



West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Meeting

5 December 2016

MINUTES

Attendees:	Brian Walsh – BW (Independent 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)	June Graves – JG (West Berkshire Council)	Dave Myers - (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)
	Helen Mackenzie - HM (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)	Rick Jones – RJ (Elected Member, West Berkshire Council)
	Rachael Wardell – RW (West Berkshire Council)	Simon Leslie – SL (Joint Legal Team)	Mick Saunders – MSa (Thames Valley Police)
	Mandeep Kaur Sira – MS (HealthWatch Reading)	Colin Hudson – CH (Thames Valley Police)	Stan Gilmour – SG (Thames Valley Police)
	Mimi Koningsburg – MK (Wokingham BC)	Winnie Spencer – WS (CCG)	Sharon Briggs - SB (Volunteer Centre West Berkshire)

Apologies:	Rachel Eden – RE (Elected Member, Reading BC)	Norma Kueberuwa – NK (National Probation Service)	Kat Jenkin - KJ (South Central Ambulance Service)
	Tony Heselton – TH (South Central Ambulance Service)	Abbie Murr – AM (Emergency Duty Service)	
Dates of future meetings:	Business Planning Day - 6 February, 1230-1530, Council Chamber, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury 1200-1500 Monday 27 March 2017, Council Chamber, Bridge Street, Reading Dates of Board meetings in June, September and December to be confirmed upon appointment of new Independent Chair.		

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 19 September 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"> • SG confirmed that Thames Valley Police have approved the Board’s Communication Protocol. • KK brought to Board members’ attention the action plan arising from the case file audit. A Board decision is required on the prioritisation of recording skills training for frontline workers. Accurate and timely recording skills are intrinsic to keeping people safe. The Learning and Development Subgroup have previously confirmed that recording skills courses have been cancelled in the past due to low take up, suggesting the training is not being prioritised by managers. GW suggested that recording skills training should be mandatory. SB outlined that the issues may be more fundamental and training alone is not enough to improve recording skills. The Board needs to understand the issues which may be systemic. • SR suggested Making Safeguarding Personal is still not fundamental in people’s minds; safeguarding forms could be improved to encourage people to collect and record better 	NM to include a reminder in the Board’s Briefing that effective

	<p>information. A cultural shift is needed in terms of quality assurance, supervision and professional accountability. Managers need to challenge where MSP is not embedded in their organisation and reinforce the message that recording skills remains a high priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in recording skills to be monitored through the case file audits in February and August 2017. • SB reported that West Berkshire’s Source of Concern data cannot be reported in the way the Board has requested but that it does reveal trends that could be useful to share. RW suggested that information be shared with the Performance and Quality Subgroup in the same format that it is collected and used internally. • SB explained that West Berkshire collects information in relation to desired outcomes expressed at the beginning of a safeguarding intervention and whether they are achieved. This approach may be more helpful in terms of Making Safeguarding Personal than the format the Board currently uses. Data shows what difference interventions make to service users. • BW reinforced the importance of providing feedback when Board members are asked to endorse documents and that nil response will be taken for consent. BW will raise this with the new Independent Chair. • Three candidates for the post of Independent Chair were shortlisted. Two candidates were interviewed last week with one further interview still to take place. BW said he will ensure an effective and timely handover and hopes the new Chair will attend the Business Planning Day on 6 Feb and take over formal chairing of the Board in March. 	<p>recording is critical to keeping people safe.</p> <p>SO’C / RF / SB to ensure a focus on recording skills in subsequent case file audits and report back to the Board.</p> <p>BW to raise issue of lack of feedback with the new Independent Chair.</p> <p>NM to notify Board members of the outcome of the interviews for the post of Independent Chair.</p>
<p>Themed discussion:</p>		
<p>3. Service user involvement</p>	<p>The Effectiveness Subgroup has been tasked to develop processes to ensure service user feedback is collected and understood, and develop mechanisms for measuring outcomes for individuals who have been through the safeguarding process.</p>	

	<p>SO'C outlined proposals developed by the Subgroup covering the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core questions for the collection of feedback from individuals who have been through the safeguarding process. • Case file audit to measure feedback and outcomes. • Independent appraisal of feedback. • Accessible information for customers and staff on MSP. • Community engagement. • Training on MSP. • Forms and IT systems. <p>Each local area is in the process of consulting with service users to agree a consistent practical approach to gathering feedback that meets the needs of service users and the local area.</p> <p>MS confirmed that HealthWatch Reading supports the initiative but they would need further resources to collect feedback and provide a report to the Board. Clients that have been supported through the safeguarding process have severe LD so increased support would be required to meet their communication needs. Case studies from people who have experienced the safeguarding process may provide intelligence but this may already be known by social care. HealthWatch could be commissioned to do particular work around themes.</p> <p>There is no formal forum to establish links with HealthWatch / SEAP across the West of Berkshire as they are not commissioned to work this way. Local HealthWatch are being re-commissioned next year.</p> <p>BW suggested that independent scrutiny does not have to be externally commissioned; the Board has enough people from a range of agencies to provide assurance.</p> <p>The Board accepted the paper with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subgroup to prioritise tasks and reconsider timescales; the proposals are overambitious. • Consider community engagement and non-tokenistic ways of bringing Board members together with lay members, for example an event for service users that Board members attend, or emulate the LSCB's Children Leaving Care challenge sessions. 	<p>Subgroup reconsider task and timescales in line with comments made by the Board.</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping exercise to look at what work is currently underway. • Gain specific feedback from Wokingham HealthWatch and West Berkshire’s SEAP on the proposals. • Can the Board provide a nominal resource to develop more creative ways of gathering feedback? • How will the Board provide an ongoing cycle of MSP training? <p>Bring forward as agenda item for next Board meeting for update.</p> <p>Message of thanks to be sent from the Independent Chair to all service users and groups that have contributed their views.</p> <p>The safeguarding fora in each area are already a valuable resource. SB explained that West Berkshire have found it a challenge to reach out to all the different people and are considering moving to a virtual forum for consultation. RF confirmed that the re-establishment of Reading’s forum is a priority. Wokingham have Choice Champions that are actively involved in delivering training, considering and promoting initiatives.</p>	<p>NM bring forward as agenda item for next meeting.</p> <p>BW send message of thanks to service user, to be cascaded by Board members to relevant individuals and groups.</p>
<p>4. Safeguarding within Mental Health inpatient services at Prospect Park Hospital</p>	<p>BW confirmed that following the last Board meeting, colleagues from Reading BC and Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust met and an action plan has been developed. Due to the complexity of the issues that have continued to emerge, this agenda item has been cancelled. Instead BW will chair a separate meeting on 10 January between Reading BC and Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust.</p> <p>SR reported that safeguarding patients with mental health issues at Prospect Park has been raised at an informal meeting of the three Councils’ CEOs. BW confirmed that he would extend the invitation to the meeting on 10 January to other relevant interested partners.</p> <p>NB. Addendum to Minutes: BW subsequently invited interested Board members to a meeting on 10 January 2017. Board members were asked to notify BW of their intention to attend, with reasons, and to share evidenced concerns about safeguarding at the hospital by 3 January.</p>	<p>BW / NM to invite interested partners to the meeting.</p>

<p>5. Common themes arising from the peer reviews</p>	<p>NM presented a summary of the common themes arising from the three Councils’ peer reviews which took place between 2014 and 2016. Each review had a different focus so there were very few commonalities identified across the three Councils. Each area has developed an action plan in response to the peer reviews. Reading BC’s peer review took place in 2014. WF confirmed that the recommendations were embedded into the Council’s safeguarding improvement business plan.</p> <p>BW recognised the challenge around Board’s accountability. Last year he met with the DASS, Lead Member and CEO in two of the Councils.</p> <p>The new Chair will need to consider representation from partner agencies. Membership is clearly a compromise to be made for a Board that covers three Local Authority areas and the balance has to be struck between meaningful involvement and wider representation. NM confirmed that the Board’s membership is Care Act compliant.</p> <p>Board members to consider how the common themes can be woven into work of the Board, embedded in risk log and in the work of the subgroups at the Board’s Business Planning Day in February.</p> <p>JG suggested that the specific comments about the Board contained within each report could be the subject of further focus.</p>	<p>NM bring forward common themes from peer reviews for Board’s Business Planning Day in February.</p> <p>NM consider comments about the Board.</p>
<p>6. Business Planning Day / Challenge & Support event 6 Feb 2017</p>	<p>BW, NM and the new Independent Chair will plan the Business Planning session. BW will contact Board members in advance to specify what information is required.</p>	<p>BW to contact Board members in advance of the Business Planning session to specify what information is required.</p>
<p>Documents for endorsement</p>		
<p>7. Communication Protocol</p>	<p>BW confirmed that the Communication Protocol has now been endorsed by all partner agencies.</p>	

<p>8. Partnership Board Joint Protocol</p>	<p>Wokingham’s CEO convened a meeting between the chairs of the partnership boards to consider where joint working may be enhanced through a joint protocol arrangement.</p> <p>RW explained that the document, developed by the LSCBs, is not the same document in each area since different local governance arrangements are reflected in the protocols. BW will confirm the status of the protocol in each area with the LSCB Chair.</p> <p>SG suggested that the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Sustainability and Transformation Plan needs to be reflected in the protocol, although the complexity of achieving this was acknowledged.</p> <p>This is a very high level document outlining the principles of joint working with no expression of the mechanisms by which they will be achieved. Further detail about data, sharing information, communication and structures are needed.</p>	<p>BW to confirm the status of the protocol in each area with the LSCB Chair.</p> <p>All members to consider the protocol and provide comments about the high level principles to BW within a fortnight.</p>
<p>STANDING ITEMS</p>		
<p>9. Business Plan 2016-17</p>	<p>Expected progress is being made in all areas.</p>	<p>Business Plan to be revisited at the Business Planning meeting on 6 Feb.</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><u>Communication:</u> Community Awareness Event for safeguarding adults to be facilitated by Involve Wokingham and opened up to practitioners and the public in Reading and West Berkshire. This will be a two hour session to take place at the end of April. <i>Involving service users</i> could be a potential theme. Board to consider the content of the event at its Business Planning session.</p> <p>NM circulated a summary report of findings from the survey. Barbara Billett in West Berkshire administered the survey, collated responses and produced the summary report. Over 330 respondents provided a wealth of data which will be analysed further by the Chair of the Subgroup and the Business</p>	<p>KK / NM analyse findings and develop proposals for consideration</p>

	<p>Members endorsed the proposal to establish robust processes for measuring impact of training on delegates’ practice.</p> <p><u>Performance and Quality:</u> Making Safeguarding Personal Performance Indicator: since various work streams are under way across the subgroups, members endorsed the proposal that the outcomes are reviewed and drawn together next year into one overarching report to the Board in March / June before developing a new Performance Indicator.</p> <p>Members endorsed the recommendation that the Board triangulates LA and Health information to see where the high risks lie in the sector. This will include hospital care, mental health, nursing, residential and domiciliary care provision, and whether services are as safe as they can be. Themes causing concern can then be analysed further within task and finish groups.</p>	<p>funds for a MCA conference.</p>
<p>11. Risk and Mitigation Log</p>	<p>At subsequent Board meetings the Risk and Mitigation Log is to be complemented by a report to specify what actions or decisions are needed by the Board to mitigate risks.</p>	<p>NM to note.</p>
<p>12. Key Performance Indicators – Q1 data</p>	<p>NM requested that the Board acknowledge the enormous amount of work that has gone into the production of the KPI set by performance teams and safeguarding leads and that the information is given due consideration.</p> <p>WF confirmed that she welcomed the interesting information and commentary. A good PI raises questions about the system and can help managers identify what areas require focus. It is interesting to compare and to learn from good practice in the other areas. The information can help to identify potential points of collaboration and assure the Board that the system is working.</p> <p>SR was less clear about the value and purpose of the information. A dashboard containing priority PIs would be of greater relevance to the Board.</p> <p>PP commented that it was of concern that Wokingham had a significant number of safeguarding concerns</p>	

	<p>within care homes.</p> <p>A synthesised analysis is required to support the Board’s decision making, including an exception report as well as the full data set, benchmarking data and trend analysis.</p> <p>NM reinforced the fact that the P&Q Subgroup does not have the necessary leadership, capacity or skills to deliver the Board’s aspiration. BW asked partners to consider how the Subgroup is to be given the capacity to enable it to do what the Board requires and to consider nominating a Chair.</p> <p>SR confirmed that each LA is required to understand how they compare nationally and it should not be burdensome to provide this information for the Board. SR will explore the production of a dashboard with colleagues in Wokingham.</p> <p>BW will discuss around the Performance and Quality Subgroup and the PI set with his successor.</p>	<p>All members to consider how the Subgroup is to be given the capacity to enable it to do what the Board requires and to consider nominating an appropriately skilled person from their agency as Chair of the Performance and Quality Subgroup.</p> <p>RW to discuss offline with BW about potential Chair for the Subgroup.</p> <p>SR to explore the production of a dashboard with colleagues in Wokingham.</p> <p>BW to discuss issues with the Performance and Quality Subgroup and the PI set with his successor.</p>
<p>13. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards</p>	<p>Board members noted the content of the report.</p> <p>The three councils reported continuing difficulties in managing DoLS applications.</p> <p>Wokingham BC has undertaken a review into its DoLS service, findings from which can be shared with the Board.</p>	
<p>14. Budget review</p>	<p>The budget sheet was noted. There is a projected underspend of £4,300 which partners agreed to carry over to the next financial year.</p>	<p>Reading BC colleagues ensure money can be carried over to the next financial year.</p>
<p>15. Regional and</p>	<p>The Department of Health’s review of DoLS, which is expected to redefine Council responsibilities, has</p>	

<p>National Developments</p>	<p>been delayed until March 2017.</p> <p>The NHS and local authorities across Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West are working together to deliver the Sustainability and Transformation Plan.</p>	
<p>16. Communication items</p>	<p>Members agreed the following items for inclusion in the Board’s Briefing:</p> <p>Importance of recording skills.</p> <p>Communication Protocol.</p> <p>Service user involvement.</p> <p>Survey results.</p>	<p>NM include item in the Board’s Briefing.</p>
<p>17. Any other urgent business</p>	<p>SB reported that ADASS is looking to commission an e-learning company on a regional basis which will potentially provide a regional resource for MCA and DoLS.</p> <p>RW said that West Berkshire have been under-represented at the Subgroup meetings and requested more opportunities to dial in.</p> <p>MS proposed care act advocacy as a future agenda item.</p> <p>Board members wished to record their thanks to BW for his work over the year and for his constant efforts to improve the Board.</p> <p>BW commented that it is a very advanced Board and members need to use their networks to share what is working well. The Board may like to continue to streamline processes and explore different ways of working as the Board mechanisms are labour extensive and process driven.</p> <p>BW wished SR and WF well and thanked them for commitment to the Board as this will be their last Board meeting. BW also extended his thanks to NM for her hard work and endeavours.</p> <p>RJ stated that he was impressed with the Chairing of the meeting and the commitment shown by members. However, he was concerned about the long list of actions and suggested that the new Independent Chair will need to consolidate the Board’s priorities.</p>	<p>NM liaise with MS and bring forward for future Board meeting.</p>

<p>18. Information Items</p>	<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"> • West of Berkshire LSCBs Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Toolkit • Modern Slavery Briefing and awareness raising posters 	
<p>19. Closing thanks</p>	<p>BW thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 1456.</p>	
<p>20. Dates of future meetings</p>	<p>Business Planning Day - 6 February, 1230-1530, Council Chamber, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury 1200-1500 Monday 27 March 2017, Council Chamber, Bridge Street, Reading Subsequent dates of Board meetings in June, September and December to be confirmed upon appointment of new Independent Chair.</p>	