

## Minutes of the Rotherham Safeguarding Adults Board Held on Wednesday 9 January 2013 9 am to 12 noon Riverside House Room 21 - Floor 2 - Wing A

Independent Chair for the Safeguarding Adults Board
Consultant in Public Health NHS R
GP Lead Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Lead Nurse NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Mental Capacity and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Co-ordinator RMBC
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care RMBC
Safeguarding Adults Co-ordinator RMBC
Chief Nurse Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust
Detective Inspector Rotherham Public Protection Unit SY Police
Team Manager Action for Children
Director of Health and Wellbeing, RMBC
Learning and Development Manager RMBC
Business Manager Children and Young People Service RMBC
Safeguarding Adults Service Manager RMBC
Adults Commissioning Manager Resources RMBC (rep for Matt Gladstone)
Safeguarding Champion RMBC
Deputy Director of Nursing RDaSH
Voluntary and Community Sector Representative SCOPE
Chief Executive Age UK Rotherham
Head of Communications RMBC
Homelessness Manager Housing Options RMBC
Safeguarding Officer South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
Community Partnership Officer South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
Service Manager Learning Disability Service RMBC
Community Engagement Officer RMBC
Detective Sergeant South Yorkshire Police
Safeguarding Adults Support Officer RMBC

Item		Action
1.	Urgent matter raised at the request of the Chair	
	Prior to the meeting commencing the Chair and Deborah Wildgoose advised they had a difficult issue to discuss with Board members but as there was a potential risk to the vulnerable adults living in Rotherham they felt it paramount to do so.	
	Doncaster Safeguarding Adults Services had investigated a very complex case involving an alleged perpetrator who ran a very successful service user support service. There had been a number of allegations; the investigation had been ongoing for a year. As part of the investigation 400 people had been seen – the investigation was due to conclude over the next 2 months, at present all allegations were unfounded.	

Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi	Item		Action
the alleged perpetrator targeted those with mental health issues. Deborah Wildgoose advised the people had voluntarily engaged with this service, she added there had only been an alert to Rotherham and Sheffield, the alleged perpetrator may not decide to set up services in the area but there was a possibility he may. Phil Morris asked if the alert had been made across all agencies. Deborah Wildgoose responded no, it had to be established where he would be residing. The Chair explained Sam Newton had been given the name of the alleged perpetrator, she added it had been the Doncaster Safeguarding Adults Board who had made the decision to circulate the information.  Karen Hockley stated if the police were aware they would be able to 'flag up' any concerns throughout South Yorkshire. Deborah Wildgoose explained the police had been provided with a recent update.  The Chair advised concerns should be resolved shortly, an update would be provided at the next Board meeting in March.  2. Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit  This item was linked with VARMM  Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton expla		was a risk he could set up services in the Rotherham area. Karen Hockley was	
concerns throughout South Yorkshire. Deborah Wildgoose explained the police had been provided with a recent update.  The Chair advised concerns should be resolved shortly, an update would be provided at the next Board meeting in March.  2. Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit  This item was linked with VARMM  Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		the alleged perpetrator targeted those with mental health issues. Deborah Wildgoose advised the people had voluntarily engaged with this service, she added there had only been an alert to Rotherham and Sheffield, the alleged perpetrator may not decide to set up services in the area but there was a possibility he may. Phil Morris asked if the alert had been made across all agencies. Deborah Wildgoose responded no, it had to be established where he would be residing. The Chair explained Sam Newton had been given the name of the alleged perpetrator, she added it had been the Doncaster Safeguarding Adults	
2. Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit  This item was linked with VARMM  Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		concerns throughout South Yorkshire. Deborah Wildgoose explained the police	
Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi			
Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.  3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi	2.	Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit	
3. VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix  Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		This item was linked with <b>VARMM</b>	Presentation attached
Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		·	
adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.  Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi	3.	VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix	
Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.  The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other	
meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.  **MASH - Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub**  The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of	
The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the 'Task and Finish' group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated	
focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi		MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub	
Rotherham. The Chair suggested it was the ideal opportunity to gather information in an area the Board wished to research. She added the findings could be discussed when the Board met in March.		focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi Disciplinary Team, Helen Dennis would be visiting to explore how it would work for Rotherham. The Chair suggested it was the ideal opportunity to gather information in an area the Board wished to research. She added the findings could be	HDennis
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 07 November 2012	4.	Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 07 November 2012	

Item		Action
	The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record of the proceedings.	
5.	Matters Arising	
	5.1 Winterbourne SCR Executive Summary and Action Plan	
	Deborah Drury advised the Department of Health actions had been published on 10 December 2012, she explained RDaSH had very significant expectations of the outcome of the review. Sue Cassin explained the CCG had been looking at what the recommendations would mean to South Yorkshire. At a recent South Yorkshire and Humber meeting Rotherham had completed all they needed to.	
	The Chair advised this issue was very current and a more detailed look at the recommendations was required. She proposed this issue would need to be placed on the next Board agenda.	Agenda Item
	Deborah Wildgoose explained one of the elements of the action plan was to review the care of all the people placed out of Authority by 1 June 2013.	Agenda item
	5.2 Draft Communications Framework	
	Tracey Holmes would be attending the next Board meeting to discuss this issue further.	
6.	South Yorkshire Safeguarding Adults Procedures	
	Helen Dennis explained following the agreement of the other Local Authorities to the tendering process 3 expressions of interest had been received. Quotes were due to be returned on 15.01.2013 and an evaluation meeting would be held on 21.01.2013.	
	The other aspect would now be preparation for a meeting to discuss the contents of the procedures. Rotherham was very keen to hold a multi agency meeting to ensure the content of the procedures would be from a multi agency perspective. Sam Newton advised it was crucial Rotherham should attend meetings with multi agency representation. In response to her request Members of the Board proposed:	
	Juliette Greenwood – a member of her team	
	Sue Cassin – Catherine Hall	
	Deborah Wildgoose – would attend herself and would also represent Doncaster	
	Mel Lambert agreed to attend as representative for the Voluntary Sector	
7.	Contract Assurance Activity – April 2012	
	Janine Parkin explained this was the first report to Board, she had been unsure as to the expected content so had provided a snapshot of the activity. She had thought it useful to look at the substance of Contracting Concerns and how they had been dealt with. She explained the team worked closely with safeguarding ensuring any Contracting Concerns which had an element of safeguarding issues was passed on to the team to look at.	
	Contracting Concerns are stored on a database and relate to potential practice issues by a provider who may or may not contract with the council. Contract Concerns can be raised via Assessment Direct.	
	A risk matrix is updated monthly which generates a monthly RAG status against all registered providers. Information from the risk matrix is presented to a monthly	

Item		Action
	CQC meeting.	
	Amanda Coyne discussed DoLS activity within care homes – some homes were not recognising when conditions had been met, the quality of recordings was questionable, re-applying for a DoL prior to it expiring etc. She suggested the sub group could look at what information needed capturing and agree a format as to how to illustrate information in the report.  Janine Parkin suggested an end of year report could be presented to Board in	JParkin to present paper to May Board
	May.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
8.	Care UK and Rotherham Hospice Representation at Board	
	Sam Newton explained Paula Hill (Rotherham Hospice) had contacted her to make a formal request to become a member of the Board – she had also received a request from Care UK.	
	Sue Cassin suggested questions could be asked relating to why they wanted to attend, what would they bring to the Board and take away.	
	Following further discussion it was agreed the Board would give consideration to their attendance. This issue would be discussed further at the next Board meeting in March.	Agenda Item
9.	Safeguarding Adults Board Training – Executive and Non Executive	
	This item was linked with Workforce Development	
	Amanda Coyne made reference to the agreement made at the previous Board meeting i.e. funding – she explained she had been unable to present information to DLT. She would meet with Nigel Mitchell, Jo Abbott and Sue Cassin to work through a paper and assess what money was needed for next year.	
	Jo Abbot discussed the lack of training for Board members, she reminded last year the Board had agreed to invite executives and non executives to sit in on training and to undertake case studies. Sue Cassin suggested a training plan specific to Board members would be beneficial, she made reference to the 'Platinum' training programme suggesting specific areas could probably be developed for Board members.	
	Following discussion it was agreed the development of the Board would be of benefit and needed to be addressed via training. Nigel Mitchell advised this could be accommodated but the Board would need to be clear about their intended learning outcome and what training would provide the appropriate solution. He added a programme of training to match the national capability around Safeguarding Adults would be appropriate.	
	The Chair suggested a pro forma to reflect the training needs of the Board. Nigel Mitchell suggested the self appraisal form could be utilised to reflect, consider and collate training needs.	
	The Chair suggested an 'Away Day' could be used as a development event, she proposed the May Board meeting could be utilised. She added the Frances Report was due to be published at the end of January this would give Board members the chance to read it and to consider the impact it may have on the Boards as a whole.	
10.	Workforce Development	
	Funding of Safeguarding Adults & Mental Capacity Act Training Programmes in 2013/2014	

Item		Action
	Safeguarding & Mental Capacity Act Trainer – this post had been vacant since December – at present Nigel Mitchell was the key contact for this training.	
	Work Programme January to March 2013 – the 'Silver and Gold' level training programmes have been commissioned with external training organisations -'Gold' (CQM Learning) and 'Silver' (Aspect) would take place.	
	Nigel Mitchell advised all planned 'Role of the Alerter' training dates had been covered with minimum disruption and 6 additional dates had been added	
	<i>E-modules</i> – e-learning was accessible to those RDaSH employees who worked in the Rotherham area – unfortunately Doncaster was outside of the licensing agreement.	
	Funding of Safeguarding Adults & Mental Capacity Act Training Programmes in 2013/2014	
	Nigel Mitchell explained funding from the PCT to access MCA and DoLS training was due to end in March – the funding agreement had been £59,000-£60,000 per year. A meeting had been held between the Council and CCG to discuss future funding arrangement. Funding had been agreed at £47,000 for 2013/2014. A Service Level Agreement/pooled budget arrangement was to be drawn up.	
11.	Significant Safeguarding Issues	
	CM – this home had a voluntary suspension of placements and a default notice in place. Work with the home was ongoing. None of the residents at CM were at risk of significant harm.	
	BL – the concerns at BL appeared to be developing into significant concerns relating to whole areas of care. A meeting would take place with the provider next week – the view of the provider was they had made significant progress if the provider lifted the voluntary suspension then a formal suspension would be invoked and a default notice served. There had been 10 to 15 safeguarding issues which would be discussed at an MDT meeting.	
12.	Feedback from Safeguarding Adults Sub Group	
	The last meeting had been cancelled due to an urgent meeting to discuss concerns relating to care home MC.	
13.	Domestic Violence	
	An update relating to the Domestic Homicide Review was given. The perpetrator had been found guilty of manslaughter and had been given an 8 year jail sentence. The DHR could now be concluded, the review was planned for February 2013 but unfortunately the author of the report was currently on sick leave.	
	Independent Domestic Violence Advocate – Helen Dennis advised funding for this post would need to be applied for from the Police and Crime Commission.	
14.	360° Appraisal Questionnaire – Update and Review	
	Shona McFarlane explained the questionnaire related to the qualities of the Chair – consideration should now be given to refresh information therefore she proposed the Chair and Board members table this agenda item for discussion. Deborah Wildgoose suggested all Board members had accepted the 360° appraisal formed part of their work. All agreed.	
	Karen Hockley suggested if adapted the questions may prove to be of benefit to Board members. Shona McFarlane agreed, she added self appraisal was in the Board's constitution and formed part of the framework for expectations of Board	

Item		Action
	members. Sue Cassin suggested the appraisal could also link to applications for Board membership.	
	The Chair advised both exercises would form part of the Board's strategy to ensure they were 'ticking all the right boxes'.	
15.	Any Other Business	
	15.1 Jimmy Saville	
	Sue Cassin explained following the significant allegations against 3 NHS organisations the DofH had decided to hold a review into Jimmy Saville's role within health regulations. The Secretary of State had appointed a barrister to provide assurance the DofH and the relevant NHS organisations would be following a robust process aimed at protecting the interests of patients.	
	The paper she had prepared outlined the safeguarding arrangements and raising awareness. She assured the Board the CCG had taken this issue very seriously.	circulated with minutes by AKirbyshaw
	15.2 Karen Hockley	7 ii un by cina ii
	Karen Hockley advises she would be leaving Rotherham PPU to work at Sheffield PPU on 11.02.2013. Mark Montiero would be replacing her.	
	On behalf of the Board the Chair thanked her for her contribution to Board, she was a valuable member who would be missed.	
	15.3 Annual Report	
	Sam Newton made reference to the Annual Report. It was agreed the March meeting would be condensed and the rest given over to discussion/preparation/contribution of Board members to the report.	
16.	Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting	
	<b>Date:</b> 6 March 2013	
	Time: 9am to 12 noon	
	Venue: Riverside House Floor 2 Meeting Room 21	