

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

AWP SAFEGUARDING MEETING

Date: 17th April 2012

Time: 12:00pm

Venue: NHS South Gloucestershire, 8 Brook Office Park, Folly Brook Road,
Emersons Green, Bristol

Present:

██████████	NHS Wiltshire, Lead Director for Nursing
██████████,	NHS Wiltshire, Adult Safeguarding & MCA Lead
George O'Neill	Head of Commissioning Mental Health & Substance Misuse, Safeguarding, Adult Care, Wiltshire Council
██████████	Care Quality Commission
██████████	Swindon Borough Council
██████████	Bristol City Council
██████████	North Somerset PCT
██████████	NHS Swindon
██████████	BANES PCT
██████████	North Somerset County Council
██████████	North Somerset County Council
██████████	South Gloucestershire PCT
██████████	BANES Council
██████████	North Somerset PCT (Part Attendance)
██████████	South West Strategic Health Authority
██████████	NHS Wiltshire

Apologies:

None

Background

██████████), Director of Nursing at NHS Wiltshire made introductions and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to establish if any Local Authority/PCT who were commissioning services from AWP had any concerns regarding Safeguarding and procedural protocols. ██████ advised the meeting, Wiltshire Council had raised concerns regarding AWP's Service with clients within Wiltshire to which George O'Neill (GO) will give a brief. ██████ explained that the SHA (Strategic Health Authority) were involved with the concerns and that it would proceed to an external independent investigation.

█████ explained that the meeting was informal and it was to try and share knowledge with other multi disciplinary agencies to see if they had similar issues. ██████ stated that she was chairing the meeting on behalf of Wiltshire Council but George O'Neill was leading on the matters raised. ██████ advised that ████████████████████ from Bristol City Council was to

provide a briefing paper in relation to their concerns surrounding AWP but this was not submitted at the meeting due to adjustments being made within the paper.

The meeting was passed to George O'Neill (GO) for Wiltshire Council's update.

Discussion on current situation

GO advised the meeting that in Mid February several Wiltshire staff including 3 Professional Leads had raised concern that they were unhappy with performance data being entered on to AWP's, RIO system.

GO explained that reviews were being entered into client records, when reviews had not taken place. Staff was being asked to record that a client had been visited, when a visit had not actually taken place. GO confirmed that 7 members of staff had met with him to discuss their concerns, this led to an ESM (Early Strategy Meeting) taking place on the 29th February 2012. After the meeting had ended, it was decided, based on the limited information, there was no evidence to suggest that any client had been put at direct risk of Safeguarding but would conduct an initial investigation and if any issue arose from that investigation, the Safeguarding Protocol would commence.

█████ advised that an initial scoping investigation took place at AWP by ██████ Director of Governance and Nursing (HW), no detailed review of client details were given. 16 AWP staff was interviewed including Management, of which, 2 Social Workers who had originally given consent to being identified, were later told not to participate.

GO advised that he had interviewed 30 staff who were currently seconded to AWP. As a results of those interviews, it was decided that an APC (Adult Protection Conference) should be conducted. This took place on 4th April 2012. GO presented his findings and ██████ gave her findings.

Result of Wiltshire Council's Investigation

GO clarified that 4 Wiltshire Council staff had not been asked to change data. The investigation showed that staff who worked within the Adults of Working Age (AOWA) had raised concerns and issues.

17 staff had been asked or told to record that a visit had been achieved or cancelled rather than record the client as a non attendance.

15 staff had said that they had been told to enter inaccurate data by their manager.

11 staff had been asked to record they had conducted face to face contact with a client, which had not occurred.

5 staff had information entered on to RIO without their knowledge.

6 staff had been asked to record a home visit when it should have been recorded as a review.

12 staff stated that reviews had been entered on to client's records when a review had not taken place.

4 staff had said that care plan reviews had been entered on to RIO as having taken place when they were either on leave or sick. The care plan reviews had not taken place.

3 staff stated that risk documentation had been inputted by admin staff to indicate that the client had a substance misuse problem when they did not

Above was just a few examples, there had been other instances.

GO explained that 3 Forensic Social Workers were told to close cases to avoid a breach of performance targets. GO gave an example that a client who had escaped Broadmore Prison twice, who was an open case to one of the Forensic social workers, their case had been closed on RIO to avoid the 3 month breach.

GO advised that an email had been received on 8th March 2012, 9 days after the ESM from a member of the AWP admin team to a social worker advising them that a case had been closed down to avoid a £3000 fine for breaching.

During the APC, 4 cases had been discussed and questions were raised as to whether AWP had followed the safeguarding protocol (MCA). 2 of the cases, the clients were considered to be vulnerable. As a result of this meeting, the Director of Governance and Nursing of AWP were given various actions of which one was to drill down from the information supplied, to give, further analysis. It was reported by AWP that their initial findings found no evidence of safeguarding or risk concerns but did confirm findings of misuse of data and that poor practice was clearly evident and there was a failure of understanding the RIO system.

██████████ clarified that AWP were given 16 instances and clients after the APC meeting. She advised that once the fact finding had taken place, there will be an independent investigation conducted surrounding the issues raised, to which, the SHA had also voiced concern. It was decided that all commissioners should be made aware of the concerns to establish if they were isolated incidents or was there a broader aspect re the provision of services from AWP.

GO advised that 16 member of AWP staff had been interviewed within 4 teams but had not yet carried out an audit regarding Wiltshire clients. Following that meeting, AWP asked Wiltshire Council to take back the management of the social workers with immediate effect, it was arranged that this would happen from 5th April 2012. GO conformed that Wiltshire Council had served noticed to AWP that they were not going to renew the contract, to which the proposal was accepted. The Director of Governance and Nursing at AWP advised that it was her view there had been a loss of trust between clinicians and social workers.

██████████ representing South West Strategic Health Authority stated that all agencies need to work together and be essentially clear on who will be the lead commissioner and which safeguarding board was going to take the lead. The early stages of gathering information could lead in a number of directions but ideally, assume the worse then there will be no surprises.

██████████ stated that there did seem to be a difference of opinion relating to the concerns between AWP and Wiltshire Council and that AWP had been issued with a number of

actions around safeguarding staff competency and the reporting of appropriate thresholds. [REDACTED] advised that a Wiltshire Council Solicitor had raised a number of concerning issues.

GO explained that Wiltshire Council has a particular client with complex needs and mental health issues and required a review of their Mental Health Assessment as it was currently out of date. Several deadlines had been missed over a period of 6 months to have another formal assessment conducted to assess if they had the capacity to return home. The client had been admitted to the RUH and discharged to respite. GO confirmed that it had been 2 weeks since the APC took place and a new assessment was received 16th April 2012. GO had concerns as to how serious AWP were taking the matter. GO explained that it was a member of staff from Wiltshire Council who conducted the assessment as 3 members of AWP had refused to carry one out.

[REDACTED] advised the meeting that Bristol City Council did not have any concerns with AWP in reference to falsification of client data.

[REDACTED] representing NHS Swindon and Swindon LA acknowledged the fact that with reference to performance indicators, each Multi Agency tries to triangulate the information from serious indicators around practice rather than the safeguarding protocol. [REDACTED] advised that Swindon's concerns were around service delivery and that they had been given no indication that data had been misused. Issues have been highlighted around design with the significant changes currently taking place within AWP and staff having to reapply for their positions. [REDACTED] felt that the quality of service felt a long way from safe practice. [REDACTED] is not assured that the data being supplied by AWP is reliable.

[REDACTED] commented on the information supplied by GO and acknowledged that the issues were clearly high risk.

[REDACTED] representing NHS Wiltshire stated that she had no confidence in the data and gave a detailed analysis on what could represent falsification. NHS Wiltshire is currently undertaking further analysis of performance data to investigate discrepancies reported by GP's associated with the recording of non attendance and the 4hr response rates for urgent cases. [REDACTED] confirmed that some GP's do have concerns surrounding AWP. An example given, clients who present themselves at the surgery with suicidal tendencies were being "baby sat" for long periods of time before a representative of AWP attends. [REDACTED] explained that 30% of referral for crisis that was screened and returned does not show up in the report as they were scored green.

It was confirmed by Bristol City Council they had brought seconded staff back under the control of council management. It was felt that the MCA knowledge was poor and staff had to be retrained. GO agreed.

Questions were raised surrounding the lack of knowledge regarding the MCA of a multi disciplinary agency commissioning mental health services. It was acknowledged that the MCA is a complex piece of legislation.

NHS BANES believed there to be confusion around alerts and what represents a safeguarding issue. BANES confirmed that they had spoken with a number of their social workers and professional leads who work for AWP. Their response was they had not been given any directive to change client records but they did feel as though they were criticized. There was acknowledgment that the targets were complex and could lead to

pressurisation. BANES felt there was a weakness between the systems the Council use and RIO as they do not communicate with each other. Quality of service and safety was a mixed picture, especially around crisis services. Some reports were good, others bad. BANES feel there are issues at executive level within AWP and that it is dysfunctional.

North Somerset are led to believe there are no issues of manipulation of data and feel that the staff within AWP had good indicators around performance, although they would interrogate if they felt there were any concerns. The performance meeting which are held are honest and open and minutes are produced. The feedback from GP's has been positive and they have seen the service improve.

NHS South Gloucestershire commented that they were not aware of any issues of manipulation but thought the staff did lack knowledge of RIO.

■■■■ representing North Somerset PCT commented that different methodology is used in different team within AWP but did feel staff was slow when there was a safeguarding issue.

It was shared amongst the meeting as to how testing assurance on services should occur. ■■■■ stated that in principle the policy would be to check and check again and to assume the worst to protect clients. ■■■■ questioned how multi agencies could rely on the performance targets supplied by AWP, when Wiltshire Council have highlighted and investigated discrepancies.

■■■■ pointed out a number of key facts:-

1. It would not be unreasonable to ask AWP for RIO recordings to double check figures they were submitting.
2. Carry out an audit of current practices – prioritize higher risk groups
3. To suspend some of the data fields within RIO and concentrate on the key fields that was required.

■■■■ suggested that lead commissioners engage in a telephone conference as to what the possibility are concentrating on certain key fields and what those key fields should be to manipulate the data and to carry out an audit of client records for some vulnerable groups.

■■■■ acknowledged that AWP were trying to run a complex service but trusting the external review and their findings were important. It was paramount agreeing the terms of reference of the independent review with lead commissioners.

It was agreed that a selection of experts would put together a proposal which had been agreed by individual commissioners regarding methodology (test out risk issues).

■■■■ confirmed that they had lost confidence in AWP with reference to training issues and now with the problems presented by Wiltshire Council. ■■■■ commented that it was important to know service users are not being affected and to make sure each service user is issued with a co-ordinator and that their care service was being managed.

ACTIONS

Responsibility	Action point	Timeframe
[REDACTED]	To define a group of people To test methodology	
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	To attempt teleconference with lead commissioners to establish ways of manipulating data supplied by AWP	Friday 20 th April 2012
[REDACTED]	Keep AWP and Chief Executives informed of progress	

DRAFT