



West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

3rd December 2018

MINUTES

Attendees:	Teresa Bell – TB, Independent Chair	Lynne Mason – LM, SAB Business Manager	Martin Sloan – MS, Head of Wokingham Integrated Social Care and Health
	Kathy Kelly – KK, Head of Safeguarding Adults, CCG Berkshire West	Angela Morris, Director, Wokingham Borough Council	Simon Leslie - SL, Joint Legal Service
	Mike Harling – MH, Principle Social Worker, West Berks	Sara Ross - SR Service Manager Prevention and Safeguarding Adults, West Berkshire District Council	Tandra Forster –TF, Acting Corporate Director (Adult Social Care), West Berks
	Jo Purser – JP, Acting Head of Adult Social Care, Reading Borough Council (left at 3:45)	Cath Marriott - CM, Policy Development – Partnerships and Performance, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner – Thames Valley	Patricia Pease, PP, Director of Nursing for Urgent Care and Corporate Trust Lead for Safeguarding, RBFT (arrived at item 7)
	Simon Price - Assistant Director Housing, Income and Assessments, Wokingham Borough Council	Dan Simms, Principal Social Worker, Principal Social Worker, Wokingham Borough Council	
Apologies / Did not attend:	Abbie Murr – AM, Head of Service, Emergency Duty Service	Clare Rebbeck- VS Development Broker, Involve – Wokingham	Cllr Marigold Jaques – MJ, Cllr, West Berkshire District Council

	Nicola Strudley – NS, Consumer Champion & Healthwatcher (Locality Manager), HealthWatch Wokingham	Seona Douglas – SD, Director of Adult Care and Health Services, RBC	Garry Poulson – GP, Volunteer Centre West Berkshire
	Sarah Gee – SG, Head Of Housing and Neighbourhood Services	Sally Kelsall – SK, Service Manager Housing, West Berkshire	Susan Powell – SP, Building Communities Together Team Manager, West Berkshire District Council
	Sarah Hanson – SH, Voluntary Sector Support Officer, Volunteer Centre West Berkshire, Volunteer Centre West Berkshire	Sarah Morland - SM, Reading Voluntary Action	Cllr Richard Dolinski – RD, Wokingham Borough Council
	Chelsea Bridges , Safeguarding Co-ordinator, Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service	Anthony Hesleton – AH, Head of Safeguarding & Prevent Lead, SCAS	Heidi Ilesley – HI, Deputy Director of Nursing, BHFT
	Stan Gilmour – SG Superintendent, Reading LPA Commander, TVP	Tania Atcheson – TA, Head of Quality and Safeguarding, NHS England South (South Central)	Cllr Tony Jones- TJ, Elected Member, RBC
	Mandeep Kaur Sira - MKS, Healthwatch Reading	Sarah Hanson - SH, VCWB	Norma Kueberuwa – NK, Senior Probation Officer, National Probation Service
	Helen Mackenzie – HM, Director of Nursing & Governance, BHFT	Tania Atcheson – TA, Head of Quality and Safeguarding, NHS England South (South Central)	Liz Warren, Risk Reduction Manager, Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Dates of future meetings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20th March 2019, 10-1pm, Room J, South Reading Community Hub, 252 Northumberland Avenue, RG2 7QA • 20th June 2019, 10-1pm, Council Chamber, Market Street, Newbury 		

Item	Discussion	Action
------	------------	--------

<p>1. Welcome, introductions and Apologies</p>	<p>TB opened the meeting and there was a round of introductions.</p> <p>There was no representation from: Voluntary Sector, Healthwatch, BHFT, RBFRS, PP for RBFT joined the meeting after the break due to an emergency.</p>	
<p>2. Self Neglect Audit</p>	<p>The board began with a discussion item on the Self Neglect Audit that was commissioned 12 months ago.</p> <p>The delay in the audit was due to the author being unable to obtain information from partners due to the level of staff turnover in the partnership over the last 12 months.</p> <p>The Board broke off into groups of 2 and 3's and were asked to consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Board agree with the recommendations? • How should the recommendations be implemented? • How will the recommendations be prioritised? <p>The groups were given Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation with specific recommendations on them to draw up actions from the audit, which will be used to finalise the actions for the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan for this audit.</p> <p>Feedback from the groups was provided key points raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit confirms the areas of risk that the Board were aware of around: Managing Risk, Mental Capacity Act, Recording, ownership and accountability. • There are RAMP processes across the LA's but the Board is not clear on the process. • The Bracknell Forest and Windsor & Maidenhead SAB's Framework for Multiagency working in situations involving risk to service users – being discussed later on in the agenda would go towards meeting the recommendations • It needs to be considered locally as well as through the partnership • National Hoarders Association are based in Newbury and offer advice and support • There is information regarding Self- Neglect that should be relaunched by the Board, and the board should seek assurance that that this information is being accessed. • Consider some bitesized learning sessions, as there is already a lot to cover in safeguarding specific training. • The board needs to ensure that there is consistent reporting across the partnership • West Berkshire struggled to provide some of the information required due to a change in recording systems, which is still being implemented. 	<p>Finalise Paper - LM</p> <p>Update learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan with the recommendations from the audit – LM</p> <p>Review Pan Berks Policies and Procedures regarding Self Neglect – KK/DS</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The clutter index should be promoted by safeguarding teams, teams should consider sending back referrals where this has not been completed so referrers have more ownership • We need to share good news stories around self neglect across the partnership • Review the Pan Berkshire Procedures regarding Self Neglect – KK and DS agreed to undertake this piece of work. <p>The key priorities that came out of this discussion was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our multiagency approach requires strengthening and this starts by making sure we have the right attendance at Board • Recommendations will be added to the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan and cross referenced with the Business Plan • Business Plan actions may require reprioritisation in light of the additional actions from this audit. <p>The Board endorsed the audit and agreed that the Audit was very informative and agreed with all the recommendations.</p>	
<p>3. Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising</p>	<p>Minutes endorsed as accurate.</p> <p>Following actions on action log were discussed:</p> <p>Action 20 – SAR Notification Process</p> <p>g) Organisations to share SAR notification processes with LM – All</p> <p>h) Review submissions and report back to board – LM</p> <p>Responses were received from West Berkshire District Council, Reading and Wokingham confirmed verbally at the Board. That whilst there is no written process all SAR Notifications will go through the Head of Service and then the DASS prior to being submitted to the Board. No further action is required on this task.</p> <p>Action 21 - SAB Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators – Q4 and Q1 data</p> <p>c) Validate West Berkshire advocacy data – TF</p> <p>TF confirmed that performance was at 100%, however this has dropped slightly this quarter. TB asked how West Berkshire had managed to achieve 100%. TF, SR and MH confirmed that there had been a lot of work raising awareness around advocacy; reminding staff that advocacy does not need to be formal advocacy and having a Best Interest Assessor in post.</p> <p>d) Collect advocacy data for people who have capacity</p> <p>This was discussed at the Performance and Quality Group, who agreed that this information could not be</p>	<p>Finalise and Publish Minutes – LM</p>

	<p>collected and it would not be comparable with the national figures. Care Act states that the advocacy duty applies if the person has substantial difficulty in being involved. The Board agreed with the Performance and Quality's group recommendation.</p> <p>Action 26 – Section 42 Sign Off Processes across the partnership There was inconsistencies across the LA's regarding signing off Section 42's, West Berkshire District Council and Wokingham Safeguarding Team sign off all section 42 investigations after they have been signed off by the lead officers manager. SR stated that this process provides good oversight and enables the team to understand themes arising and areas for learning. Reading Borough Council, Safeguarding Team sign off 10% of section 42's that are completed. The Board agreed that Reading Borough Council should follow the same process as West Berkshire District Council and Wokingham by ensuring that the safeguarding team sign off all section 42's.</p> <p>Action 27 – OT Support in Care Homes LM presented a briefing note based on the response from LA's. The Board were assured by the process LA's were following. No further action required.</p>	<p>Reading Borough Council to change process so that all section 42's are signed off by the Safeguarding Team - JP</p>
<p>4. Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan and Business Plan</p>	<p>To ensure that learning is not lost from SARs and Audits, the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation plan has been created.</p> <p>Due to the level of SARs and audits recently undertaken by the board and the ambitious 3 year business plan set. The level of actions for the subgroups is unmanageable. TB asked that the board agree to prioritise actions on the business plan that link in with the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation plan and to set aside other actions that do not.</p> <p>LM provided some data to support the board with their decision currently, there are 60 actions on the business plan that require completion in the next six months, by removing actions that are not linked with the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation plan the number of actions reduce to 30.</p> <p>The Board Endorsed the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation plan and agreed that TB can reduce the Business Plan based on priorities identified through learning.</p>	<p>Finalise Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan – LM</p> <p>Update 18/21 Business Plan based on prioritises identified through learning – LM</p>
<p>5. Budget and Admin Support</p>	<p>TB raised that the item regarding Admin support has been discussed at the Board on numerous occasions and LM requires admin support in order to carry out the audit/assurance work that the SAB has previously had to commission.</p>	

	<p>A business case has been presented to all partners, breaking down partnership contributions, responses were requested by the 19th November 2018. West Berkshire District Council and Wokingham approved the proposed increase. However questions were raised by the CCG and RBFT who requested that the total % contribution for Health is much higher than other funding agencies and therefore could not approve this request.</p> <p>At the time of this discussion the only health representation present was KK.</p> <p>It was the first time that the current members of this board had seen the breakdown of funding; there is no information available to understand how this funding breakdown was agreed. KK stated that Health's overall funding equates to 43% of the SAB budget and this is disproportionate when comparing with Health's contribution to the LSCB. The Board agreed that funding does need to be discussed in more detail with funding partners and a meeting will be arranged outside of the Board. ADASS are currently looking at SAB funding arrangements so it would be useful to have this information available prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the decision regarding admin support could not wait until the budget meeting and agreed with the business case that the Board will look to recruit admin support for 15 hours per week.</p>	<p>Await ADASS findings on SAB funding – All</p> <p>Arrange budget meeting for all contributing partners– LM</p> <p>Start recruitment process – LM/JP</p>
<p>6. Missing People Who's Responsibility</p>	<p>At the last board meeting there was a discussion item, based on letter from TVP about how we manage in our localities when responding to missing people.</p> <p>Paper 6 is the draft response from the Board prepared by LM. Response to be amended so the difference between the West of Berkshire SAB and West Berkshire District Council in clear. There are also a couple of typos that require updating. Once amendments made this response can be sent to TVP.</p> <p>The Board agreed to adopt the Herbert Protocol</p>	<p>Update letter and sent to TVP – LM</p> <p>Add adoption of Herbert Protocol to Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan - LM</p>

<p>7. Risk and Mitigation Log</p>	<p>It was agreed at the last board that the individual risks scores will be agreed at this meeting, the risk and mitigation log was presented to the board and 3 of the 9 risks were discussed.</p> <p>Risk 1 - The Board does not know how individuals experience the Safeguarding Adults Process. Adults with care and support needs have no involvement with the Board.</p> <p>Agreed with the risk, however there is a lot of information that is being collected by the partnership but this is not being fed up to the board. The Gross Likelihood/ Impact Score was agreed as High. This was reduced to Low with the Actions put in place.</p> <p>Risk 2 - People who make safeguarding referrals do not receive feedback</p> <p>Agreed with the risk, The Gross Likelihood/ Impact Score was agreed as High. This was reduced to Low with the Actions put in place.</p> <p>Risk 4 - Responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 are not fully understood or applied in practice as a safeguard for people who may lack capacity (SAR finding)</p> <p>Agreed with the risk, this was further supported by the Self Neglect Audit. The Board agreed that MCA is a risk as it is a difficult concept to understand and that training needs to be specific to practice and not law. The Board accepts that whilst actions can be taken to support the partnership’s workforce MCA will always remain as a high risk area.</p> <p>The Board agreed that this was a useful discussion and that TB and LM will set the risk scores for the remaining risks and that these risks will be brought to the board for discussion at future board meetings.</p>	<p>Update Risk and Mitigation Log – LM</p> <p>Agree Risk scores for remaining risks – TB/LM</p> <p>Add to agenda for next meeting - LM</p>
<p>8. Mental Health Governance</p>	<p>KK provided a verbal update to the Board from a report supplied by Rabia Alexander from the CCG.</p> <p>There is nothing that requires escalation to the Board. KK to share copy of report with LM, to share with the Board.</p> <p>Agreed that a further update should be requested in six months’ time.</p>	<p>Provide copy of report to LM – KK</p> <p>Share report with Board – LM</p> <p>Add to June 2019 agenda - LM</p>
<p>9. Emergency Duty Service Arrangements</p>	<p>LA’s were requested to provide an update to the Board as TB had been alerted to the fact that there may be changes to the current EDS arrangements planned and as this is such a crucial function, clarification regarding any possible changes is required.</p>	

JP read out a statement on behalf of RBC, to which both Wokingham and West Berkshire District Council agreed:

- The Joint agreement for Out of Hour Social Care service for adults and children's for all of the 6 Berkshire Unitary Authorities has been hosted by Bracknell Forest Council since 1997.
- The last formal review of this shared agreement was in 2012.
- In June 2015 a process was started by Bracknell to review the arrangement for a number of reasons but mostly to reflect best practice and other relevant legislative changes.
- Not all authorities took part and there was disagreement in some areas on the proposed new service specification. Some authorities started to look at the other options to provide an EDS and at that stage there was some concern re the viability of the service without all partners contributing. However there was no comparable local area market model available to commission.
- In January 2018 Bracknell started negotiations via group workshops and with all partners about a new service specification and also a different costing model going forward which was worked out at relevant to each authority % usage of the service. For various reasons this has not been concluded to everyone's satisfaction. It was hoped that a newly agreed contract would be in place by December 2018.
- During November 2018 each authority has received from EDS a copy of the annual report with their own usage data and each Director has been sent a formal contract extension letter asking them to agree a one year extension of the current agreement pending a formal renegotiation of the specification.
- The current service manager of EDS is leaving her post at the end of December 2018 and Bracknell is recruiting to that post.
- Reading Director of Adult Care and Health Services manages the Reading contract on behalf of their service and also on behalf of Children's services. The intention is that the extension letter will be signed. Wokingham Borough Council and West Berkshire District Council also confirmed their intention to sign at the Board.
- There is expected to be no change to the current service during the contract renegotiation.
- The service will operate as usual over the Christmas weekends and Bank Holidays and from 3pm on both Christmas and New Years Eve.

The Board require assurances from EDS on the following:

- Is it the intention of all six authorities to sign up with the extension agreement?
- What are the implications from the service if a one year extension is agreed and how will the potential

Seek assurance from EDS – LM/TB

	<p>impact on staff be managed, as with this uncertainty over the future, some may choose to leave</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What management arrangements are in place after AM leaves on the 31/12/18? <p>Agreed that this should be added to the SAB risk and mitigation log register.</p>	<p>Add to the SAB risk and mitigation log - LM</p>
<p>10. SAB Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators</p>	<p>2018/19 data was discussed.</p> <p>DoLs Data was highlighted to the Board as the national figures had been published. The partnerships performance for % of applications completed within prescribed timescales is low at 4.7% compared with the national average of 22%, however it should be noted that the average outturn for Berkshire is 6% and the Southeast 11.28%.</p> <p>The board agreed that this is just one indicator we are using to compare performance and that commentary should be requested from DoLs leads regarding this data to seek assurance on how it is being managed.</p> <p>The Board find the Dashboard useful.</p>	<p>Request commentary on DoLs data from DoLs leads – LM</p> <p>Provide update at next board - LM</p>
<p>11. Reduction in Safeguarding Concerns</p>	<p>Due to the 25% reduction in safeguarding concerns in 2017/18 compared with 2016/17, safeguarding leads were asked to investigate and feedback the reasons for this reduction.</p> <p>There was still some debate on this reduction so the Board requires a written update from LA Safeguarding Leads, LM will provide a template with data and key questions for Safeguarding Leads to answer.</p> <p>The Performance and Quality Group discussed the reduction in safeguarding referrals and agreed and set an action that all LA's must use the same screening tools. Success will be measured by the concern to enquiry conversion rate which is currently very different across the LA's.</p> <p>SR went to a SAR workshop last week and it was clear that across the country LA's were using different process for screening and logging concerns.</p>	<p>Devise template for Safeguarding Referral Reduction explanation – LM</p> <p>Collate and present response at next board – LM</p> <p>Generic screening tools for the LA's to be agreed – Performance and Quality Subgroup</p>
<p>12. Quarterly Reports from Subgroups</p>	<p>The Board endorsed the SAB Subgroups Chairs Terms of Reference and the subgroup reports.</p> <p>TB highlighted to the Board that the subgroups are struggling with the number of actions allocated to them through the Business Plan and Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation plan. However the Boards agreement to reduce the action plan by prioritising learning from SARS and Audits should assist with this.</p>	<p>Finalise Sub Group Chairs ToR – LM</p>

	The first formal subgroup chairs meeting took place in November with positive feedback from attendees.	
13. Annual Report	<p>Final draft was brought to the Board for endorsement as will be going to Health and Wellbeing Board in early 2019.</p> <p>LM asked the Appendix F, training data was removed from the annual report as the data was not reflective of the training carried out in the partnership. The board agreed.</p> <p>KK requested that LM checks health's training data Appendix F is a nil return and KK did submit this information.</p> <p>There will be some slight amendments to the main report in light of the Business Plan changes, this will be approved by TB.</p>	<p>Removed Appendix F – LM</p> <p>Check health data for Appendix F and feedback to KK – LM</p> <p>Update report based on Business Plan updates - LM</p>
14. Section 42 Audit	<p>Section 42 audit was carried out in November 2018 and KK presented a report summarising the findings from this audit.</p> <p>Key Learning identified was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audits were showing positive progress • A SAR notification was made on the basis of a section 42 audit • Advocacy remains a challenge • The majority of cases involved Domestic Abuse, which is a key priority for the Board • Evidences good working relationships across the partnership • Middle Management need to be involved in the audits to support with their learning • Audit forms must remain consistent and not adapted by individual LA's • Positive feedback must be shared with the workforce <p>The Board thanked KK and the other auditors for their work; recommendations were agreed and will be added to the Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan.</p>	<p>Finalise report – LM</p> <p>Add recommendations from Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan – LM</p> <p>Share positive feedback from audit with workforce – All</p>
15. Risk Assessment Framework	<p>The Risk Framework is a tool that is currently being used in the East of Berkshire that the Board are asked to consider whether or not it should be adopted. It is felt by the Performance and Quality Subgroup that such a tool would support the partnership in achieving a number of actions set in the Business Plan and Learning from SAR/Audit Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Board felt that it was in principle a good tool the document was too wordy and would clash</p>	Principle Social Workers to send through all current risk management tools being used in LA's – DS, JP, MH

	with Risk Frameworks already devised locally. It was agreed in principle that there should be a consistent approach to risk management across the partnership. This would be achieved by setting up a task and finish group with TB, LM and the Principal Social Workers.	Task and finish group to be arranged - LM
16. Communication/ information items	<p>NHS Safeguarding Advice App http://www.myguideapps.com/nhs_safeguarding/default/safeguarding_adults/?nocache=0.9944203523793312</p> <p>Safeguarding Adults Bite Sized Workshops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional curiosity in safeguarding – 6/12/2018 • Mental Capacity Act in practice – March 2019 <p>For more information please visit: www.sabberkshirewest.co.uk/practitioners/workforce-development/</p> <p>Care Home Christmas Project</p>  <p>Care home christmas projectv3.docx</p>	
17. Any other urgent business	<p>Allegations Management Framework was sent round as paper 14; please provide comment by 31/12/18 so it can be endorsed.</p> <p>Lorna Pearce to join Wokingham Borough Council as Safeguarding Lead in January.</p>	Feedback to LM by 31/12/18 - All