



West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

19 September 2016

MINUTES

Attendees:	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 Fowler – JF (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)
	Stuart Rowbotham – SR (Wokingham BC)	Graham Wilkin – GW (Reading BC)	Johan Baker – JB (Safeguarding Forum, Wokingham)
Apologies:	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 Sira – MS (HealthWatch Reading)	Rachael Wardell – RW (West Berkshire Council)
	Stan Gilmour – SG (Thames Valley Police)	Tony Heselton – TH (South Central Ambulance Service)	
Dates of future meetings:	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"> • 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 if Wokingham CLASP helps the Board with this podcast and other communication material, a contribution to the charity may be required. Board members agreed with this proposal. • SR confirmed that he had made representation to Thames Valley Police regarding a press release involving a significant incident at a care home in Wokingham. A function of the SAB is to ensure partner organisations work together; there is a Communication Strategy and due processes to ensure an organisation’s public communication does not negatively impact on another agency. BW will raise the outstanding issue of joint communication and partnership working with Stan Gilmour. • Data Analysts are liaising across the three Councils to agree a common approach to the presentation of safeguarding performance data for the Councils’ safeguarding annual reports. • <u>Addendum to minutes</u>: a response was subsequently received from Christian Papaleontiou, Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel, confirming that the Home Office is currently updating the statutory guidance on Domestic Homicide Reviews and the amended guidance will contain more clarity on demonstrating the independence of a DHR Panel Chair. 	<p>KK to lead on the development of a podcast to raise awareness for Making Safeguarding Personal, to be endorsed at next Board meeting.</p> <p>BW to raise the issue of joint communication and partnership working with SG and report outcome at next Board meeting.</p> <p>RW, SR, WF to maintain oversight of the production of the Councils’ safeguarding annual reports.</p>
Themed discussion: Priority 1 Governance and Accountability		
3. Priority 1 Progress	<p>Quality Assurance Framework The Board’s Quality Assurance Framework has been reviewed in line with Priority</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Assurance Framework • Self-Assessment audit tool • Berkshire Policy and Procedures 	<p>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 achievements and areas where they are working to improve outcomes. Such an event would enable the Board to evidence how partners challenge each other and to identify evidenced based 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). Confirmation regarding what is included in current contracts between the Councils and HealthWatch is required in time for this meeting.</p> <p>Self-Assessment Audit Tool 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; some elements could be aligned although it is unlikely the whole tool could be replaced. The aspiration is that the Board streamlines processes across all agencies 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>Berkshire Policy and Procedures 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>RW / WF/ SR to confirm what is included in existing contracts with HealthWatch in time for the next meeting of the Effectiveness Subgroup on 18 October. Progress to be reported at next Board meeting.</p> <p>Progress against this aspiration to be picked up at Board meeting in March or June 2017.</p> <p>NM to ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the document and the website.</p>
<p>4. Wokingham Peer Review</p>	<p>SO'C presented findings from the Wokingham Borough Council peer review. The review focused on: safeguarding, care governance and commissioning; service users views of the framework; Care Act compliance; and 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>The 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 (Optalis) has a social care function providing long term support, noting a disconnect between the way these functions worked across the Council. SR confirmed that improvements have been made since the review.</p> <p>LM commented that learning gained through the process outweighed the effort and time. Staff and customers valued the opportunity of being involved.</p> <p>The review confirmed the right decision had been made to base the Principal Social Worker in the safeguarding service and the role is well embedded and provides an element of challenge.</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>NM present common themes arising from the peer reviews at the next Board meeting.</p>
<p>5. Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust Mental Health Benchmarking</p>	<p>NB introduced a paper to provide the Board with an update on safeguarding within Mental Health inpatient services at Prospect Park Hospital. It was agreed to progress with the item in the absence of a report from Reading BC which was unavailable due to staff sickness. 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 a good context for 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</p>	

	<p>Reading. The A&E department receives increasingly more complex cases and PP's job remit has changed in order to focus on this.</p> <p>KK assured the Board that there are Serious Incident processes within the CCG whereby if an incident was felt to be preventable or predictable, there is a system where these cases are considered for a SAR.</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. BW requested that a shared understanding between BHFT and Reading BC be achieved. A 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 written 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>NB / RF to convene a meeting of relevant colleagues and produce a written report for BW within a month.</p> <p>NM bring forward for Board meeting in December.</p>
<p>6. Governance Subgroup function and purpose</p>	<p>It became apparent to SR and members of the Governance Subgroup that there is a lack of clarity about the function of the subgroup and apparent 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>Following discussion it was agreed by Board members to disband the Governance Subgroup.</p> <p>All funding partners should continue to be involved in decisions, for example, around funding or recruitment of the Independent Chair.</p> <p>BW impressed upon Board members that commitment from partners 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. BW and NM will review and re-allocate actions in the Business Plan to other subgroups.</p>	<p>NM remove references to the Governance Subgroup from all Board documents and the website.</p> <p>BW and NM to review Business Plan and re-allocate outstanding actions to other subgroups.</p>

<p>7. Documents for endorsement</p>	<p>Annual Report 2015-16 Board members endorsed the draft Annual Report and agreed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directors to approve the Councils’ annual safeguarding performance reports and ensure they are completed within the agreed timeframe. • Include links to annual reports produced by partner agencies. • NM to produce the remaining appendices. • An easy read version of the Annual Report to be commissioned. <p>Board’s Terms of Reference Board members endorsed the amended Terms of Reference which reflect the Care Act (2014).</p> <p>Communication Protocol 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 representatives from TVP.</p> <p>Induction Pack for new Board members Board members endorsed the Induction Pack for new Board members.</p>	<p>RW, SR, WF ensure Councils’ annual safeguarding performance reports are produced. NB and PP forward annual report to NM. NM produce remaining appendices.</p> <p>NM bring forward Communication Protocol for December Board meeting.</p> <p>NM to publish Induction Pack on website and circulate to new Board members.</p>
<p>STANDING ITMES</p>		
<p>8. Safeguarding Adults Reviews Action Plan to embed learning from Case of Mrs H</p>	<p>Board members reviewed the action plan to embed priority findings as agreed 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</p>	

<p>and Case of Mr I</p>	<p>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>The Effectiveness Subgroup will monitor the delivery of the action plan, exception reporting to the Board.</p> <p>The full report on the Case of Mr I will 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>NM bring forward as standing item for Effectiveness Subgroup.</p> <p>NM publish Mr I full report on Board’s website and forward to Hampshire CC.</p>
<p>9. Business Plan 2016-17</p>	<p>Expected progress is being made in all areas, with the exception of action 4.2: <i>Service user feedback indicates that clients’ desired outcomes are met, in line with MSP and the well-being principle.</i></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 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) set to include measures for Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP). The next Effectiveness Subgroup meeting is dedicated to this priority area.</p> <p>PP confirmed that patient and carers’ feedback is gained by Health agencies that already produce reports about patient experience: these are not safeguarding specific, but safeguarding in its widest context.</p> <p>Development work is needed if an additional KPI on MSP is included, with mechanisms established to enable collection of the correct data from April. To be taken forward by the Performance and Quality Subgroup.</p>	<p>NM bring forward for the next meeting of Performance and Quality Subgroup and will report back progress at next Board meeting.</p>
<p>10. Quarterly report from subgroups</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>Mental Capacity Act conferences – 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 subject to underspend of Board activity, at least on an annual basis. The three SABs in the east of Berkshire</p>	<p>NM to bring forward for the next Learning and Development Subgroup meeting.</p>

	<p>could be approached to commission a Berkshire wide event.</p> <p>Board members agreed to withdraw the Threshold Guidance 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 guidance document needs to be produced.</p> <p>Case file audit – the peer review of case file audits was a very useful process and revealed common themes as presented in the 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"> • Raise awareness of Empowerment in Safeguarding via a briefing note. • Prioritisation of recording skills training for frontline workers. • Improve use of advocates. • SAB to develop better understanding of service user voice in regards to protection. • LAs to focus on areas not achieved in S42 audit. • Re-audit to show improvement against the findings. <p>Board members confirmed that Source of Referral data is meaningful and should continue to be included in the KPI set for Wokingham and Reading. West Berkshire collect the data in a different way and cannot 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>NM to bring forward for a future Effectiveness Subgroup meeting.</p> <p>Relevant colleagues to note actions allocated to them in the action plan.</p> <p>SB to consider and report back at next Board meeting.</p>
<p>11. Key Performance Indicators – Q1 data</p>	<p>The new format for the PI data was developed by colleagues in the Wokingham Performance Team. Safeguarding Leads were not able to produce a commentary on the data in time for this meeting. BW requested that Board members read the document carefully and feedback comments on the format to NM within two weeks. Safeguarding Leads to produce commentary on Q1 and 2 data for the December Board meeting which will provide analysis on emerging trends for half a year.</p>	<p>Board members to feedback comments on the format to NM within two weeks.</p> <p>Safeguarding Leads to produce commentary on Q1 and 2 data for December Board meeting. NM bring forward for next Performance and Quality Subgroup meeting.</p>
<p>12. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards</p>	<p>SB outlined that the use of external assessors has enabled West Berkshire Council to keep up with the increase of DoLS applications, but this is unlikely to be sustainable.</p> <p>Reading BC has capped the cost for external BIAs to £200 per assessment, in line with Wokingham’s practice. In West Berkshire payments fluctuate, starting at £200</p>	

	<p>and increasing for out of Borough placements. There now appears to be a shortage of external BIAs; standardised payments have led to movement outside borders.</p> <p>SO'C is utilising the ADASS screening tool and categorising cases as urgent by need rather than urgent by process. In Wokingham, internal capacity has increased through use of a rota and as a result of the workforce development strategy.</p> <p>BW suggested Court of Protection (CoP) figures appear to be low. SB outlined that West Berkshire are using the ADASS tool of prioritisation developed in November 2014 to review the CoP authorisations and are prioritising applications for those experiencing the most significant restrictions in their care plans. SB confirmed that West Berkshire are experiencing capacity issues within their legal service which is limiting the number of CoP applications for community DoLS that can be made.</p> <p>Some GP practice will not charge for a diagnosis; the highest they can charge is £25.</p>	
13. Risk and Mitigation Log	BW requested that all Board members give due attention to this important document and feedback any comments to NM within two weeks.	Board members review the Risk and Mitigation Log and feedback any comments to NM within two weeks.
14. Regional and National Developments	<p>BW updated Board members on regional and national developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges on the whole Health and Social Care system. • Implementation of the Sustainability and Transformation Plans. • Launch of the King's Fund. • National scarcity of SAR lead reviewers and authors. 	
15. Communication items	<p>Board members agreed the following items to be communicated in the Board's Briefing Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service user involvement and feedback. • Streamlining of Board's governance processes. • Quality Assurance. • SAR findings. 	
16. Any other urgent business	Reading BC to begin the appointment process for a new Independent Chair so that a clear handover of responsibilities can take place before March at the latest. NM has	WF begin the appointment process for a new

	<p>previously circulated the Job Description and advert to funding partners for comment.</p> <p>The Board meeting was extended to three hours and all Board members agreed that this was appropriate given the breadth and complexity of discussion required.</p>	Independent Chair and update on progress at next Board meeting.
17. Information items:	<p>Board members were asked to note the following information items and circulate to relevant teams and networks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A guide for people on how to reduce the risk of skin breakdown. • Government response to the Confidential Inquiry into premature deaths of people with learning disabilities. • Berkshire West CCGs Federation Safeguarding Team. 	
18. Closing thanks	BW thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 1500.	
19. Dates of future meetings	Monday 5th December, 1200-1500, Shaw House, Church Road, Shaw, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2DR	