



## Report of the Director of Adult Social Services

### Scrutiny Board: Adult Social Care

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> February 2011

### Subject: Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Six monthly Progress Report

#### Electoral Wards Affected:



Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

#### Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

## Executive Summary

1. This report provides a six-monthly progress report to Members of the Scrutiny Board on the work of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board.

### 1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the work of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board to the Scrutiny Board.

### 2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 Each year Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board produces an annual report of its business for the previous year and a work programme for the following year. The work programme is informed by the priorities of the Board and its partner agencies.
- 2.2 Although Safeguarding Adults Boards do not yet have the same statutory framework as that designated for Safeguarding Children Boards, the formal recognition of the work of Adult Boards is a national priority for central government and the Health and Social Care regulator, the Care Quality Commission. It is anticipated that Safeguarding Adults Boards will be put on a statutory basis, although the exact timing is still not yet confirmed.
- 2.3 The Scrutiny Board received a report presenting the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board Annual Report 2009/10 and work programme for 2010/11 on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2010. Scrutiny Board requested six-monthly updates on the progress of the Safeguarding Adults Board's work.
- 2.4 On 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010, Members of the Scrutiny Board received a report containing the formal response from the Director to the Scrutiny Board Report on the Independence, Wellbeing and Choice inspection of Leeds Adult Social Services 2008. The report supported all three recommendations made by the Board, following the conclusion of its

inquiry into the inspection and the consequent action plan. This report includes an update on the three recommendations.

### **3.0 Main Issues**

- 3.1 In the current financial year there continues to be an increase in the number of safeguarding referrals made into the Leeds Safeguarding Adult Partnership, with over 2,000 between April and December 2010. This compares with 2,049 in the whole of 2009/10, and reflects the ongoing increase in general awareness of safeguarding issues and understanding of the need to safeguard adults through the revised multi-agency procedures. The proportion of those which continued on to be the subject of a safeguarding investigation is increasing slightly on previous years, suggesting that there is a slight improvement in the appropriateness of referrals into the safeguarding system.
- 3.2 As reported to Scrutiny Last July, a new independent chair has been appointed to the Board. He is Professor Paul Kingston, a professor of gerontology (the study of the process of ageing), at Staffordshire University. Prof Kingston met Board members in July when he led a Board Development day. He chaired his first Board meeting in October 2010. He has also been meeting Board members, chief officers and chief executives of the various partner organizations, when time allows, as part of his induction. He has also made links with independent chairs of other Safeguarding Adults Boards, and with the independent chair of the Leeds Safeguarding Children Board. Prof Kingston is commissioned to spend 20 days per year in Leeds. Although unavailable for this February meeting of the Scrutiny Board, Prof. Kingston hopes to present the next half yearly Safeguarding Adults report to Scrutiny, in person.
- 3.3 As reported to Scrutiny Board in July 2010, local arrangements to implement the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA) and the associated Deprivation of Liberty safeguards were brought under the governance structures of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board in April 2010, reflecting national best practice and policy guidance. Over the last six months, the Board's MCA local implementation network (LIN) sub-group has reviewed its work plan to ensure that best use is made of the resources available from the other sub-groups of the Safeguarding Adults Board, whilst retaining the expertise required for its particular work.
- 3.4 This enables the Board to be assured that wherever there is an overlap between Safeguarding Adults and mental capacity issues, they are dealt with in an effective way. This includes any required revision of policy and procedures, communications work, quality assurance, training and workforce development. Retaining a separate sub-group ensures that any issues that are specific to the Mental Capacity Act can be monitored, and solutions for them developed and implemented, by staff with the requisite knowledge and work responsibilities.
- 3.5 The other new sub-group of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board, the Communications and Community Engagement sub-group, met for the first time in September 2010. In February 2011, the Board will consider this sub-group's proposals for the Safeguarding Adults Charter and the Safeguarding Adults Communications and Community Engagement Strategy. It is hoped to hold a Charter launch event in the new financial year, where stakeholders will have an opportunity to discuss their experience of the Safeguarding Adults process, and feed their views in to the Board. The Board is interested to get views on how it should involve stakeholders so that they can inform the Board's understanding and influence the continuous improvement of the process.
- 3.6 In August, the Board agreed revised procedures for undertaking serious case reviews (SCR) in Leeds. These new procedures incorporated learning from the first two SCRs, and enabled an improved process to be used with the third. They included clear requirements around individual management reviews (IMRs) for each agency involved,

and proposed training at the beginning of each SCR for all authors of these. The procedure now provides more detail on the process for pulling individual reports into an overview report from the multi-agency perspective.

- 3.7 The third SCR is approaching conclusion and is due to be reported to the Safeguarding Adults Board in April. There have been some inevitable delays due to the requirement for criminal and coroners' work to be completed before we conclude the case and report on it to the Safeguarding Adults Board.
- 3.8 There have been a number of cases considered against the criteria but no further SCRs have been recommended. The Board's Serious Case Review and Professional Practice sub-group is developing ideas on other methods for partners to gain learning from cases which do not meet the criteria. Such cases are reported to the Safeguarding Adults Board.
- 3.9 The Board has reviewed the timescales stipulated in the procedures, and added some new requirements. It has reviewed its advocacy and safeguarding guidance and developed and adopted new additions to its procedural guidance, including a procedure for alleged perpetrators or victims to use if they wish to contest a case conclusion (that is, whether or not an allegation is substantiated) and further guidance on investigating institutional abuse. Further guidance is currently being developed on investigations involving a number of victims regardless of setting.
- 3.10 The Board has also agreed a quality assurance framework, and is currently undertaking some time-limited work on standards for which it wishes to see regular reports.
- 3.11 The other major area of work is in training and workforce development. Much work has been done on training staff and volunteers to recognize abuse and to know when to refer into the system. It is recognized that in the current financial climate it is all the more essential to have skilled workers undertaking and managing complex investigations, effectively and efficiently. The Board now wishes to ensure that its specialist staff receive continued training on investigating and coordinating investigations. This includes working closely and professionally with the police in joint investigations.
- 3.12 The Board has discussed the need for a resourcing model for such training. It is likely that joint work can be undertaken with neighbouring Safeguarding Adults Boards so that costs can be shared, but the Board recognizes that specialist training requires external expertise.
- 3.13 The following paragraphs provide an update on the three recommendations from the Scrutiny Board Inquiry, as agreed in September 2010.
- 3.14 The first recommendation, that the Chairperson of the Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board provides a half yearly update to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board or its successor Board during 2010/11 and 2011/12, is met by plan for regular half-yearly reports, of which this is the first.
- 3.15 The second recommendation, that the Director of Adult Social Services ensures partnership organisations provide an undertaking to provide evidence for serious case reviews within a reasonable amount of time to be defined by the Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board, was met by partners ratifying and working to the revised serious case review procedures in the summer of 2010.
- 3.16 Adherence to the procedures is monitored both by the DASS under the arrangements in the Board Memorandum of Understanding and also by the serious case review sub-group, under the same Memorandum of Understanding. The DASS has meetings with the chair of the Board every two months, and serious case reviews are one of the

standard items on that agenda. In addition, the DASS and the Chair of the Board meet both annually and also at the conclusion of each serious case review, with the chair of the Board's serious case review sub-group.

- 3.17 Concerns about particular organisations can be raised at any time, by the chair of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board's serious case review sub-group to the independent chair of the Board, who in turn can bring this to the attention of the chief officer of the organisation concerned and with the DASS.
- 3.18 The third recommendation, that the Head Scrutiny and Member Development ensures the provision of adult safeguarding training to all newly elected members as part of their induction programme, has been met by the development of a programme of training for all Leeds elected members on Safeguarding Adults.
- 3.19 The Member Development Officer has met with the Head of Safeguarding Adults and the safeguarding training development officer to put together a draft learning programme. This will include an induction session for new members, forming part of their casework and surgery management training. It is likely that this will be delivered on a sub regional basis. A further session aimed at Scrutiny members and those with specific responsibilities relating to adult safeguarding is also planned for early autumn. This will include sessions on effective questioning, decision – making and considering risk. Thereafter it is planned to hold refreshers, probably on an annual basis, to ensure that members are informed of any changes to local or national guidance on Safeguarding Adults.

#### **4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance**

- 4.1 The Board Memorandum of Understanding and its annexes was revised during 2010, and agreed by members in the autumn. Each agency has undertaken to provide a signed copy and lodge this with the Safeguarding Adults Board partnership support unit, as evidence of their agreement. As part of this revision, additional work has been done to provide a Dispute Resolution Process for partners and an information sharing agreement (under the auspices of the Leeds Inter-Agency Protocol on Sharing Information) specifically for Safeguarding Adults.
- 4.2 The Memorandum of Understanding will continue to be kept under review. This is particularly important in the light of the continued likelihood of further guidance emerging for local safeguarding boards from Central Government following the previous Government's review of the 2000 'No Secrets' framework.

#### **5.0 Legal And Resource Implications**

- 5.1 The legal implications relate to a significant array of legislation in relation to offences against the person, guidance in relation to Care Standards, Mental Capacity, the implementation of specific guidance in relation to Adult Safeguarding, Dignity in Care.
- 5.2 The resource implications of the Board are set out in the annual report. Elements of this investment are being offset by contributions from partners, where appropriate as income (in the case of NHS Leeds for example) or in terms of time devoted by officers to supporting the work of the partnership (in the case of the West Yorkshire Police, for example).

#### **6.0 Conclusions**

- 6.1 The Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board continues to make progress towards its vision of Leeds as a place where **all the citizens of Leeds, irrespective of age, race, gender,**

**culture, religion, disability or sexual orientation live in safety and free from abuse or the fear of abuse.**

6.2 The Board recognizes there is still work to be done, and partners continue to be committed to the continuing programme of work designed to achieve excellence in Safeguarding practice in Leeds.

## **7.0 Recommendations**

7.1 Members of the Scrutiny Board are requested to note the progress made by the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board, since the last report, and to receive a further progress report in six months time, together with the annual report for 2010/11.

7.2 Members of the Scrutiny Board are requested to note the actions taken against the three recommendations of the Independent Wellbeing and Choice Inquiry and the successful conclusion of actions against all three recommendations.

## **Background Documents referred to in this report**

Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board agendas and papers