

# Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Proposals Working Group

25<sup>th</sup> February 2009, 10:15pm  
Committee Room 5, Civic Hall, Leeds

## MINUTES

### ATTENDANCE

#### Members:

Cllr. Judith Chapman (JC) (Chair)  
Cllr. Suzi Armitage (SA)  
Cllr. Clive Fox (CF)  
Joy Fisher (JF) (co-opted member)  
Sally Morgan (SM) (co-opted member)

#### Officers:

Dennis Holmes (DH), Chief Commissioning Officer  
Paul Broughton (PB), Interim Chief Officer, Learning Disabilities  
Sandra Newbould (SN) Principal Scrutiny Adviser

**Interests Declared** – Cllr Clive Fox , Member of the Roseville Management Board

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1	<p><b>Attendance / Introductions / Apologies</b></p> <p>The above attendance was noted. Apologies were received from Cllr. Debra Coupar and Cllr. Penny Ewens</p>	
2	<p><b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>Received and Approved</p>	
3	<p><b>Adult Social Care Safeguarding Posts – HR Process</b></p> <p>At the January meeting the group was advised that there had been some inevitable delays in the recruitment process. The working group requested a briefing note detailing the timeline for recruitment of the posts since it began to identify if there has been any unnecessary delay that could have been avoided. This report was presented to the working group who were satisfied with the content.</p> <p>A progress update was provided for the overdue tasks specified in the December reporting period (1.8, 1.9 and 2.6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 senior practitioners – Interviews took place 11<sup>th</sup> Feb 2009.</li> <li>• 3 Independent Safeguarding and Risk Managers – Final interviews taking place 26<sup>th</sup> February 2009.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b>Independence Wellbeing and Choice Inspection Action Plan: January 2009</b></p> <p>Overdue actions in this reporting period</p>	

	<p>2.6 Establish performance and quality assurance sub-group - JC expressed her disappointment that this action still red. The group was advised that progress will be made in the near future and that this area should have moved to amber before the next working group meeting.</p> <p>Other Actions</p> <p>1.5 – A supervision checklists have been rolled out to fieldwork staff. Casework audits however have not yet been undertaken.</p> <p>1.7 – Safeguarding cases have been reviewed however the final Audit Report will not be available until April and this is why the status has moved to amber.</p> <p>9.1 – The target dates set for this action point reflect Government deadlines.</p> <p>The group was reminded that the CSCI inspector is due to return to review progress on the 19<sup>th</sup> of March 2009.</p> <p>The group advised that they agreed with the principle that actions should not move to green unless it is completed, however concern was expressed that many of the targets are on amber status with no indication of whether matters are progressing or falling further behind. JC suggested a arrow indicator (↑↓) which would then indicate the direction of progress.</p> <p>DH advised that this could be difficult as many of the aims do not have a statistical basis but would endeavour to incorporate some type of indication. PB added that all actions with an amber status are in progress.</p> <p>When asked if all front line staff have now received Safeguarding training DH advised the group that this is an ongoing process.</p> <p>JF sought clarification on how a safeguarding concern is determined, and was advised that front line managers would make a determination based on established facts and regular reviews.</p>	DH
5	<p><b>Safeguarding Board – Draft Minutes</b></p> <p>Members of the group expressed their whole hearted disappointment that neither Leeds Teaching Hospital Trust or Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust had (nominated attendee or sub) had been present for the first meeting of the Safeguarding Adult Partnership Board. JC will be formally writing a letter to the Chair of the SAPB expressing the working groups disappointment formally.</p> <p>The group were advised that the attendance records of the SAPB would be reported in the annual report.</p> <p>The group asked how the Children’s safeguarding processes are to be utilised (1.11) and were advised that the suitability of the processes are to be considered first as statutory duties and powers are very different and it may be the case that the procedures are easily adaptable for Adults.</p> <p>CF asked how poor performance within the partnership would be tackled and was advised that this would be clarified in the memorandum of understanding.</p> <p>The group enquired about the progress of the two serious case reviews. DH advised that this process is a good opportunity to learn away from the</p>	SN

	<p>incident. The number of cases to be reviewed in the future may depend on how effective the organisations are when working together. Any organisation can made a referral for a serious case review, which once undertaken, learning would be reported back to the Safeguarding Board for dissemination.</p> <p>Referring to 6.1 the group asked about the 'other' category and was advised that it is not always clear how the referral was generated, but it does not indicate that it was an anonymous referral.</p> <p>The group asked if 97 referrals are typical in a month and was reminded that there has been an increase in the number of safeguarding referrals during this year compared to 2008/9, which may be due to a recent publicity campaign. This has created additional pressures on staffing resources however once new recruits are in place the required level of infrastructure support to the Safeguarding Board, quality assurance monitoring and frontline staff can be provided. Safeguarding awareness is being raised via marketing, public information and training. SM suggested that as the Dignity in Care campaign has been such a success maybe that model should be adopted for Safeguarding.</p>	
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Staffing Review and Look North Report.</b></p> <p>PB advised the working group of the major change across accommodated based services and day services. Currently support is essentially provided in large segregated buildings and this model is outdated and does to support national expectations.</p> <p>The current hierarchical staffing structure, incorporating 12 different grades, has not been reviewed for over 25 years. The proposal is to implement a two tier staffing structure at level 1 (support worker) and 2 (support leader) with an emphasis on flexible working within areas opposed to buildings based. The service is reflecting on where it needs to be in 5 years in order to meet the requirements of personalised services.</p> <p>A list of individual services were stated in the report. The working group asked if all of the services mentioned was due to close and were advised no ,not at this time. The group added that it is important that all elected members are informed of future plans for residential and day care centres to ensure accurate communication to residents and prevent inaccurate rumours from manifesting. The group requested that 6 monthly update reports on the Learning Disability Services supported living and fulfilling lives review be brought to the ASC Scrutiny Board.</p> <p>The working group was assured that nothing would close until an alternative service is in place and there will be support throughout the transition. There will be an element of dual running but to minimise financial pressure the review will done in stages across the City. At this point the group again stressed the point of advising ward members of the implications.</p> <p>SA asked what other authorities have done where there has been no day centre provision and was advised that individuals have been supported via social networks and functions i.e. coffee mornings and events in community centres.</p> <p>JF stated that there had been rumours about the closure of Roseville. The</p>	<p>PB/SN</p>

	<p>group was advised by CF that the Doors Service is certainly under review due to the end of decency funding and the procurement power of the ALMO's to seek services elsewhere. JC added that as a Lead Member for Env and Neighbourhoods she had been advised that staff would be re-deployed. S.A requested an update to know exactly what is happening.</p> <p>(As this Doors function within Roseville does not fall within the remit of ASC Scrutiny Board Neil Evans will be contacted and requested to provide a general Councillor update.)</p>	SN
7	<p><b>Future meetings dates</b></p> <p>The following future meeting dates were agreed. The review of the Independence Wellbeing and Choice action plan to be scheduled onto the agenda for the meetings detailed below. All meetings to start at 10:15am.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 25 March 2009 – Committee Room 5</li> <li>➤ 30 April 2009 – Committee Room 4</li> </ul> <p>Specific agenda items to be confirmed.</p>	SN

DRAFT