

Health, Inclusion and Social Care Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Tuesday 15 January 2019

Committee members: Councillors Lucy Richardson (Chair), Jonathan Ca Landy, Bora Kwon, Amanda Lloyd-Harris and Mercy Umeh

Co-opted members: Victoria Brignell (Action On Disability) and Jim Greal Our Hospitals)

Other Councillors: Ben Coleman

Officers: Lisa Redfern, Strategic Director of Social Care and Public Service Reform

Guests: Ian Cassidy, Commissioner, Older Peoples Commission; Rosalin Commissioner, Older Peoples Commission; Mike Howard, former Independent Chair of the Triborough SAEB; and Marilyn Mackie, Commissioner, Older Commission

219. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED

That the minutes of Tuesday, 4 December 2019, be deferred

220. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

221. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

None.

222. SAFEGUARDING ADULTS EXECUTIVE BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

Councillor Richardson welcomed Mike Howard, the former triborough, Independent Chair, of the Safeguarding Adults Executive Board (SAEB). This was the final, annual report of the triborough SAEB, following disaggregation. Mr Howard confirmed that he had been appointed as chair of the new SAEB, for Hammersmith & Fulham, as of 1 July 2018. Mr Howard commented that he was very proud of the report (which covered the period 2017/18), and which was presented in a similar format to that of previous years. The format was in the style of a magazine to make it easier, and more interesting to read. Many organisations worked collaboratively and in partnership, to support the work the SAEB, and the report showed how safeguarding was not just the responsibility of the Council.

The SAEB helped keep the people of the Borough safe, protecting those at risk of either physical, emotional, or financial harm, making a positive difference to the quality of lives. The SAEB advocated a person centric focus, supporting an individual's personal choices, rather than what a practitioner might recommend was in that person's best interests. Using the example of people with dementia, it was important to understand that there were differing levels of need and that service commissioners needed to be aware that there were a wide range of symptoms to be accommodated appropriately. The back of the report (page 26) listed statistics, from which the safeguarding journey could be inferred. Some examples included: the percentage of adults in the population without support; the number of safeguarding enquiries received; the percentage of those at risk; and the impact of the enquiry on the person identified as at risk.

The review period ended at 31 March 2018, and a detailed breakdown of the number of enquiries received was provided and categorised, according to type and outcome. An ongoing concern had been the lack case closure. Two out of three cases resulted in successful outcomes but more closure of cases was required. Although more recently, it was confirmed that there was a higher rate of closure, with greatly improved outcomes. It was also important to understand that in some cases, the risk remained. Frequently, where the abuser was a son or daughter, people were reluctant for the matter to formally progress and did not want the police involved.

Councillor Richardson commended the report, and noted that the key issues were well documented. The report was easy to read and brought safeguarding issues to life. Councillor Richardson congratulated Mr Howard on his appointment and his continuing role. It was confirmed that the SAEB was newly established and held its first meeting in September, maintaining an ethos of engaging directly with communities. All the sub-groups of the Board were chaired by professional leads from other agencies, and not the Council:

1. Safeguarding Adults Review - Chaired by the Head of Safeguarding for the West London Mental Health Trust. This sub-committee undertook

middle-management reviews of cases to understand what was going wrong;

2. Co-production - To look at established policies and procedures, to evaluate if they were achieving the required outcomes; and
3. Prevention and awareness – To establish what local communities want to prioritise; to analyse whether safeguarding messages are being effectively communicated and how these could be better targeted.

Mr Howard explained that there were four co-chairs, with diverse backgrounds, for example, the Board had recently recruited the chair of governors from HM Wormwood Scrubs Prison. Further recruitment continued to appoint members of the sub-group, which was to be confirmed at a meeting on 29 January 2019. It was noted that Councillor Patricia Quigley had recently been appointed to the SAEB.

Councillor Lloyd-Harris endorsed the Chair's comments, observing that the report was very comprehensive and easy to read. She asked how the SAEB had advertised for appoints to the Board and its sub-groups. Mr Howard explained that they had relied upon contacts within the Council and thanked Susan Hughes for her assistance and support. An event had been hosted by QPR Football Club and they had relied upon word of mouth, rather than physical adverts. There had been a reasonable response and take up.

Councillor Lloyd-Harris commented on the issue of older people experiencing domestic abuse by a young person (son or daughter), or by a person living in the same household, and the increase in such cases. It was understood that the Violence Against Women and Girls group, had done considerable work in highlighting the issue, to ensure that those experiencing domestic violence were as much a concern as the perpetrators. The Board benefitted greatly from the appointment of Sally Jackson, from FiLiA but it was important to avoid any duplication of work, and synchronise with the work of other safeguarding teams.

Councillor Umeh endorsed the report, which was commended. She enquired about how the Board worked with those whose first language was not English and how language barriers were addressed. Mr Howard outlined how the Board benefitted from members coming from a range of diverse backgrounds. One of the chairs originated from Malaysia, for example. Their perspective and advice was both helpful and unique, and ensured that there was clear communication.

Councillor Caleb-Landy echoed earlier comments from his colleagues, and congratulated Mr Howard on an excellent report, which had brought to life a range of issues. He enquired about how the SAEB's local statistics compared to national figures. Although the figures were only recently released, it was still not possible to draw comparisons due in part to the way which cases were classified and outcomes recorded. For example, some SAEBs include an enquiry in their count, other count the enquiry being taken forward. Ms Redfern informed the Committee that an interim Head of Safeguarding had

recently been appointed and that it was possible to circulate statistics for members of the Committee. It was noted that as a result, the number of referrals had increased and that the quality of performance had improved. Mr Howard added that they had deliberately avoided the inclusion of too many statistics.

ACTION: LR to circulate safeguarding statistics to the Committee

Councillor Caleb-Landy asked about the number of safeguarding incidents resolved in LBHF, how many went on to appeal, and how many made an application for review to the local government ombudsman. Ms Redfern confirmed that to her knowledge, there were no such cases. Mr Howard corroborated this view, and added that he had never reviewed any data about complaints, during his 9-year tenure as Chair.

Councillor Kwon also commended the report and hoped that it would be widely distributed. On the issue of scams and fraud, she enquired about the level of interaction undertaken with banks and other financial institutions. Victims often became victims twice over, as they tried to claim back any losses, having to deal with hostile banking staff. It was explained that the Board did not undertake this work directly itself but instead, relied upon the expertise of support staff, and referred to pages 20 and 21 of the report. There was a national requirement for banks to be more victim focussed and co-operative. They were also working with Royal Mail to raise awareness of the issue, given the concerns around identify theft. This was often an overlooked area of safeguarding and some of these individuals were often very lonely, and isolated, and unfortunately regarded scammers as friends. Work was undertaken with Barclays, for example. This was also an opportunity to involve local community groups.

Co-optee Jen Nightingale asked about the process for referral and how this operated in practice. Ms Redfern explained that referrals did not just originate from agencies, which were wide ranging and included health and social care. Informally, referrals also came from carers. As awareness of safeguarding continued to increase, the net will broaden. There was also an increased focus on prevention, working with different community and residential groups. Mr Howard added that in health, for example, pressure sores were a safeguarding concern and Ms Redfern confirmed that she would be happy to provide the Committee with further information about this issue.

ACTION: LR to provide the Committee with information about safeguarding work undertaken with NHS colleagues on pressure sores

Councillor Richardson thanked Mr Howard and those involved with the production of the 2017/18 report, and looked forward to reviewing the first report of the newly appointed sovereign board for the Borough, covering 2018/19. Raising awareness of safeguarding concerns with professional organisations was recognised as a critical area of work, particularly in terms of identifying what constituted a safeguarding risk.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

223. THE REPORT OF THE OLDER PEOPLE'S COMMISSION

Mr Ian Cassidy provided apologies on behalf of the Chair of the Older Peoples Commission (OPC), Bryan Naylor. Mr Cassidy provided background to the report, which had managed to achieve significant levels of engagement, working with local organisations, the third sector and residents. Approximately 500 responses had been received, both through online access, in-depth interviews and qualitative focus groups.

The report benefitted greatly from the quality of the engagement and reflected an authentic voice. Satisfaction varied, with those in the 55+ group, expressing relatively greater satisfaction, compared to the over 75+. This could be attributed to differences in generational outlook, or, the perception that those in the lower age bracket did not consider themselves to be 'old'.

One of the recommendations was to consider increasing Council Tax by adding a social care precept to help alleviate financial pressure. Also highlighted were shared concerns with the Disabled Peoples Commission. In line with the current drive to embed coproduction, the OPC felt that an older people's council champion should be appointed, together with an older people's board.

Rosalind Duhs, OPC commissioner explained that while there was provision within LBHF that could address social isolation and loneliness (SIL), information about this was not well communicated or co-ordinated. Marilyn Mackie, OPC Commissioner referred the Committee to the Chair's comments in the forward to the report. Older people were not "passive recipients of services"; their breadth of knowledge and expertise made them a valued and much underutilised resource.

Councillor Coleman commended the report as well written, with challenging recommendations. The report would be considered by Cabinet and work would commence on how the recommendations could be implemented, in conjunction with other areas of work such as SIL, health and wellbeing. Councillor Coleman thanked members of the Commission for their commitment and excellent work in producing the report, and looked forward to working with them, in taking forward recommendations.

The report was widely regarded as exceptional, offering a diverse and unique perspective, without patronising. Co-optee Victoria Brignell welcomed the report, and commended its view that older people were an asset, and not passive victims having things imposed on them, and that older people had a lot to offer, in common with people with disabilities. She suggested that if the recommendation for a social care precept was implemented, it should be ring-fenced.

In considering the 40% rate of overall satisfaction, Mr Cassidy confirmed that he could provide the Committee with the raw data, which could offer clarity on the possible underlying factors of 60% indicating dissatisfaction. Ms Mackie elaborated that the recommendations were formulated in response to expressions of dissatisfaction.

Councillor Caleb-Landy welcomed the report, observing that the recommendations were sensible, well-considered, and aligned closely with those of the DPC. He asked if it was possible for these to be more readily achievable, if they were to be combined. Councillor Richardson commended the report for its approach to recording such diverse perspectives and asked about the possible timeframe for implementation. Councillor Coleman responded that the DPC report had focused on specific recommendations but largely were largely about how the Council operated. The focus on co-production was an approach that underpinned broader, high level policy reports. The OPC report focused on more practical aspects, with specific recommendations. In terms of implementation, co-production was the first step, which if successful, would lay the foundation for meeting the needs of everyone.

Councillor Richardson commented that some recommendations were relatively straight forward to implement, for example, providing better and accessible forms of communication on noticeboards. Interestingly, it was reported that there were higher levels of satisfaction expressed by those living in sheltered accommodation, compared to those in Council housing. Councillor Coleman expanded further, commenting that the specific needs of older people should be considered in the context of the redevelopment of service provision. To illustrate, the Council was currently considering the provision of housing repair services. There were plans to meet with different resident groups, including those in sheltered housing.

Councillor Bora Kwon, expressed regret that Mr Naylor had been unable to attend, anticipating the presentation of what would have powerful voice advocating the views of older people. She asked if it was feasible to approach organisations and charities in the Borough about funding. Councillor Coleman concurred, highlighting that the report also reflected on the way in which the Council funded the third sector. It was important to support organisations in the third sector; particularly where they could provide engaging activities and continuity of provision.

Mr Cassidy acknowledged that meaningful activity was primarily sought after, the challenging being to qualitatively improve on what was currently on offer to older people. By contrast, research had indicated that befriending services were not regarded in the same way.

Councillor Umeh welcomed the report and asked how the approach to SIL would address language and cultural barriers for BAME and LGBTQ which might prevent older people from accessing provision. Ms Mackie explained that the Commission had gone to great lengths to speak to communities whose first language was not English, covering many diverse groups. The

Chair of the Commission would have been able to elaborate further, but this had been a big and rewarding experience for members of the Commission.

Jim Grealy referenced an earlier point regarding social prescribing and ways by which the CCG could be encouraged to develop a broader and deeper understanding of the LBHF population demographic. The Borough was relatively young but the CCG did not include qualitative associations in their perspective. Focusing on the introduction to the report, he observed that older people found it increasingly difficult to access primary care, more so than before. He suggested that a meeting with the CCG be convened to discuss the report. It was recognised that it was more efficient to extend GP appointment slots to accommodate discussion of multiple ailments than to return for multiple appointments, when considered in the context of the report. The qualitative data contained in the report created greater resonance than the generalised empirical data relied upon by the CCG.

Merrill Hammer suggested that further consideration should be given to “becoming older people” as there was no single group of older people. The issues of ‘becoming older people’ and health needs, was a concern which needed wider publicity and engagement.

Mr Cassidy offered to facilitate the report through the older people’s wellbeing workstream with the CCG and take it to their next meeting on transport. Mr Grealy suggested that the most helpful forum for this might be a round table discussion. The following actions were agreed:

1. Ian Cassidy to facilitate the OPC report to the CCG;
2. The report to be widely circulated, and provided to organisations such as Save Our Hospitals, and, CCG patient reference groups, as determined by the Commission;
3. To ensure that the report feeds into the NHS consultation on digital working;
4. To highlight concerns around how older people accessed primary care appointments, given the number of potential GP closures, practice consolidation or hub closures, with travel to these appointments being a primary concern; and
5. Officers to explore the feasibility of setting up a sub-group of the Committee to meet with the CCG and members of the Commission;
6. To identify and consider wider engagement opportunities to promote and publicise the findings of the report.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

224. WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

225. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee noted that the date of the next meeting was Monday, 11 February 2019.

Meeting started: 7pm

Meeting ended: 9:42pm

Chair

Contact officer: Bathsheba Mall
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 07776672816
E-mail: bathsheba.mall@lbhf.gov.uk