

West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

2 June 2015

MINUTES

Attendees:	June Graves – JG (West Berkshire District Council)	Natalie Madden – NM (Business Manager. Minutes)	Hilary Cole – HC (Elected Member, West Berkshire District Council)
	Rachael Wardell – RW (West Berkshire District Council)	Nancy Barber – NB (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)	Simon McGurk - SMG (Reading BC)
	Debbie Daly – DD (CCG)	Jenny Selim – JS (CCG)	Sue Brain – SB (West Berkshire District Council)
	Lynn McFetridge – LM (Wokingham BC)	Debbie Johnson – DJ (Probation)	Linda York – LY (Thames Valley Police)
	Kat Jenkin - KJ (South Central Ambulance Service)	Lorna Pearce – LP (Wokingham BC)	Lindsey Finch – LF (Thames Valley Police)
	Elizabeth Porter – EP (Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)		
Apologies / did not attend:	Teresa Bell – TB (SAB Independent Chair)	Patricia Pease- PP (Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)	Elizabeth Rhodes – ER (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)
	Melanie O'Rourke – MO'R (Reading BC)	Rebecca Norris – RN (HealthWatch Reading)	Sarah O'Connor – SO'C (Wokingham BC)
	Tony Hesleton – TH (South Central Ambulance Service)	Ian Wootton – IW (West Berkshire District Council)	Gabriel Amahwe - GA (Thames Valley Community Rehabilitation Company)
	Penny Conroy – PC (Emergency Duty Service)		
Date of future meetings:	Tuesday 1 Sept 2015 1000-1200 - Committee Room 1, Council Office Plaza West, Reading Tuesday 1 Dec 2015 1000-1200 - Wokingham, venue tbc		

Item	Discussion	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	<p>As above.</p> <p>Teresa Bell is unable to attend her first Board meeting since taking up the post of Independent Chair due to an urgent personal matter. Meeting Chaired by June Graves, Chair of Governance Subgroup.</p>	
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	<p>Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 3 March 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>1) LY and DJ liaise with TH re. information sharing and engagement with SCAS.</p> <p>DJ met with Bob Stirling to discuss information sharing and engagement with South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). Confirmed that no request had been received from SCAS to attend Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) meetings. Statutory agencies attend the meetings and other agencies are only invited if they are pertinent to a particular case. DJ reviewed recent meetings and confirmed that SCAS have not been involved in cases that have come to MAPPA.</p> <p>KJ expressed concern that SCAS has not been involved in learning and reviews undertaken by the Board, and since SCAS has a lot of care plans in place they could provide useful information.</p> <p>LY gave an overview of local Panels:</p> <p>The focus of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) is perpetrators of violent offences, with the focus on public protection. Cases must fit criteria of sentence and are graded based on the category of offence and risk they pose to the community. Level 1 cases are not discussed. DJ / LY chair Level 2 meetings, the purpose of which is to put in place everything to protect the public from the perpetrator. Level 3 cases involve extremely dangerous individuals or those cases that could cause massive embarrassment to the organisation, and these are chaired by Directors. Statutory agencies are Children's Social Care, Adult Social Care, Thames Valley Police, Probation, Mental Health Services, and Job Centres. Anyone else relevant to the case can only attend part of the meeting. Minutes are confidential. MAPPA guidance is available on line:</p>	

	<p>(http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/aboutus/aboutus-parts/aboutus-parts-mappa.htm)</p> <p>Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Committee (MARAC) is established to review individual, high risk domestic abuse cases. Anyone can make a referral if the risk to the victim is high. Committees are co-chaired by Police and Probation; the aim is to put into place a plan to protect victims and any children in the household. Further information is available on line: http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/aboutus/crprev-domabu/crprev-domabu-whatdomabu/crprev-domabu-whatdomabu-intvp.htm</p> <p>2) Co-produce local procedure for carrying out enquiries: Board to request report from each LA outlining outstanding actions needed to ensure this requirement is met. This action is in progress. Feedback from Local Authorities will be reviewed by the Independent Chair who will make a decision when and how this will be brought back to the Board.</p>	
3. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)	<p>Update from three Local Authorities about local arrangements for DoLS:</p> <p><u>Reading BC</u> Best Interest Assessors (BIAs) - the number of internal BIAs in Reading are: 5 full-time, 3 part-time; 2 have recently completed training. The DoLS lead has left; finding a replacement will be a challenge. Currently reviewing general approach to manage DoLS, including how to manage the rota and HR issues. Reading BC would be interested in expanding the training programme with other areas. SMG will be producing a statement about how the organisation has managed DoLS in order to be defensible in the face of any legal challenge.</p> <p>Dols figures for 2014-15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 404 Dols applications for 378 people in 81 care homes. • 202 were granted and 27 not granted. A further 4 are not yet signed off by the supervisory body and 171 requests were withdrawn. • Gender Breakdown: Female – 260. Male 144 • Age Breakdown: 18 to 64 – 88. 65 to 84 – 145. 85 and Over - 171 <p><u>Wokingham</u> The biggest issue has been the sign off of the new ADASS paperwork; it has proved time consuming for the two authorised signatories; senior staff are currently being trained to sign off paperwork. 8 new staff have been trained as BIAs and 3 new senior members of staff are about to start training. Wokingham's aim is to reduce the use of agency staff. There have been minimal</p>	

	<p>breaches in timescale but an increase in is anticipated. All LAs are struggling with the increase in workload: one of the big authorities have received a £60k fine for a long breach.</p> <p>In 2014-15, 482 Dols applications were made for 440 people and 76 Care Homes. 434 were granted and 48 not granted. Of those not granted: 32 did not meet criteria, 11 had a change in circumstance and 5 passed away. 24 of those granted ended in the year (2014-15) and the remaining 410 are planned to end this year (2015-16). 12 people were reviewed in the year. Age breakdown of people whose Dols was granted (not including repeats): 18 to 64: 77 65 to 84: 132 85 +: 189</p> <p><u>West Berkshire</u></p> <p>Annual figures for 2014-15 are 218 applications in total (compared to previous year's total of 14). There have been some breaches. 6 court of protection applications started within this timeframe. There were no legal challenges last year, but there has been one this year.</p> <p>This year there have been 90 DoLS applications in the first 8 weeks, plus all renewals and reviews. There is 1 additional court of protection to pick up. There has been one legal challenge, where DoLS is being used as lever to challenge the placement.</p> <p>Regarding the legal duty for those in respite, the team is looking at developing a more efficient approach by using the Court of Protection to cover the whole of the care plan; currently seeking legal advice on this matter.</p> <p>West Berkshire has 11.5 internal BIAs trained and a rota is in place. There are plans for another 6 to be trained. Still need to use significant amount of external BIAs.</p> <p><u>Royal Berks Hospital</u></p> <p>From the Hospital's perspective, nearly all DoLS are urgent and numbers are increasing on a monthly basis. There have been some complications around detaining patients under the Mental Health Act since S12 doctors may interpret the Act differently.</p> <p><u>Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust</u> have seen an increase; initially there were delays getting assessments through.</p> <p><u>Wokingham</u> reported a particular issue with an external BIA, whose assessment was challenged.</p>	<p>NM b/f DoLS as standing item for</p>
--	---	--

	<p>It is felt across the area that the quality of external assessments is not as good as internal assessments. Volume of demand dictates pragmatism. Board members are aware of the need to work together to increase purchasing power and are mindful of the risks with the external market. There is a conflict between time pressure and the need to maintain cost effectiveness. Aim across the whole area is to increase the volume of trained staff that can be shared locally.</p> <p>There is a Berkshire wide MCA / DoLS group where all 6 unitary authorities review prices and other issues.</p>	future Board meetings.
<p>4. Safeguarding Adults Reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on current cases 	<p>Sylvia Stone has agreed to be the Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Adults Review Panel. To be reviewed annually.</p> <p>JG gave an update of current cases under review:</p> <p>West Berkshire brought to the Panel's attention a case involving an individual who had wide ranging but low level issues that did not fit the criteria for an individual service. A review of the case revealed the need for more to be done to promote the Board's <u>At Risk Pathway</u> within the Council and for more joined up work with Environmental Health. Through closer working with Environmental Health, the team became aware of a hoarding behaviours project. Fire Service is involved, and Reading and Wokingham have also been invited to join this project. Environmental Health can flag up safeguarding issues that teams were previously unaware.</p> <p>KJ reported that SCAS will refer to Fire Service and Adult Safeguarding if they are aware of houses where hoarding is an issue. Understanding is needed across partner agencies about criteria and levels.</p> <p>Two further cases are with the Coroners; Panel is waiting for report to come back.</p> <p>Reading BC case – JG and S'OC are lead reviewers on the full Safeguarding Adults Review using the SCIE Learning Together model. Introductory meetings are scheduled for June and July, with individual conversations with case workers scheduled for beginning of July. Aim to complete the review by Dec / Jan. It is likely there will be a parallel criminal investigation, but LY confirmed there is still no update from the CPS.</p>	<p>NM / SM – invite RBC Environmental Health to give presentation at future Board meeting.</p> <p>SB give update on Hoarding project at future Board meeting.</p> <p>SB share contact information for Hoarding project with Reading and Wokingham.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAR Panel Terms of Reference 	<p>Draft Terms of Reference for the SAR Panel were reviewed.</p> <p>Membership of the SAR Panel reflects core membership of Board; others will be invited as required. The expectation is that members from organisations pertinent to a particular case will attend relevant Panel meetings.</p>	<p>JG forward suggested amendments to NM.</p> <p>NM to amend and re-circulate as appropriate.</p>
<p>5. Board's Readiness for the Care Act</p>	<p><u>Duty of Candour</u></p> <p>LP presented a Duty of Candour briefing note prepared by Simon Leslie. The implications of this for safeguarding inquiries and also for publishing of reviews were discussed.</p> <p>Timeliness of candour is that it has to be done immediately. The Duty applies to the individual affected. There is a need for transparency with the individual concerned and / or with the family (or person acting on individual's behalf) if the individual is deceased or lacks capacity. This may bring agencies into difficult situation e.g. when members of family are involved in criminal investigation or when the case is going through the coroner's process. The expectation is that findings would be shared with the family but may not be possible if a criminal investigation is underway.</p> <p>Regarding domestic homicide reviews and criminal investigations, work has arisen from one problematic case to look at national guidance around Safeguarding Adults Reviews and criminal cases and how the two processes work alongside each other. All partners must be mindful about sharing information with others.</p> <p>Duty of Candour is immediate, and agencies can be fined if the Duty is not met. Staff need to be able to show that Duty of Candour has been considered and there are reasons for not applying it.</p> <p>Board members agreed that there is a need to clarify with the legal team and develop a joint statement, so that a conviction is not jeopardised. Future piece of work for the Board to consider to ensure all partners understand their responsibilities. SAR Panel to examine the Duty in more detail and come up with a workable solution.</p> <p><u>Modern Slavery</u></p> <p>SM referred to a briefing paper circulated with the agenda. There is a new duty to refer cases of modern slavery through national referral mechanisms. The duty includes adults and children. LA safeguarding leads are first responders; LAs will need to do some work around this. There are cases across all three Local Authority areas that are under investigation; each one takes a different form, but most are about adults. SMG will attend a meeting in Kidlington this week on</p>	<p>NM b/f for future item for SAR Panel for further consideration.</p> <p>SMG report back after meeting on Modern Slavery. TB will consider further and decide whether it is something that the Board needs to come back to.</p>

	Modern Slavery and will report back.	
6. Strategic Plan 2015-18 and Business Plan 2015-16	<p>Draft Strategic Plan and Business Plan were previously circulated for consultation and suggested amendments have been incorporated. NM gave overview of the development of the plans – they are the result of Board planning days in October and February and a consultation with providers, partners and service users in November.</p> <p>The Business Plan includes the detail of how individual agencies will support the delivery of the Board's priorities and objectives; the Strategy is the public facing document and includes an overview of the priorities, objectives and the outcomes planned for the next year.</p> <p>Business Plan may appear disjointed as all the actions have been developed by wide range of agencies. Some members commented that it was useful to see what other agencies are doing and what issues they might be having. This format may prove to be a useful way to report on actions that have been delivered and to enable practice to be shared.</p> <p>JG suggested further discussion about the format of the Plans at the Workshop on 17th June.</p> <p>HC commented that it is vital to name Lead Members and involve them in the actions. LA liaise with lead members about including their names on the business plan.</p> <p>Discussion was had around attendance of lead members and directors and whether they should attend every Board meeting, or just those held in their area. This is has always been a big challenge as the Board covers three Local Authority areas.</p> <p>Independent Chair to have a discussion with directors. The day of the Board meeting can be varied if this would facilitate attendance.</p>	<p>LM, JG, SM liaise with lead members about including their names on the business plan and feedback to NM.</p> <p>LM, JG, SM take back question of attendance to lead member and feedback responses to TB who can lead on the discussion.</p> <p>TB have discussion with Directors about expectations and attendance at Board meetings.</p>
7. Quarterly Subgroup and Forum Reports	<p>Board members reviewed the reports submitted by the Subgroups and Forums which had been previously circulated. There was discussion about the following points:</p> <p>Funding from partner agencies Letter has been sent to all three LAs, TVP and CCGs asking for agreement to an increase in</p>	

	<p>funding contribution of 25%, bringing total to £8,125.</p> <p>Confirmed that the East of Berkshire have received funding from Thames Valley Police.</p> <p>Until now CCG, RBH and BHFT have given same amount of funding. JG clarified that request made to CCG for an increase on behalf of the three health partners. NB confirmed that BHFT will continue funding at the same level but will seek the percentage increase from the CCGs.</p> <p>Domestic Abuse Strategy Reporting Arrangements Board members agreed with proposal that each LA presents an annual progress report on their Domestic Abuse Strategy to the SAB, in line with reporting arrangements to LSCB.</p> <p>Safeguarding concerns received from partner agencies Further discussion by Board members about SCAS referrals: Paramedics are only in house for a short while and make referrals based on an initial impression. At a recent Providers Forum in West Berks, providers shared concerns about a seeming lack of understanding about what safeguarding is and a lack of communication between providers and SCAS.</p> <p>KJ reported that there will be a month long project on safeguarding across SCAS to raise awareness across all bases. It will be helpful for safeguarding teams to know when this is happening as an increase in referrals is anticipated. A recent review of forms has been undertaken so that the information in a referral is clearer. Tony Hesleton is leading on this. JG advised that TH should link up with local authorities when reviewing the forms.</p> <p>Out of Area Review document Partnership and Best Practice Subgroup reviewed the Out of Area Review document used by Reading and West Berkshire. Guide is felt to be holistic and helpful for practitioners carrying out reviews. ADASS has expressed interest in the document.</p>	<p>DD have discussion with providers and respond to JG's letter.</p> <p>NM liaise with DA leads in each LA over reporting arrangements.</p> <p>KJ inform LA Safeguarding Teams when the Safeguarding Awareness month is scheduled.</p>
8. Arrangements for Workshop on 17 June	<p>At the Business Planning Day on 3rd Feb, Board members agreed to an additional workshop, the aims of which are to: help share approaches to adult safeguarding across all agencies; help members understand work of colleagues in other agencies; find improved ways of working together.</p> <p>JG suggested that some of time is given to look again at Business Plan document.</p>	<p>NM share invite with names given by LY of colleagues within TVP.</p> <p>NM discuss with TB who is planning the session.</p>

9. AOB	<p>LF gave an update on implementation of Mental Health Triage process: Between Friday and Monday there will be a double crewed resource (1 police officer and 1 mental health nurse) able to respond to incidents where mental health is felt to be an issue. Depending on the recruitment process, patrol would be in place by mid-July. The aim is that better pathways are identified, leading to a reduction in the number of S136 detentions.</p> <p>KJ raised the potential issue of duplication with SCAS. LF confirmed there is strategic level liaison with SCAS but not specifically at a local, West Berkshire level. There is a small steering group, but SCAS is not specifically represented. There will be merit in planning what joint working can be done. LF is leading on the development of this work for all three LA areas and once meeting dates for the strategic group are set up, will involve the mental health lead from SCAS.</p> <p>SMG reported that Reading BC's peer review raised the issue of membership of the Board: SMG would like to bring the review findings to the next Board meeting. Peer reviewers raised the issues that Board membership should include trading standards, Job Centre and Pensions. Also flags up service user / carer representation. Fire Service is a valued member but they cannot attend every meeting; given opportunities to comment and attend, and receive minutes. May need to review this and ensure Fire Service attend more regularly. Reading' peer review: SMG would like to bring this to the Board next time.</p> <p>Wokingham and West Berkshire are expecting peer reviews in October.</p>	<p>SMG present Reading's peer review to the next Board meeting.</p>
10. Dates of next meetings	As above.	
11. Closing Thanks	JG thanked everyone for attending and the meeting closed at 1210.	