



**Brighton & Hove Safeguarding Adults Board**  
**Monday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2018, 15:00 – 17:00**  
**Room G91, Hove Town Hall**

**Present**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
<b>Graham Bartlett</b>	Independent Chair, B&H SAB, ES SAB
<b>Mia Brown</b>	Business Manager, B&H SAB, BHCC
<b>Richard Bates</b>	Detective Chief Inspector, Head of Safeguarding, Sussex Police
<b>Tony Benton</b>	Safeguarding Adviser, Healthwatch B&H
<b>Alan Boyd</b>	Project Coordinator, Healthwatch
<b>Alexandra Barnard</b>	Board Administrator, B&H SAB, BHCC (Minutes)
<b>Mark Burden</b>	Deputy Head / Senior Operations Support Manager, National Probation Service
<b>Allison Cannon</b>	Chief Nurse for Sussex CCGs
<b>George Coleby</b>	Quality Assurance & Learning Development Officer, BHCC & ESCC
<b>David Feakes</b>	Head of Safeguarding, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust (SCFT)
<b>Candy Gallinagh</b>	Designated Nurse Safeguarding Adults and MCA Lead, B&H CCG
<b>David Kemp</b>	Head of Community Safety, East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (ESFRS)
<b>Roland Marden</b>	Evidence & Insight Manager, Healthwatch B&H
<b>Rob Persey</b>	Executive Director, Health & Adult Social Care (HASC), BHCC
<b>Andy Porter</b>	Deputy Director of Social Work and Principal Social Worker, Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SPFT)
<b>Debbie Piggott</b>	Head of Policy Development and Safeguarding Strategic Lead, KSS CRC

**Apologies Received**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
<b>Mark O'Brien</b>	Sussex Police
<b>Christina Chatfield</b>	Lay Member
<b>Wendy Taylor</b>	Pavilions, Cranstoun

<b>Caroline Davies</b>	BSUH
<b>Robert Sobotka</b>	CQC
<b>Michelle Jenkins</b>	BHCC Head of Professional Standards, Safeguarding & Quality Monitoring
<b>Karen Barford</b>	Councillor

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all members, Introductions were made, and apologies were noted.  
 1.2. The Chair reminded all members to declare any conflicts of interest should they arise.

### 1.3. Minutes of Last Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 4th December 2017 were agreed for accuracy, pending the following changes:

- David Feakes is the Head of Safeguarding for SCFT, not Community Safety.

The chair thanked Mia for chairing December's board meeting in their absence.

## 2. Matters Arising

**Item 3.1.** The outstanding input was received, and the annual report has been completed and circulated. It is also available on the SAB website, [here](#).

**Item 4.** The Homelessness report was circulated with December's board minutes. Performance data has been tabled as an agenda item for today's meeting, and George Coleby will provide a summary for the board.

**Item 4.** The Adult A Briefing has been circulated for partners to disseminate.

**Item 4.** The Learning & Development sub group now has a standing item on sharing SAR learning. The next item will cover a joint SAB-LSCB review from Newcastle, around sexual exploitation of young people and adults with care and support needs. A Learning Briefing will be circulated for consideration in team meetings. **Action: Alexandra to circulate the LSCB briefing on review from Newcastle.**

**Item 6.5.** Richard updated the group on work to develop the Stop, Look & Care booklet into an app. The Participation + Engagement (P&E) sub group have discussed this and do not wish to pursue the app but support the distribution of paper copies of the leaflet. Mia advised that the CCG are reviewing and updating contents of the booklet and the SAB will do a print run of 10,000 copies for distribution across the City once completed.

Graham suggested future development of apps be done on a pan-Sussex basis and rolled out across the county. This may make finding relevant expertise easier.

**Item 7.5.** Progress on the Safeguarding Self-Assessment has been forward planned for the agenda for April QA sub group meeting.

Item 8.11. Mia informed that group that there was no update on LeDeR steering group representation. **Action: Mia to ask Ian Wilson to update on representation.**

Item 8.11. LeDeR is now a standing item on SAB SAR agenda with Candy providing updates as an when appropriate.

Item 8.11. The SAB SAR terms of reference have now been amended.

Item 8.11. Mia has now contacted East and West Sussex counterparts to discuss amendments to the pan-Sussex SAR protocol.

Item 10.4. The Brighton & Hove SAB Constitution has now been circulated for signatures. This will be uploaded once signatures have been received.

Richard asked how the Brighton & Hove constitution and information sharing protocol differs from the East Sussex document that it initially drew from. Mia has cross referenced the Brighton & Hove constitution with the updated East Sussex version to ensure this is consistent across the two boards.

Item 11.1. Mia updated the group on the Safeguarding Partnership Protocol. Due to imminent changes in the LSCB this has been postponed until arrangements are clarified. The Protocol between the LSCB, SAB and Health and Wellbeing Board still stands.

Item 11.2. The briefing on the Truth Project was circulated, and the local event has now taken place.

Item 11.3. Emma Gilbert will clarify with contacts from both universities their understanding of safeguarding and ascertain what work they do with vulnerable people at their universities. They will then consider whether the board is the right place for university contacts.

Item 11.3. Mia updated the group on Emma Gilbert's request from private sector landlords for training and information about safeguarding. The Learning & Development (LD) group have discussed this, and note the difficulty with *private* accommodation not commissioned by housing. The group do not have capacity to support with this, but Tim Wilson, in workforce development, has advised there is training on offer via BHCC, but that there would be a charge for private organisations/ individuals – he will pass information to Emma. Mia noted that the difficulty with independent organisations mirrored the previous issues with GPs.

Item 11.3. Richard confirmed that the Participation & Engagement (P&E) sub group are discussing producing a flier or card covering how to report abuse, neglect, etc., that could be included in lettings packs.

Item 11.4. Graham updated the group on a review of the West Sussex SAB, focusing on its function and financial arrangements. The review has been commissioned by the director and new chair, and only looks at the West Sussex SAB, so will not cover pan-Sussex work. Graham had met with Surrey and West Sussex, and noted that there was appetite for cooperation across Sussex, but not for a pan- Sussex board.

Item 11.6. Graham updated the board on the new Adult Safeguarding Liaison Group (ASLG). The group will mirror the Child Protection Liaison Group (CPLG), which has worked well for LSCB. Graham noted that the group will not discuss issues case by case, but more generally discuss and resolve operational conflict, and improve multi-agency response.

### 3. Feedback from Chairs (standing item)

#### 3.1. Learning & Development Sub Group

Sub Group, Chair	Headlines
<p><b>Learning &amp; Development (L&amp;D)</b> David Kemp</p>	<p>The most recent meeting took place on 19<sup>th</sup> February; the next meeting is on the 21<sup>st</sup> May.</p> <p>The L&amp;D work plan continues to be developed. The recent meeting focused on developing the L&amp;D strategy, and developing the strength of quality assurance. Mia has put together a 20 page strategy. The group had a very useful discussion about where this sat in regards to East and West Sussex.</p> <p>Key issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duplication of work done elsewhere</li> <li>- Effectiveness and quality of MCA DoLS training. Levels of training.</li> <li>- Compliance with gold standards</li> </ul> <p>There have been discussions at the SAB Training sub group about whether the group should recommend the uptake of an MCA Competency Framework to the Board.</p> <p>A competency framework was developed some time ago and was presented to Board who accepted that it was good practice to evidence competency, holding back from making it an expectation that all partner organisations did so. Since the original framework Bournemouth University have produced what they describe as a National Framework. The group will review both documents and make a recommendation to the Board again as to which and how the framework should be used by safeguarding services across the city.</p> <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some elements of L&amp;D strategy will be unique to Brighton &amp; Hove - how to keep relevant but sufficiently general?</li> <li>- Size and location more of a struggle for organisations working in each area, easier for those that work pan-Sussex.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, an active and friendly sub group. New issues discussed with enthusiasm, clear interest to working to improve.</p>

The chair thanked David for updating the board, and asked if the group had had similar discussions with West Sussex regarding working pan-Sussex. David noted that the group wanted to assess appetite in Brighton and Hove first.

David Feakes asked if it would be feasible to have an overarching, pan-Sussex L&D, but with local task and finish groups. David Kemp noted that the current Brighton & Hove L&D sub group meets 4 times a year. With the logistics of travel and location and size of venue, would this frequency be possible for a pan-Sussex group? David Kemp noted the value in having a smaller group and benefitting from all members actively participating.

Candy noted that it was worth getting the strategy in place first, before scoping size.

**Action: The L&D chair will liaise with East and West to test appetite for a shared strategy.**

### 3.2. Co-commissioning

Tony asked if this could lead to co-commissioning of training.

Graham suggested that where the boards can co-commission events/training they should. The Self-neglect Conference in East Sussex, which was planned for last week, is the type of event that could be pan-Sussex.

Graham noted that there had been discussion about giving L&D and P&E some designated funding of £10k each. Particularly for P&E, there has been a great deal of discussion and ambition, but a lack of funds.

**Action: Graham Bartlett to Update on Funds for L&D/P&E at Next Meeting**

### 3.3. Participation & Engagement Sub Group

Sub Group, Chair	Headlines
<p><b>Participation and Engagement</b>, Richard Bates</p>	<p>The P&amp;E group have now met twice as a combined group, and maintain a fairly good balance between adults' and children's safeguarding.</p> <p>The group discussed the joint strategy drafted by Mia. It takes the same approach as the LSCB strategy - identifying key audiences and key messages. They have circulated it for feedback. The group expects to sign off the current version at the next meeting.</p> <p>The group is taking a thematic approach to meetings. d examining topical areas, exploring good practice, and considering how to take this forward within our own agencies.</p> <p>The group discussions are very engaging and passionate, although it is sometimes difficult to highlight what is taken from these discussions.</p>

	<p>The 'Stop, Look, Care' booklet was discussed, as previously captured in these minutes.</p> <p>The group are also focusing on the annual reports. Mia has been speaking to a company which works with adults with LD, who can produce an easy-read version of the SAB's annual report.</p> <p>The LSCB is considering a youth LSCB to shadow/ or be a reference groups for main board. The group felt this was an interesting and positive initiative, but want to clarify how it would sit alongside the board. If a youth LSCB is formed, the need for a joint P&amp;E group may need to be reassessed.</p>
--	---

The chair agreed that an easy-read version of the annual report may help the report to focus on how things are done, and to avoid jargon.

David Feakes asked if the communications strategy is pan-Sussex. Richard confirmed a shared commitment to sharing communications and events across the city were relevant and appropriate to do so.

The chair thanked Richard for his update.

#### 3.4. Quality Assurance Sub Group

Sub Group, Chair	Headlines
<p><b>Quality Assurance</b>, Mia Brown</p>	<p>The Quality Assurance sub group last met on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January.</p> <p>Self Assessment Challenge Event held at last meeting – update on March Board agenda. From this activity, Healthwatch continue to have concerns about scrutiny of GP safeguarding - 48% of GP surgeries haven't completed CCG self-assessment tool and need for clarity about when work to evaluate the assurance tools will be undertaken.</p> <p>From the multi-agency homelessness audit the SAB have been trying to recommend B&amp;H commissioners consider Residential, Outpatient &amp; Halfway House Care for clients who are experiencing and /or recovering from emotional and psychological trauma related disorders. However, identifying the correct lead for this has proved difficult.</p> <p>The next audit will focus on MCA/DoLS. This is difficult as the MCA framework and expectations differ across services.</p> <p>Good progress has been made against homeless audit action plan – detailed report on progress shared with Cllrs Moonan and Barford, as well as the Rough Sleepers Strategy Group.</p>

	<p><b>Action: Alexandra to circulate letter to Councillors regarding Homelessness Action Plan.</b></p> <p>The Sexual Abuse audit has been completed; recommendations and report will be presented to next QA meeting. A learning briefing will be disseminated to staff.</p> <p>George updated the group on progress with the multi-agency data set. The group felt this was very good, and heading in right direction regarding comparative work.</p>
--	--

### 3.5. Rough Sleeping Strategy

Rob updated the board on the rough sleeping strategy. The night shelter which is running until March 11<sup>th</sup> saw a very small number of either safeguarding alerts or concerns. There are plans to conduct a more formal evaluation of the night shelter after it has closed, to feed into considerations about commissioning for next year. Currently there is both the SWEP and the night shelter, but there is a need to consider what is best to commission for next year.

Tony asked if anything is known about the numbers of people who choose not to access the shelter, and if so why they choose not to. Rob confirmed that they did not have those numbers, but noted that there were estimates of 178 rough sleepers, with in the region of 20-30 who do not wish to access a night shelter. Rob noted that it is important to be careful about wording, and that this is attempting to remove the *need* for rough sleeping, as rough sleeping cannot always be eliminated.

Rob noted that there had been discussions about the process for individuals to get a place at the night shelter, which requires them to turn up at an earlier time of day. It has been noted that this is at a time that is particularly lucrative for begging, and so this has been a barrier for some individuals who are not going to this earlier referral process. Rob noted that this process involved criteria, in contrast to SWEP which does not. Rob offered to bring an update to the June meeting of the SAB.

Mia enquired about the Galvanise project that has been running, specifically who this was commissioned by and who might be able to provide an update to board. Rob suggested that Emily Ashmore might provide an update on this.

**Action: Mia to get feedback on Galvanise project for next meeting.**

The Chair asked how the Board could be assured about third-party provision to ensure it is appropriate and people running it are alive to safeguarding. He suggested an accreditation style programme. Whilst this would be a voluntary code of conduct it could support better safeguarding.

**Action: Graham Bartlett to speak with Geoff Raw and Rob Persey.**



### 3.6. Safeguarding Adult Review Sub Group

Sub Group, Chair	Headlines
<p><b>Roland Marden,</b> Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR)</p>	<p>The group is going well. The group has regular monthly meetings; the last meeting was held this afternoon (Monday 5<sup>th</sup> March)</p> <p>The representation has been good, although police representation has been a little inconsistent, but this is expected to improve after a period of role changes.</p> <p>The group's main role is the process of Safeguarding Adult Reviews (SARs). The group monitors the process of initial referral, the review itself, both SARs other types of review, through to monitoring implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>There is work to do on raising awareness of SARs, particularly to encourage referrals. Equally, one of the three referrals this year need not have been referred. Cases need to meet the criteria, of incident that caused either death or serious harm, <i>and</i> where there are concerns around multi-agency working. There is a need to spread awareness and ensure that all understand that cases should meet these two thresholds.</p> <p>Another challenge for the group has been getting timely responses. Some agencies are particularly poor, although most are good. But there is a need to work with particular agencies to get necessary information.</p> <p>Outcomes from discussions around the cases that are being considered will be sent to Board in due course.</p>

The chair noted that concerns about a low volume of referrals was raised at pan-Sussex and Surrey level, and was aware that West Sussex have had a large number of cases referred, particularly in relation to Sussex Healthcare, where Brighton & Hove and East Sussex have not. Surrey have also received only a small number of referrals.

### 3.7. Bedfordshire SAR

Andy noted that SPFT was involved in a SAR that sits under Bedfordshire, which is to be published in March. Andy suggested this therefore ought to be considered by the B&H SAB in some way. Mia confirmed that they and the SAR sub group were aware of the review, had been in contact with Bedfordshire, and were awaiting its publication.



Andy asked whether SARs in East and West Sussex are seen by B&H SAB in anyway. Roland confirmed that a number of reviews from other boards have been picked up, and noted that George Coleby had recently come to the sub group to briefly present the learning from a SAR conducted by East Sussex SAB.

Mia also advised that the three board's business managers meet quarterly and will advise the other boards of any future reviews. David Feakes noted that they were unsure if this was done in West Sussex, but would enquire.

### 3.8. SAR Practice & Learning Event

George informed the board that the three boards were jointly hosting an event next week around SARs, on the 14<sup>th</sup> of March, which will include a presentation by Michael Preston-Shoot and presentations by board managers to discuss recent SARs led by the three bars. There is also a plan to produce a learning briefing to disseminate more widely.

The chair thanked Roland for his update to the board.

## 4. In-depth Review of PASA Subgroup

Postponed in absence of Michelle Jenkins.

## 5. Safeguarding Strategic Self-Assessment Challenge

Papers have been circulated relating to the challenge of BSUH and CCG. Candy fed back to the board that previously, prior to co-commissioning, the CCG sent out an assurance tool to try to start looking at primary care assurance. Since co-commissioning, they have decided to redo this for further assurance. The return rate is 52%, which is fairly high. The chair of the CCG has written to practices that have not provided a return. Cluster leads are also raising this. This was also brought as an item at the QA meeting.

Tony said that Healthwatch is uncertain about the level of reassurance regarding GP practices meeting the fundamental minimum safeguarding standards set by the CCG. A response was given by Candy's predecessor, and the chair asked that they provide periodic reports. Tony expressed concern that these reports have not been received, and that from Healthwatch's point of view they are uncertain that those GP practices that were not meeting the standards are meeting them now. Tony noted that this is tracked by CQC, but stressed that if the board and Healthwatch haven't had that assurance, they are left uncertain.

Allison clarified that the purpose of assurance toolkit Candy referred to, which the CCGs want GP surgeries to sign up to voluntarily, is to get assurances on broader aspects of safeguarding. As noted, 52% have responded.

Tony noted that they have not heard that the practices currently operating are meeting the minimum standards. The group discussed whether it had been agreed that this would be discussed at the QA sub group. The chair noted that this may not be sufficient to reassure that all are at a high level.

The Board were reminded that the Q and A subgroup have the responsibility for overseeing Primary Care safeguarding compliance on behalf of the board with only exception reporting coming to the main meeting

## **6. Budget and Spending**

Mia updated the board briefly on the budget. As mentioned, designated funds for L&D and P&E activities have been requested. The chair proposed that £10,000 be set aside for P&E, particularly for web development, and for £10,000 to go to L&D.

Mia advised the board will be declaring an underspend but warned that this is due to funds not being appropriately aligned from the SAB budget and so was unable to give an exact figure. Going forward for next year, the board will request that £30,000 is set aside for potential SARs. The chair noted that in the event of a particularly large/complex review, a budget can be used very quickly, and although it can be hard to justify underspend to finance, the money is needed as a contingency.

## **7. Performance Data Key Findings**

The full performance data report was circulated last week. The report was presented to the QA sub group in January, covering Q1 & 2, 2017. The data analysis related to safeguarding concerns raised, and included comparison with available national data. This was drawn from NHS data, which is latest available to compare.

George fed back to the board on a number of statistics, most of which saw Brighton & Hove as comparable to the national averages.

### **7.1. Organisational Abuse**

Nationally, the level of organisational abuse recorded is 5%. In Brighton & Hove this is 0.5%. However, this comes with a caveat that the statutory requirements for data mean that some categories which are reported on a voluntary basis are only available for Brighton & Hove. However, 0.5% does seem low. The pattern is also the same in East Sussex. The group discussed some of the possible reasons for that figure, and noted that there is a fine line between quality issues and organisational abuse. Neglect or omission might be recorded, but multiple referrals from one organisation might not be picked up as potential organisational abuse. It was felt that further investigation was needed. This was discussed with Michelle and George has now arranged a meeting with performance and improvement manager to try to drill down into the reasons for this. Any findings/recommendations will go back to the QA sub group.

### **7.2. Repeat Referrals**

The data shows 16 adults with five or more safeguarding enquiries. George has asked for further details to ascertain whether action is being taken to minimise the risk. Going forward, data will be provided twice a year (June & December) and this will be included in the multi-agency data report to QA sub group. For adults with four or more enquiries, a case study type summary will consider; age, gender, ethnicity, support needs, a summary of concerns and actions taken, and measures in place to address risk and current situation.

Andy asked whether it should be 'built in' to processes that if an adult has a certain number of enquiries, a review takes place. Rob asked why the data will focus on adults with four or more enquiries. Rob suggested that while two enquiries could be no cause for concern, 3 or more should also warrant inquiry. Tony agreed that 3 enquiries warranted scrutiny.

### 7.3. Gender

George clarified that statutory reporting covers male/female and does not require non-binary gender data. So there are issues with identifying enquiries relating to adults who do not identify as male or female. George will meet with Michelle to discuss how to capture this data going forward, and the hope is to ensure that we can include data on transgender individuals in reports, even from April. It may be that if more detail on previous cases is required that this can be obtained in an anecdotal way, as numbers are small, but the aim is to obtain in a more systematic way going forward.

### 7.4. Pathways

George noted that the aforementioned repeat referrals are a good example of picking up and feeding back. David Feakes noted that West Sussex have a complete pathway which has been tested for the last 9-10 months. The chair noted that there is a process pathway in quality monitoring groups that feeds into the SAR sub group, but this is not fool proof.

Andy noted that some of SPFT's data has been added to the report, but that there is wider data which could be included.

**Action: Andy Porter to meet with George Coleby before the next report to discuss SPFT data**

## 8. Healthwatch Report on the Impact of PIP and ESA

### 8.1. Context of report

Alan thanked the SAB for the opportunity to bring the Healthwatch report. In addition to raising the report at the SAB, local MPs and local news have been made aware, and hope to take this to Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities and Equality Committee (NICE).

Alan summarised the context around the work. Last year Healthwatch received information from Mind out (local charity supporting LGBTQ), who had concerns about PIP ESA assessments, which look at the impact of long term condition on someone's life. Based on these concerns Healthwatch decided to look further. Together with several agencies, they considered individual cases. Alan noted that they were able to talk with some individuals, but many had concerns that this might impact on their assessment.

It's important to note that this report only relates to those who were able to get an advocate, so there may be many whose situation we are not aware of.

### 8.2. Considerations and Implications

- Particularly vulnerable people, on the fringes of community, isolated, unable to work, may need support.
- Assessors did not appear to be knowledgeable about mental health conditions, nor showed a great deal of sympathy or empathy

- Instances of appointments being cancelled with short notice, even when client is en route. People feel treated as number, invalidated, having to repeatedly provide the same information.
- Examples of back-pay, and restored funds, but impacting on budget and transport in meantime.

### 8.3. Recommendations from the report

- Improved training for assessors.
- Reasonable adjustments are provided.
- Scrutiny of mandatory reconsiderations.

### 8.4. Recommendations to Board

- Endorse the recommendations made in the report.
- Write to government/local MPs raising issues.
- Write to ATOS and Maximus urging them to respond.
- Write to NICE in advance of the next meeting urging them to discuss the issues.
- Healthwatch is aware that Brighton and Hove Council are monitoring the impact of benefit changes on local people, and we suggest this report and its recommendations are included in that wider review.

The chair thanked Alan for updating the board on the report by Healthwatch, noting that it was deeply sobering. The issue had previously been taken to the Health and Wellbeing Board, but that was prior to the publishing of this report.

The chair noted that the recommendations were very clear. The SAB's role centres on ensuring that the system is there to provide support to vulnerable people and to ensure they are not being abused or neglect. The chair suggested that the report does sit within the board's agenda, possibly including some audit work later on, perhaps next year. Certainly keeping an eye on any cases where a SAR may be required, although hopefully this will not be necessary.

Andy noted, regarding the recommendation to write to ATOS and Maximus, whether we should invite ATOS/Maximus to have a discussion.

**Action: Graham Bartlett will write to ATOS/ Maximus in conjunction with Healthwatch as the authors of the report.**

David Feakes expressed agreement with the concerns in the report, and asked whether it was within the Boards remit to write to the recommended people. David suggested that the board endorse the recommendations and write to ATOS/Maximus. Rob agreed with the comments on the report, but expressed concern that, as a representative of Adult Social Care and the Council, the board sign up to anything of a political nature. Rob suggested that the board could agree with the concerns in report, rather than the report's recommendations, or seek a way to support the concerns whilst keeping the recommendations apolitical.

The chair noted that as an independent member of the board, they have some leeway, but would still need to avoid appearing partisan.

Andy suggested endorsing the report by recognising that Healthwatch have produced and published the report and that the SAB has received it. The chair suggested the board could welcome the report. Board members agreed.

**Action: The chair noted and shared the concerns raised and will consider who to liaise with about the safeguarding concerns noted in the presentation.**

**9. Refresh of DVA, SV and VAWG Strategy**

Postponed

**10. AOB**

The chair updated the board that a joint leadership group with LSCB is being trialled. The sub group chairs provide similar updates and discussions as they bring to board. This will allow further challenge and coordination.

**Next Meeting: 3-5pm on 15 June 2018 in the Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall**

**Future meetings**

Day	Date	Time	Location
Monday	25 <sup>th</sup> June	15:00-17:00	Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall
Monday	3 <sup>rd</sup> September	15:00-17:00	Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall
Monday	3 <sup>rd</sup> December	15:00-17:00	Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall
Monday	18 <sup>th</sup> March	15:00-17:00	Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall

**Forward Planned Items**

- Sexual Violence Audit
- Partnership Protocol (MB)
- Trauma Informed Approaches
- Vulnerable Victims of Fraud Pilot
- Allegations Against People In Positions of Trust – Annual Update
- Review of Priority Business Needs For All Boards / Forums In The City – Partnership Protocol
- Cuckooing
- CVS & Safeguarding Standards (GB)
- Galvanise Interview Data (Emily Ashmore)
- Participation & Engagement Strategy