. HC proposed that Reading should take leadership/ownership via the Health and Wellbeing Board on behalf of the three areas, cascading information and reporting back to other local authorities and Health and Wellbeing Boards as appropriate.</p> <p>Agreed that NM would circulate Terms of Reference of the task and finish group to SAB members.</p> <p>RW suggested that link into joint conference in October. NM reported that all the workshops had been booked and that there had been a separate workshop at the Conference two years ago, but consideration will be given to mentioning it in the introduction to the day.</p> <p>VH encouraged SAB to think about what goes in to the November conference and provide ideas to her by the end of October.</p>	<p>WF to take comments and negotiate decisions made at the Board with Reading Health and Wellbeing Chair</p> <p>NM circulate ToFR to SAB members</p> <p>SAB members consider what goes into November conference – by end of October 2015</p>
<p>4. Victim Services commissioned by Police and</p>	<p>Dr Shona Morrison (Police and Crime Commissioner's Office) brought an update to the Board on what the PCC are doing to support victims of crime. The responsibility for victims of crime moved from the Ministry of Justice to PCCs last October. Thames Valley PCC has done a vast amount of research and held focus groups (for both voluntary and statutory organisations). A</p>	

<p>Crime Commissioner (PCC)</p>	<p>number of information papers are on the PCC website. http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/aboutus/aboutus-pcc.htm</p> <p>SM explained the generic referral system in place, along with the self-referral system. Contract awarded to Victim Support for the next 3 years, which currently uses volunteers but is looking at shaping its services further.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of funding for supporting young victims and this is an area under development. An Oxford Service (SAFE) will prioritise young people in sexual/domestic violence abuse situations and extend individual sexual advisers. Refuge has the contract for the outreach service across the Thames Valley; they are making contact with GPs and also supporting victims of FGM too.</p> <p>PCC has identified significant gaps across the Thames Valley for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Young victims; - Victims with mental health/substance misuse issues who need supporting. An 18 month contract / pilot is being set up to look into this. Need to stabilise these victims of crime so that they can get into a refuge. Will monitor this contract/pilot over the next 18 months. - Trauma Service – received an additional 2 years funding and provided funding to pilot studies in Reading and Oxford to identify victims of modern slavery and sexual exploitation. - Counselling Hub funding – to be established for those who need access to counselling; criteria around the budget still to be agreed. <p>WF was concerned that there appear to be huge areas of overlap. Need to look at safeguarding issues and safeguarding of people with LD. How can the SAB support this work? SM suggested that the SAB needs to make PCC aware of evolving issues and that Victim Services receive feedback on what they are doing well and what needs improving / gaps in provision. WF questioned what links exist between the SAB and the PCC? Agreed that SM and NB discuss further and ensure links are made to each other's organisations websites.</p> <p>DD suggested that in 18 months time providers should be provided with feedback.</p> <p>Agreed that SAB would be interested in evaluation data.</p>	<p>SM and NB discuss further and ensure have links to each other's organisations websites.</p> <p>All review projects and provide feedback to PCC, via NM.</p>
--	---	--

6. Care Act Implementation	<p>NM took the Board through the paper. Proposal that Partnership and Best Practice and Governance Subgroups lead on this work. The tight timescales were noted.</p> <p>DD asked about the membership of the subgroups – was it the right mix and was there capacity to deliver the work? NM reported that membership of the groups was reviewed in March; there is an issue that a small number of people sit on lots of groups and are being spread too thin, especially the CCG and Wokingham reps.</p> <p>WF reported that she has brought in a consultant to review Reading’s Safeguarding processes, Wokingham has done the same. Would the Board like feedback from both authorities? Agreed.</p>	<p>Future agenda item</p>
7. Making Safeguarding Personal	<p>SMcG reported on the delays in embedding MSP in Reading. Advocacy is an area that needs developing and a meeting is planned with Healthwatch re. auditing outcomes. The 3 authorities are planning joint training. MSP will be an agenda item for the Forums. WF recommended that this work is not delayed. SB recognises that there is a cultural shift– some teams are better than others at balancing this.</p> <p>Questions from WF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to monitor the impact of this? - How to make it happen faster? - How do West of Berkshire respond? (a cohesive response would be better, not 3 separate responses from the 3 LAs) <p>BW is interested in quality of impact across the three LAs. He will look at this when he starts in post.</p> <p>LY asked when training would be available to partners. SB reported that there are no details on timing as yet. Learning and Development Subgroup leads on training and recognises the need to do something quite quickly.</p> <p>RW asked what was the benefit of training in local authorities first before providers? SB responded that volume/capacity issues and the need to get it embedded into Adult Social Care first.</p> <p>RE suggested providing training across the 3 authorities and questions what are the advantages it is delivered by a single authority?</p>	<p>NM to get message through to Learning Development Subgroup to develop training in the three LAS as a priority action.</p> <p>BW take forward as future piece of work.</p>

	<p>Need to consider whether training is half a day/full day's training and when it could happen. Will also need to get sense of scale in terms of the training and what partners will need to contribute to costs.</p> <p>DD suggested that this training be incorporate into Level 3 training for Health and Social Care staff.</p> <p>Training proposal to be provided to Board in October. SMcG find a trainer.</p>	
8. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards – Quarter 1 Data	<p><u>Reading</u></p> <p>SMcG reported that Reading was doing badly in terms of processing DOLs applications and hasbeen unsuccessful in recruiting staff. The use of internal and external BIAs also needs to be looked at.</p> <p>WF asked if there was potential for one service rather than 3 DOLs services.</p> <p>SMcG reported that Reading has commissioned independent DoLS training to cover all Adult Social Care and mental health (4 x half days). Has reported to DMT and Lead Councillor Briefings re. DOLs issues recently and is doing everything he can to sort.</p> <p>SO'C asked if Reading is directing Court of Protection through DOLs? SMcG confirmed and highlighted that there are issues around understanding mental capacity generally.</p> <p><u>West Berkshire</u></p> <p>SB reported that number of DoLS applications in Q1 and 2 exceeded the whole of last year's number. Training more social workers to be BIAs. Breaching Court of Protection but by small amounts.</p> <p><u>Wokingham</u></p> <p>SO'C reported on Court of Protection – slow at identifying referrals but not breaching. Have got Workforce Development Plan in place. Using manual database which is an issue when completing returns.</p>	

	<p>action plans would be needed to ensure cohesive delivery of the Framework. LY agreed that action plans and timescales were essential for partners to plan work flow.</p> <p>RE commented there was no mention of scope in Framework; non-statutory agencies are not included in the Framework.</p> <p>SG asked that at the next meeting can the Board consider if they are fulfilling its duty and what value we can add to it.</p>	
Performance and Development Updates		
10. Quarterly Subgroup and Forum Reports, including Performance Indicators Quarter 1 Data	<p>NM reported Terms of Reference for Governance Subgroup and Partnership and Best Practice have been reviewed and attached as appendices.</p> <p>NM took the Board through the Performance Indicators spreadsheet. WF commented that it supplied the Board with fascinating information. NM will update with Q2 data for the next meeting and include a narrative if possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Governance Subgroup has written to TVP re. contribution of funding, but not yet received a response as yet. SG reported that he's chasing his colleagues for a response. 2. Potential areas for development as a result of increased funding presented to the Board for consideration – Members to review proposed list and feedback any comments back to NM direct. 3. Learning from Safeguarding Adults Reviews Monitoring Tool presented for the Board's consideration. Members are asked to consider whether this tool fulfils the monitoring requirements of the Board. NM has spoken to WF and BW who feel it is not robust or detailed enough. Board members review and feedback any further comments back to NM direct to take to the Subgroup. 4. Board members to support the launch of the Board's website within organisations. http://www.sabberkshirewest.co.uk/ 5. Format for Board's Annual Report presented for approval - Comments back to NM by end of September. 6. Source of referral - Subgroup needs coordinated response across the 3 authorities. West 	<p>SG to pursue colleagues for a response to letter re. funding.</p> <p>All to review and feedback any comments back to NM direct.</p> <p>All review and feedback any further comments back to NM</p> <p>All circulate link.</p> <p>All feedback comments on proposed format for Annual Report to NM.</p> <p>SB forward source of referral data to</p>

	Berkshire has done some work already and agreed that it would helpful if they share what they collate with others.	NM for discussion at next Performance and Quality Subgroup meeting on 10 Sept.
11. Safeguarding Adults Reviews - update on current cases	<p>JG case – Board members are requested to note the content of the Learning Document into the case of JG and circulate to teams.</p> <p>Consideration of partner agencies’ processes in relation to ensuring DAAT providers fulfil their safeguarding requirements. RW was happy to take action away from today’s Board for West Berkshire and other Directors to discuss.</p> <p>CW Case – is pending.</p>	<p>Future agenda item for Best Practice Group re. training assurance</p> <p>RW take forward for discussion with directors.</p>
12. Business Plan 2015-16 - Quarter 1 Progress	<p>Business Plan circulated. Any outstanding actions to NM by the end of September.</p> <p>RE also asked for clarity about what constitutes “red, amber and green”.</p>	Any outstanding actions to be completed and reported to NM by the end of September.
Documents circulated for Information		
13. Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust Annual Report 2014-15 and Annual Plan 2015-16	Any comments to NM and WF.	Any comments to NM and WF.
14. Berkshire Mental Health Care Crisis Concordat – Action Plan	Any comments to NM and WF.	Any comments to NM and WF.
15. Law Commission DoLS Consultation	Review report and consider responding to consultation.	Review report and consider responding to consultation.
16. AOB	SBe re Regulation 28 reports to prevent future deaths. Coroner wrote to the 6 Berkshire authorities about an open dialogue between local authorities and the Fire and Rescue Service – deadline for response was the end of July. RW thought the letter had been sent to Chief Executives and then delegated to Directors but will check.	Directors to check this has been shared by Chief Executives.

17. Dates of next meetings	As above.	
Closing Thanks	WF thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 1200.	