



Safeguarding Adults Board
Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 15 November 2016
Filby Room, Police Headquarters, Jubilee House,
Falconers Chase Wymondham, Norwich NR18 0WW

PRESENT:

- Joan Maughan**, Independent Chair
Deborah Beresford, Deputy Dof Nursing & Quality, NCH&C (representing community health providers)
Garry Collins, Hov Prevention and Protection, Norfolk Fire & Rescue
Gareth Jackson, Probation Service
Christine MacDonald, Operations Manager, Healthwatch Norfolk
Cllr Elizabeth Morgan, Adult Social Services
Kate Rudkin, Head of Development & Operations, Age UK, Norfolk
Jane Sayer, Director of Nursing, NSFT
Jackie Schneider, Head of Patient Safety, N Norfolk CCG
Helen Thacker, (on behalf of Lorna Bright) Head of Service, Safeguarding, Norfolk County Council
Ian Sturgess, Police & Crime Commissioners Office
Julie Wwendth, Chair of Norfolk Safeguarding Business Group (representing Norfolk police)
Walter Lloyd Smith, Manager, NSAB
Andrea Smith, Safeguarding Coordinator, NCC (Minutes)
- Daniel Anderson**, Community Manager, Pohwer (part)
Mark Osborn, Preventing Radicalisation Coordinator (part)

Item	Minute	Action
1	Welcome and apologies for absence	
1.1	Lorna Bright, Assistant Director Adult Social Services Sue Doolan, Governor, HMP Bure James Kearns, CEO, BUILD Norwich Antek Lejk, CO, South Norfolk CCG Catherine Underwood, Acting Exec Dof Adult Social Services, NCC	
2	Declarations of interest	
2.1	None	

Item	Minute	Action
3	Approval of minutes	
3.1	Item 4.9 relates to a self-assessment tool, not risk register.	
3.2	The minutes were signed off as an accurate record of the last meeting.	
4	Minutes of last meeting (Tues 12 July 2016)	
4.1	JM to write to Ray Harding (as board representative) around attendance. Update: carry forward.	JM
4.2	(Item 4.3) CQC Report – Jackie Schneider noted and discussed the report from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) published this morning (15-10-2015) detailing the annual analysis of the quality of health and adult social care in England that had made news headlines where hospital staff levels were at risk. JSch noted that Norfolk in particular is finding it difficult to recruit medical staff. There was general discussion of how to understand this national report in relation to Norfolk and NSAB requested JSch to provide a summary analysis of the CQC report in relation to Norfolk for the next meeting. Jackie to draft a document that will explain all actions across acute and providers. This will go to the board via the business group. Update: Carry forward to next business group meeting. Document will be circulated to board members.	JSch
4.3	(Item 4.5) The Board discussed the how to make the best use of the risk register. The board needs to understand what the main concerns are and be able to demonstrate that these risks are being managed appropriately. It was AGREED that the register should be circulated in advance of the meeting to allow members sufficient time to review. Kate will work with Walter to address what risks should be highlighted and when. Risks should identify a clear owner and a mechanism should be in place that holds the risk holder to account. The Board AGREED that sub groups should have sight of the risk register. Kate advised that a meeting had been set up to progress and she will provide a report. Update: on agenda for today's meeting. Action: close.	
4.4	(Item 4.7) News Desk - Vulnerable communities The members of the group are not fixed and interest from others is welcome. Judith Blackman from Norfolk Probation Service expressed interest and Walter will send on contact details to her. Christine MacDonald advised that Healthwatch is hosting a follow-up meeting on this topic in June, and believes that some useful information may come from that which she can pass to the group. HS had met with the Task & Finish Group. A	

Item	Minute	Action
	<p>paper had been drafted for presentation at the October Board, around the recourse of public funds.</p> <p>CMcD advised that the follow up meeting with Jenny McKibben regarding migrant workers has yet to take place. Feedback has been requested and there will be a watching brief.</p> <p>Update: JM has had conversations with GYROS and has asked them what the board should be considering. GYROS are best placed to advise as they are out there dealing with people. Action: WLS to follow up.</p> <p>GC asked what the board's top three priorities were in terms of vulnerability. JW responded: domestic abuse, mental health and trafficking as they applied to all age groups although these vulnerabilities are fluid and change all the time. GC had concerns relating to this discussion which he was asked to put in an email and JM will take to public protection forum (PPF).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WLS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GC/JM</p>
4.5	<p>(Item 4.8) News Desk – Licenses A query was raised by North Norfolk DC regarding applications for licences which currently have to be run past the children's board. Shouldn't these have to be agreed by the adults' board as well? The group AGREED that we need to know the types of licences that are being considered first before we can decide. Walter will speak with Abigail McGarry from the children's board to find out more. Update: the board AGREED that it would be useful to adopt some of the children's boards' approaches and processes but were reluctant to take on a large administrative task at this stage. Action: WLS to advise children's board that 'we have no resource to manage currently but may revisit at a later stage.'</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WLS</p>
4.6	<p>(Item 4.10) SAR AH JM will write to Cambs to let them know what's happening. JM confirmed that Cambridgeshire and the parents have been kept informed. The ombudsman report is still awaited and should be available mid-September. We cannot officially receive the Report until it is in final version. Update: JM advised that ombudsman's report is still awaited and unlikely to be available this year. She has been in communication with AH's father, who is understandably frustrated about the whole process. Action: will update at January's meeting.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">JM</p>
4.7	<p>(Item 4.13) Budget/Resource Update JM asked the meeting to consider the following option for SAR funding: should there be a pot of funds or a three-way split? A</p>	

Item	Minute	Action
	<p>discussion around this put further questions forward, such as: is there a way for the board to become more resilient to be able to fund the SARs when they come up. JS asked if we could approach other health providers. JM will write to District Councils requesting a contribution of funding towards the work of NSAB.</p> <p>JM confirmed she has not yet written to the District Councils, but has tried to make contact with Ray Harding to arrange a visit with the Chief Officers Group. JM advised NSAB had received support last year towards the Partnership Event. Final outturn figures resulted in £29k surplus for last year. The Board discussed how the surplus funds could best be used. Update: £29k surplus went to SAR budget and has been largely used to pay for SAR BB. Funding for 2017/18 has been agreed by three key funders. Action: close.</p>	
4.8	<p>(Item 4.14) Budget/Resource Update The Board had a clear consensus that there should be an equal financial split between the adult and children's safeguarding board. They acknowledged the differing levels of resource available to each and there was considerable discussion of the reasons for this and it will remain an on-going issue. JM to inform future discussions, JM will send out figures once known. Update: JM confirmed that the board still requires additional administration support and will discuss with Lorna Bright.</p>	JM
4.9	<p>(Item 4.15) Presentation – Wendy Hicks Wendy's report provoked lots of discussion, including whether the Board should link more closely with the development of early help hubs. Should local safeguarding adult partnerships (LSAPs) look at where the gaps in their membership may be (a key request of inter-agency collaboration), using a mapping exercise. This will be picked up by the business group. Update: this is an agenda item for December business group. Action: close.</p>	
4.10	<p>(Item 5.1) KR circulated the SARPSG Template – April 2016</p> <p>It was noted the date was incorrect. The focus had been on performance as there is a meeting to be held regarding the Risk Register. The BIP Team looked at the cycle of information flow. When the information comes through we can analyse and get this onto the Dashboard to provide a pilot Dashboard for the October Board meeting, prior to the implementation in 2017.</p> <p>JM suggested that a Dashboard presentation is given at</p>	

Item	Minute	Action
	<p>the next Board meeting to enable the Board to gain a clearer understanding around the purpose of the data.</p> <p>HS requested a steer from the Board and suggested a light touch, self-audit approach to avoid an unwanted risk to NSAB. .</p> <p>Discussion took place and the Board AGREED on a light touch approach.</p> <p>KR to circulate Risk Register ahead of next meeting. Update: on agenda for discussion. Action: close.</p>	
4.11	<p>(Item 6.1) JW circulated the NSAB Business Group – Update Report July 2016 advising there were not too many amendments and highlighted the key issues.</p> <p>JW advised that there was a more cohesive approach from all sub-groups which has assisted coordinated activity.</p> <p>The Business Group has looked at the Work Plan so each work stream makes the best use of the LSAPs.</p> <p>JW, HS to arrange a meeting to go through and finalise timescales.</p> <p>The Business Group will focus on Self-Neglect and will support NA. Update: complete. Action: close.</p>	
4.12	<p>(Item 8.3) TP to check the date of the Self-Neglect Launch with WLS. Action: close.</p>	
4.13	<p>(Item 8.4) HS provided details of the FGM events taking place. There are some places available in Great Yarmouth and King’s Lynn. HS to provide TP with further information for circulation to the Board. Update: these are progressing. Action: close.</p>	
4.14	<p>(Item 9.1) NA circulated the Self-Neglect and Hoarding Strategy for review and discussion.</p> <p>HT advised an amendment is required to page 46, item 6.2 and should read Appendix 3 and not Appendix 5. NA duly noted and will amend.</p> <p>JM has drafted the foreword for review. Although in final draft organizations will need visibility in order to achieve sign-off.</p>	

Item	Minute	Action
	<p>Update: the strategy has been launched now. Action: close.</p>	
4.15	<p>(Item 9.2) Further training around Self-Neglect has been requested as the event had improved communication and understanding of this subject matter.</p> <p>WLS/NA to provide feedback to the LSAPs. It was noted that a pilot will be undertaken in the West and Central.</p> <p>NA has met with Alison Simpkin and Maureen Begley to capture issues around Mental Health, Self-Neglect and Hoarding to avoid duplication.</p> <p>Update: complete. Action: close.</p>	
4.16	<p>(Item 9.3) JM recommended that a copy of the Self-Neglect and Hoarding Strategy is given to Kate Brown, asking if she could review in relation to Train the Trainer development plan.</p> <p>HS asked in what context would agencies be expected to refer to this document and expressed his concern that this would be resource heavy for agencies.</p> <p>JW advised a pilot is being undertaken to identify any resource issues.</p> <p>JS gave positive feedback on the document.</p> <p>The Board will require Agencies to sign-up to this document. The document will be evaluated.</p> <p>Update: complete. Action: close.</p>	
4.17	<p>(Item 10.3) MG was asked if a vote could be taken today as not all members were not present. MG confirmed a decision needs to be made as it is a legal requirement. The Board AGREED the sign off.</p> <p>MG to advise WLS and link in with Kate Brown regarding the policy. Update: complete. Action: close.</p>	
4.18	<p>(Item 10.4) NSAB discussed liabilities and indemnities. As JM is not an employee of NCC, MG advised JM to check that she is indemnified. Update: pending response from LB. Action: carry forward.</p>	JM
4.19	<p>(Item 11.6 in relation to safeguarding and older people's bed availability) Jackie Schneider to seek feedback from HESAA</p>	JSay

Item	Minute	Action
	for further discussion at the January 2017 meeting. Update: JSay confirmed that, along with CCGs, they had commissioned a review of beds for mental health patients/older people and will advise further. Action: carry forward to March meeting.	
4.20	(Item 12.1) Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board's guidance on content of Adult Safeguarding policies and procedures The Board discussed the document, acknowledging it was for multi-agency sign-up but low level precedence for the strategic board. NSAB could not sign off this document as it had not been before the Norfolk Safeguarding Business Group. JM to liaise with WLS for more clarification. Update: signed off by business group. Action: close.	
4.21	(Item 12.2) Model Adult Safeguarding policy and procedures final draft The Board accepted SD's observations that the HMP environment would find it difficult to follow as they operate in a different way. The Board accepted this. NSAB could not sign off this document. JM to liaise with WLS for more clarification. Update: signed off by business group and published on NSAB website. Action: close.	
4.22	(Item 12.3) NSAB – guidance on allegations against people in positions of trust. IT was AGREED this document would be published on the website as an advisory note. Update: complete. Action: close.	
4.23	(Item 13.1) JM reminded the Board that the next meeting will form part of the Development Day, which is being held at Hethel Engineering Centre. The Board AGREED that invitations should be extended to the Adult Social Care Committee, Business Group and LSAP Chairs +1. Update: members of the board agreed that the day was useful and engaging provoking lively discussion and debate. Action: close.	
5	Risk & Performance Report	
5.1	KR tabled the report template (Nov 16) and risk register (Oct 16), and gave an overview of both. The documents prompted lively discussions about the method of scoring, which the group found quite subjective and felt that there was a need for a level of risk to score against. Board members also felt that there was a need to take ownership for the items. The group AGREED that the business group would decide which items from the risk register should be discussed by	

Item	Minute	Action
	<p>NSAB. The business group would also decide ownership of each item by 'virtual' means if not done at their meeting.</p> <p>KR highlighted that the register is an assessment tool which needs a bit more work doing before WLS and KR will pilot.</p>	
5.2	GC agreed that being a member of the risk and performance group would be useful and will liaise with KR/WLS about joining the group.	GC
6	NSAB Business Group Report	
6.1	WLS gave an update: work is moving more freely through the structure. He reported that low attendance at partnership meetings is a concern. The LIP sub group has had train the trainer materials developed and these will be trialled shortly. WLS will circulate details post meetings.	WLS
6.2	Financial abuse and suicide prevention were suggested by WLS as themes for 2017 safeguarding week, and he asked NSAB if they would endorse these. Members of the group suggested that the broader area of 'neglect' would be a useful topic to highlight, along with suicide prevention.	
6.3	The group AGREED that neglect and suicide prevention would be useful topics and JM felt that the group could have 'neglect' as an area of focus and then have other related items added on.	
7	Safeguarding Adult Reviews	
7.1	SAR BB: the final report was emailed to board members on 1 November for their comments. The group voiced their concern about the length of the report; not all members confirmed that they had read it. The group felt that some of the recommendations were a bit unprecise and lengthy. JSch was concerned that we had perhaps lost sight of what we had intended to learn from the report findings and this had instead become an opportunity to point the finger of blame. JSay asked whether NHS England had seen the report. JM confirmed that this wouldn't happen until the report has been made public.	
7.2	The total cost of the report was a concern also. There had been additional expense due to extra meetings between the report writer and primary care. There had been disagreements about wordings in the report resulting in copious amendments and additional versions of the report being produced. JW pointed out that we should be careful here that we're not paying somebody for a 'retrospective' report which highlights changes which have already been made. SAR BB isn't necessarily an example of this but JW cited a current SAR where the victim passed away four	

Item	Minute	Action
	years ago and highlighted that a lot of change to policies and procedures had happened in the past four years (some as a result of the event), so a report highlighting these was not constructive.	
7.3	JW questioned whether the appointed report writer was the right person for this particular SAR and confirmed to the board that SARG were introducing a new policy for the recruitment of future independent overview report writers. A standing group consisting of SARG members would assess and recruit potential report writers. This process would ensure that the most appropriate candidate was appointed and there would be a focus on cost as well.	
7.4	The methodology used in this SAR had highlighted the difficulty it was for primary care involvement due to the number of hours they were expected to spend attending meetings and reading draft reports, etc. The board wondered whether this might deter primary care from involvement in future reviews. JM confirmed that she would be meeting with the primary care representative on the panel (HB), to discuss what lessons can be learnt from SAR BB.	
7.5	IS commented that the report seemed to disregard family members. WLS explained the reason for this. EM suggested that reports should capture the difficulty of working with families and that there is perhaps a link here to independent advocacy.	
7.6	<p>JM advised the board that the SAR group had already set aside time on 6 December to evaluate the approaches used to review both SAR AA and SAR BB. This will take into account issues raised by primary care regarding SAR BB. It is clear that lessons can be learned to improve the efficiency of whatever approaches are used in the future. JM confirmed that she will be meeting with HB to discuss what can be learnt from this review.</p> <p>JM highlighted some of the improvements already taking place, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More specific terms of reference for individual reviews • More specific guidance to reviewers in order to produce SMART recommendations • A standing group from SARG to assess and recruit reviewers <p>The SAR group will prepare a short report for NSAB on the outcomes of deliberations for the next meeting.</p>	

Item	Minute	Action
7.7	Due to insufficient time, an update of other safeguarding adult reviews will be given at the January 2017 meeting.	
8	Safeguarding Newsdesk	
8.1	Due to insufficient time, this will be emailed out with the minutes.	AS
9	Presentation: The PREVENT agenda and adult safeguarding. Dr Mark Osborn	
9.1	MO gave a short presentation on PREVENT and the work that he is doing. A high level strategy document has been agreed. There will be various levels of training across agencies and Mark has been able to use some of the work which has already been completed by the NHS. He confirmed that it was up to agencies to ensure that staff were trained and is looking at ways of making sure that training is done more effectively.	
9.2	Some members asked questions about training. MO confirmed that health training is compliance rated so is being put to one side. JW was concerned about safeguarding in MASH and how PREVENT fits in. Looking at the process to CHANNEL panel, do we link the MASH arena in? Has this been considered? MO responded that it wasn't outside of it, it's just a 'clumsy' process. HT said that the roll out of training for adult social services is slow however, e-learning is available now.	
9.3	MO will be engaging with key people from each sector. There will be a briefing day on 23 January 2017 where approximately 80 people from agencies will be able to attend. GC confirmed that he had planned to attend and so will attend on behalf of NSAB as well.	
9.4	MO will send the strategy through to WLS/AS for forwarding on to board members.	MO
10	Presentation: Advocacy services and adult safeguarding in Norfolk. Daniel Anderson	
10.1	DA gave an overview of Pohwer, where he is a community manager. He has already worked alongside HT and has spoken with social work teams to encourage them to contact the advocacy service and explain what the issue is and they will recommend a service.	
10.2	DA said that he was surprised at how low the number of queries is and not just in Norfolk. Both Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire have a higher number of queries but even these figures are lower than anticipated. DA wondered if this was due to a lack of awareness about the service	

Item	Minute	Action
	existing. He is keen that the services are promoted to anyone working in safeguarding as we need to enable people to have as much of a voice as possible. Also, it will give staff confidence if they have made a referral to the service; the referral can also be noted on the service user's record.	
10.3	DA is trying to promote local information even though all referrals initially go through a triage system in the Birmingham office, and a prompt response is guaranteed. DA said that queries can go via him first rather than Birmingham if required and he is happy to talk to anyone who would like more information.	
10.4	JM suggested that advocacy might be a suitable workshop topic for next year if NSAB were to hold similar events to those that were held recently in Swaffham and Norwich. DA has already been to the eastern LSAP and is in regular contact with them.	
11	NSAB as Data Controller	
11.1	To be carried forward to next meeting.	
12	AOB	
12.1	There was insufficient time for this item.	
	Date of next meeting	
	Tuesday 10 January 2017 Wroxham room, Police HQ, Falconers Chase, Wymondham	