



West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

4 December 2017

MINUTES

Attendees:	Teresa Bell - TB (Independent Chair)	Natalie Madden – NM (Business Manager)	Carl Borges – CB (Healthwatch Reading)
	Rachael Wardell – RW (West Berkshire Council)	Kathy Kelly - KK (Clinical Commissioning Group)	Simon Leslie – SL (Joint Legal Team)
	Christopher Nicklin – CN (Wokingham BC)	Andrea King - AK (West Berkshire Council)	Linda York – LY (Thames Valley Police)
	Jayne Reynolds - JR (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)	Kathryne Abbott – KA RW (West Berkshire Council)	Rick Jones – RJ (Elected Member, West Berkshire Council)
	Eve McIlmoyle – EM (Reading BC)	Sarah Morland – SM (Reading Voluntary Action)	Mike Harling – MH (West Berkshire Council)
	Patricia Pease - PP (Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)	Heather Owoo – HO (Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)	Anthony Heselton – AH (South Central Ambulance Service)
	Maura Noone – MN (Reading BC) For items 1, 2 and 11.		
Apologies / Did not attend:	Stan Gilmour – SG (Thames Valley Police)	Tandra Forster – TF (West Berkshire Council)	Sally Kelsall – SK (West Berkshire Council)
	Sarah Gee – SG (Reading BC)	Rachel Eden – RE (Elected Member, Reading BC)	Emma Congerton – EC (West Berkshire Council)
	Jenny Broad – JB (West Berkshire Council)	Norma Kueberuwa – NK (National Probation Service)	Dave Myers – DM (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)
	Seona Douglas - SD (Reading BC)	Abbie Murr – AM (Emergency Duty Service)	

Dates of future meetings:	To be confirmed
----------------------------------	-----------------

Item	Discussion	Action
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p>Attendance as above.</p> <p>A presentation was made to Natalie Madden as this was her last Board meeting and TB thanked her on behalf of the Board for her excellent work and commitment in the role of Business Manager over the last five years.</p>	
2. Strategy 2018 - 2021	<p>TB reported that a small working group was convened to review progress made under the current Strategy and identify priorities for inclusion in the Strategy 2018-2021. The Strategy is intended to be a high level, living document that can be amended as necessary, with detailed activity documented in the annual Business Plan.</p> <p>Priority 1: We will strengthen our communication and engagement across groups and communities in the West of Berkshire to ensure that our plans and actions are informed by the experience of the widest range of local people.</p> <p>Priority 2: We will extend our links with other partnerships to work together to break down barriers across agencies and to promote Think Family/Think Community approaches (Make Every Contact Count)</p> <p>Priority 3: We will share learning and develop innovative ways to support both paid and unpaid staff across the partnership to continually build confidence and the effectiveness of everyone's safeguarding practice.</p> <p>Priority 4: We will understand how effective adult safeguarding is across the West of Berkshire to ensure that we identify emerging risks and take action accordingly.</p> <p>Board members endorsed the four priorities. NM and TB will consider all comments added to the priority sheets in order to finalise the Strategy and begin developing the Business Plan in time for Board endorsement in March. The Strategy will be consulted on in January during events that have already been scheduled.</p>	<p>NM and TB to finalise the Strategy and begin developing the Business Plan. All to consider inviting TB to planned events where the priorities could be consulted on.</p>
3. Deprivation of	Key agencies have been asked to provide assurance for the Board that actions are underway to manage	

<p>Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)</p>	<p>the risks and difficulties associated with DoLS.</p> <p>West Berkshire AK reported that safeguarding and DoLS are included in the Adult Social Care improvement framework and referred to the extract from the Improvement Plan previously circulated. Risks have been reduced and are now graded as amber or green. DoLS remains on the Council’s corporate risk log. The service area is encouraged by improvements that have been made, is well supported by the Lead Councillor (RJ) and it is anticipated that practice will continue to improve.</p> <p>Wokingham CN reported that management responsibility for DoLS has been transferred to an operational manager. A review of capacity and waiting lists indicated that staff required support as they were failing to progress issues that were above their level of responsibility. A plan is in place to manage high priority cases and the overspend is being monitored. Progress is being made but it has been hampered by lack of leadership since senior staff have left Wokingham recently.</p> <p>Reading TB surmised from the report provided that no escalation of issues is required at this point. Figures indicate that the appointment of a temporary BIA within the team has reduced the backlog dramatically.</p> <p>Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust JR reported that DOLS application forms have been developed on the electronic record keeping system to simplify the process for staff. Urgent applications are rarely completed within timescales but there is a robust process in place to follow-up applications. Further training is required on community inpatient units to embed the process and a named person is required in each area to review applications and follow-up. Prospect Park Hospital applications will continue to be monitored by the Safeguarding Team.</p> <p>Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust Application of the Mental Capacity Act in practice and the low number of DoLS applications was recognised as a risk by the Trust Strategic Safeguarding Committee. There has been a general improvement in the application of the MCA in practice across specialities and where individual staff are identified as needing additional support, this has been provided. There has been an increase in the number of DoLS applied for during 2017.</p> <p>PP reported that Reading has not granted applications from RBFT: this is an issue that needs to be resolved and it is unfortunate that there is no one from Reading BC present to address this concern. PP commented that compared to other health trusts, RBFT is pragmatic in its DoLS applications.</p> <p>KK reported that Continuing Health Care do have Community DoLS in place and it is included on the corporate risk register.</p>	<p>PP take forward with SD.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>Board members reflected on the ongoing resourcing and capacity issues.</p> <p>SL outlined James Mumby’s decision that parental responsibility does apply to young people aged 16 and 17 who are in a placement and whose restrictions amount of deprivation of liberty.</p> <p>RJ reinforced that the issue is one of capacity and this can only be fixed at central or local government level. Local Authorities must put pressure on central government to change funding.</p> <p>TB belongs to both the national and London network of independent chairs and the Board agreed that it would be appropriate to channel its concerns to these groups and also for TB to write to the Local Authorities to highlight that this is a pressured, but under resourced, system. TB will liaise with SL to develop a letter.</p> <p>TB noted that West Berkshire and Wokingham have improvement plans in place; the Board seeks assurance that Reading BC also has an improvement plan for DoLS in place.</p>	<p>TB to liaise with SL to develop a letter for the LAs and the independent chairs networks.</p> <p>SD to assure the Board that Reading BC also has an improvement plan for DoLS in place.</p>
<p>4. Business Plan progress update</p>	<p>Board members reviewed the progress of the Business Plan.</p> <p>1.1b Mandatory feedback form added to the Councils’ electronic systems for every statutory S42 enquiry. Assurance is required from each LA that this action is complete.</p> <p>2.1a Representatives from Housing and Provider organisations to be invited to attend Board meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing representatives from Reading and West Berkshire have been nominated; this action remains outstanding for Wokingham. • Involvement of provider organisations to be taken forward for the new Business Plan. <p>3.1c Specific activities to improve record keeping skills are complete.</p> <p>4.2a NM reminded Board members that the deadline for the completion of the self-assessment audit by partner agencies is the end of December. The Bracknell Forest and Windsor and Maidenhead Board have adopted the same audit, and partner agencies working across Berkshire are only required to submit one return which will be shared by the Boards.</p> <p>4.5b An external resource has been appointed to undertake the self-neglect audit. Partner agencies are to ensure that the requested information be returned as soon as possible.</p>	<p>SD, RW, CN provide assurance that this action is complete.</p> <p>CN take forward for Wokingham.</p> <p>TB / NM include involvement of provider organisations in the new Business Plan.</p> <p>Partner agencies to note and return completed self-assessment audits to NM by end of December.</p> <p>NM to resend email and partner agencies to ensure that the requested information be returned as soon as possible.</p>
<p>Standing items</p>		

	<p>each Local Authority. The purpose of the dashboard would be to provide a front page for the existing KPI set, providing an overview of areas of joint concern and demographics of each area, as well as data under the headings: volume, advocacy, risk outcomes and making safeguarding personal.</p> <p>The Board endorsed the dashboard which will be populated by the Performance and Quality Subgroup in time for the Board meeting in March. The dashboard can be piloted, adapted and improved in time.</p>	<p>TB / NM take forward for the Performance and Quality Subgroup.</p>
<p>7. Safeguarding Adults Reviews</p>	<p>KK gave a progress update for the cases that were currently under review.</p> <p>Case 1 The review is making good progress and is likely to be complete in time for the Board meeting in March</p> <p>Case 2 An independent reviewer has been appointed and chronologies have been requested from the agencies involved. KK outlined ongoing concerns for a family member. The independent author is aware of these concerns and the remit of the review may be extended. The focus of traditional reviews is on agencies; this review may also focus on the role of the community and use of social media.</p> <p>Case 3 A review of the chronologies has confirmed that although there was no evidence of multi-agency failings, this review did reveal good practice as well as other learning that will be shared.</p> <p>Case 4 A single agency review is underway for this case.</p> <p>KK noted that there is an increasing number of cases being presented to the SAR and asked that until the new Business Manager is in place, new cases be referred to TB for consideration.</p>	
<p>8. Key Performance Indicators – Q2 data</p>	<p>TB invited each LA to present highlights from the KPI set for the Board’s attention. No highlights or exceptions were noted.</p>	
<p>9. Section 42 case file audit</p>	<p>Safeguarding leads observed that the auditing process identified gaps in confidence, practice knowledge, skill and application. All three LAs felt that the audit process needs to be inclusive of middle management and encourage peer review. AK acknowledged the value of front line staff auditing files alongside the safeguarding manager.</p> <p>The outcomes of the Section 42 case file audit have been recorded under strengths and challenges: Strengths</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recording of perpetrators Timescales (moved to a strength from last audit) Protection (moved to a strength from last audit) <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate offered MCA (less evident than previous audit) Domestic abuse <p>The following areas of concern were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timescale: one case was open for 18 months and the risks were not addressed. Empowerment should be higher; it is hard to justify that safeguarding is personal when people are not empowered. Categories of abuse were mixed, with a dominance of domestic abuse cases; very complex issues are coming through safeguarding. It is of concern that victims of domestic abuse are not seen alone. Issues that are evident in the case file audit should be addressed through supervision. PP observed that quality of practice is impacted by workforce issues, such as less experienced staff, use of agency staff, lack of time allocated to supervision, and at the same time staff are expected to work with more complex cases. TB queried whether the timeframe in the proposed action plan is realistic. RW requested clarity about the activities required to deliver the final action (<i>SAB to consider workforce support and feedback from workforce in working within the current provision</i>). This is likely to inform the Business Plan for next year. 	
<p>10. Budget</p>	<p>The budget monitoring report is currently being finalised and will be shared by email. MN to ensure that there is clarity regarding the projected underspend for 2017-18.</p>	<p>MN to ensure that there is clarity regarding the projected underspend. NM to circulate with the minutes.</p>
<p>11. Plans to recruit to Business Manager post</p>	<p>MN confirmed that a job description and person specification has been developed and agreed with TB. The post can be advertised before Christmas and promoted internally across all partner agencies; applications can be shortlisted and interviews held by mid-January.</p> <p>Board members discussed the potential need for a full time Business manager and administrative support. A business case would be required for both these proposals.</p> <p>The post should be filled as a matter of urgency, although it was noted that the opportunity for shared resources with the LSCBs could be considered in the longer term with an interim appointment made.</p> <p>TB asked MN to coordinate a small group of representatives from funding partners to take forward the advertisement and recruitment to the post.</p>	

	<i>Addendum to minutes: TB subsequently wrote to SD and MN to ask that the post be advertised as a substantive post as a matter of urgency. This request was supported by other funding partners.</i>	SD / MN ensure the post is advertised as a matter of urgency.
12. Risk and Mitigation Log	Failure to appoint to the post of Business Manager to be added as a risk. KK to consider whether any issues arising from the S42 audits constitute a risk and add to the Risk Log.	NM to add to risk log. KK to consider issues arising from the S42 audits that constitute a risk.
13. Communication items	The Board agreed the following items for inclusion in the Board’s Briefing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy 2018-2021. 	NM include in Board Briefing.
14. Any other urgent business	AH raised an issue of local and national concern regarding a DBS conviction that had reportedly been removed under the Human Rights Act. AH to share the response that the Ambulance Service receives from the Disclosure and Barring Service so that the Board can understand the issue in more detail. This is likely to be a strategic issue also faced by the LSCB and TB will discuss with the LSCB Independent Chair.	AH to share the response from the Disclosure and Barring Service with the Board. TB will discuss with the LSCB Independent Chair.
15. Information items	None.	
16. Closing thanks	TB thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 1500.	
17. Dates of future meetings	To be confirmed.	