

Safeguarding Adult Review Quality Markers checklist

Supporting dialogue about the principles of good practice

SAR Quality Markers are a tool to support people involved in commissioning, conducting and quality assuring SARs to know what good looks like. Covering the whole process, they provide a consistent and robust approach to SARs. The Quality Markers are based predominantly on established principles of effective reviews / investigation as well as experience, expertise, and ethical considerations.

The SAR Quality Markers assume the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal, as well as the Six Principles of Safeguarding that underpin all adult safeguarding work (Empowerment; Prevention; Proportionate; Protection; Partnership; Accountable). These principles therefore permeate the Quality Markers explicitly and implicitly.

The SAR Quality Markers are based on the Serious Case Review Quality Markers developed for learning from children's safeguarding cases¹ and adapted for adult safeguarding policy and practice.²

We encourage people to use them in conjunction with the SAR Library cover sheet, and the four domain categorisation scheme for systems findings.

How they help

The SAR Quality Markers are intended to support commissioners and lead reviewers to commission and conduct high quality reviews. They capture principles of good practice and pose questions to help commissioners and reviewers consider how they might best achieve them. SCRs are a complex field of activity where simple rules rarely apply, so judgement is often needed. The Quality Markers are therefore designed to stimulate discussion and support informed judgements. They are not a 'how to' handbook because there are a variety of ways in which they can be achieved. The quality markers do not presume or promote any particular model or approach for how to achieve them. They support variety, innovation and proportionality in approaches to case reviews.

¹ See www.scie.org.uk/lipp

² We have drawn on Camden Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board's Safeguarding Adults Review Framework in the adaptation process. <https://tinyurl.com/yys7u5mb>

How they can be used

The SAR Quality Markers can be used in a number of different ways and at different times during a single SAR.

When	Which Quality Markers	For what purpose
At the beginning	All	To create clarity and transparency of what is being commissioned
At the beginning	All	To support practical planning and preparation
Progressively over the course of the review	individual markers as appropriate	To manage and quality assure the process
At the end	All	To structure reflection retrospectively on the review and identify improvements for future SARs

The markers should not be treated as a process map because while the three clusters in which they are structured are broadly sequential, the components within them are not.

This document

In the full reference document (forthcoming), each Quality Markers is presented using the following structure:

1. **Quality statement** – a summary description of the Quality Marker
2. **Rationale** – further explanation of the marker and why it is important and necessary
3. **How might you know if you are meeting this QM?** – questions to consider for self-assessment
4. **Knowledge base** – any research or practice evidence underpinning to the marker
5. **Equality & diversity** – any specific equality and diversity issues that are important to consider
6. **Link to statutory guidance & inspection criteria** – any relevant regulations, statutory guidance and national minimum standards
7. **Tackling some common obstacles** – These have been identified by the Lead Reviewers and LSCBs during the LIPP project and can be added to over time.

This document presents a 'check list' version' presenting (1) ad (3) from the structure above. The Quality Statement is followed by a list of questions to help people consider how they will know if they are on track to meet the marker. The questions have been broken down to reflect different roles and functions.

Roles and functions

The SAR process and roles are arranged in a variety of different ways, and in different locations. In order to present the Quality Markers in a way that does not preference some arrangements over others, we have attempted to distinguish functions. The table below distinguishes seven different functions related to SARs. We give an indication of the possible role with responsibilities for that function, but there will be other ways that the functions are accomplished.

This breakdown of functions is used in the Quality Markers checklist version that follows. The checklist version contains the quality statement for each marker, and a set of questions to help people know if they are meeting the Quality Marker. We have differentiated the questions per function, and colour coded them accordingly. The aim is to allow people in different roles to readily identify the questions relevant to them.

SAR roles and functions		
No.	Generic SAR function	Possible role
1	Who is ultimately accountable? Including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decision to commission a SAR, • sign-off of the SAR • providing transparency and accountability via the SAB response and annual report • seeking assurance of effective responses by agencies and/or Board 	SAB Chair
2	Who has delegated responsibility for managing the SAR? Including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initial information gathering, • recommendation to proceed or not, • scoping the review, • identifying and commissioning reviewers, • agreeing and publishing the Terms of Reference • agreeing the methodology / model to be used • providing quality assurance and challenge 	SAB SAR sub-group
3	Who provides practical day-to-day support for the review? Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing administrative support, • project management support, • means of access to data, • links with staff, • liaison with the Chair 	SAB Business manager or Adult Safeguarding Lead

4	<p>Who conducts the review and provides independent leadership? <i>This may be the same or different roles depending on whether Panel and Panel Chair is used</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing independent challenge • ensuring individuals and families are included • ensuring the review is informed through engagement with front line practitioners and managers • ensuring an accessible report is produced • ensuring reviews are conducted in a timely manner. 	Reviewer(s) Independent Panel Chair
6	<p>Who does follow-up to a review? Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decide on publication • deciding/leading on immediate action in response to findings • providing evidence of responses 	SAB Board members and/or SAB SAR sub- group
7	<p>Who monitors the longer term sustainability of changes and evaluates what difference, if any, has been made?</p>	SAB QA sub- group

Overview (links to be added)

Setting up the Review		
1	Referral	The case is referred for a Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) consideration with an appropriate rationale and in a timely manner
2	Decision making- what kind of SAR, if any	Factors related to the case AND the local context inform decision making about whether a SAR is needed and initial thinking about its size/scope.
3	Informing the person, their family or other important network	The person, relevant family members, and any other important personal network are told what the Safeguarding Adult Review is for, how it will work and the parameters, how they can be involved, and are treated with respect.
4	Clarity of purpose	The Safeguarding Adult Board (SAB) is clear and transparent, from the outset, that the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is a statutory process, with the purpose of organizational learning and improvement, and acknowledges any factors that complicate this goal
5	Commissioning	Decisions about the precise form and focus of the SAR to be commissioned take into account a range of case and contextual factors in order to make them proportionate to the potential for learning and improvement. Decisions are made with input from the SAB Chair and members and in conjunction with the reviewers.

Running the Review		
6	<u>Governance</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review achieves the requirement for independence AND ownership of the findings by the Safeguarding Adults Board and member agencies
7	<u>Management of the process</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is effectively managed. It runs smoothly, is concluded in a timely manner and within available resources.
8	<u>Parallel processes</u>	Where there are parallel processes the SAR is managed to avoid as much as possible duplication of effort, prejudice to criminal trials, unnecessary delay and confusion to all parties, including staff, the person and relevant family members.
9	<u>Assembling information</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) gains sufficient information to underpin an analysis of the case in the context of normal working practices and relevant organisational factors.
10	<u>Practitioners Involvement</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) enables practitioners and managers to have a constructive experience of taking part in the review.
11	<u>Involvement of the person and relevant family members and network</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is informed by the person and relevant family and network members' knowledge and experiences regarding the period under review. They are involved in aspects of the SAR as determined at the outset of the review.
12	<u>Analysis</u>	The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) analysis is transparent and rigorous. It evaluates and explains professional practice in the case, shedding light on the routine challenges and constraints to practitioner efforts to safeguard adults.
Outputs, Outcomes and Impact from the review		
13	<u>The Report</u>	The report identifies clearly and succinctly the analysis and findings of the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR), while keeping details of the person to a minimum. Findings reflect the causal factors and systems learning the analysis has evidenced.
14	<u>Improvement Action</u>	The Board enables robust, informed discussion and agreement by agencies of what action should be taken in response to the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) report.
15	<u>Board Written Response</u>	
16	<u>Publication</u>	
17	<u>Implementation and Evaluation</u>	

Setting up the Review

Quality Marker 1: Referral

Quality statement: The case is referred for a Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) consideration with an appropriate rationale and in a timely manner

Those with delegated responsibility for managing SARs

- Does the referral state explicitly which of the statutory criteria the case has met
- AND/OR how the case features practice issues to be proactively reviewed before abuse or neglect has occurred, in order to pre-emptively tackle them
- AND/OR specify clearly any other reason why a SAR is needed?
- Does the information provided evidence the rationale given for why the case is being referred?
- Are explanations provided for any delays in the referral?

Quality Marker 2: Decision making- what kind of SAR, if any

Quality statement: Factors related to the case AND the local context inform decision making about whether a SAR is needed and initial thinking about its size and scope.

Those ultimately accountable

- Is the rationale for the decision clear and defensible, paying close attention to the Care Act 2014 and Making Safeguarding Personal principles?
- Have SAB member agencies had the opportunity to contribute to decision making process?
- Are explanations provided for any delays in decision making?
- Is there transparency for SAB members on the decision making process and outcomes?
- Has independent challenge to decision making been considered?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Has meaningful multi-agency discussion informed the recommendation to the Chair?
- Has there been appropriate challenge about how an adult with care and support needs is defined?
- Have discussions about the abuse and neglect suffered by the person, included self-neglect?
- Have discussions about any cause for concern about the quality of safeguarding practice, overtly referenced the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal?
- Have discussions about any cause for concern about working together to safeguard, included consideration of all parts of the system - provider and commissioner, direct practice and oversight?
- Has available data from existing audits and reviews been used to identify outstanding learning needs locally, as well as what is already known and does not need to be re-learnt?
- Have the benefits of proactively learning from practice issues in the case, been considered in tandem with identifying whether any of the statutory criteria have been met?
- Has the recommendation about whether a SAR is needed given an indication of the appropriate size/scope given the case and context?
- Are you clear whether the s42 is completed (where relevant) ?
- Have other review pathways been considered and dicounted, e.g. DHR?
- Have other parallel processes been identified?

Those providing practical support

- Have all key agencies provided information about their involvement?
- Have neighbouring SABs been asked for information, if the person lived outside the SAB area?
- Has single and multi-agency intelligence from other quality assurance and feedback sources, that is relevant to practice in this case, been gathered .e.g audits/benchmarking, complaints and previous SARs?

Quality Marker 3: Informing the person, their family or other important network

Quality statement: The person, relevant family members, friends and network are told what the Safeguarding Adult Review is for, how it will work and the parameters, and are treated with respect.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you noted or praised prompt, clear, accessible, compassionate and respectful correspondence with the person and relevant family or network ?
- Is there overt encouragement and support for honest communication to address legitimate questions posed by the person, relevant family members, or other important network?

Those providing practical support

- Has the person, relevant family members, friends and network of the SAR been informed at the earliest stage possible?
- Have the purpose, process and parameters of the SAR been communicated in the most appropriate setting or method to ensure that these can be understood and convey respect to those involved?
- Are opportunities being offered to discuss any queries or clarifications about the SAR purpose, and do they give them a realistic chance of doing so?

Quality Marker 4: Clarity of purpose

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Board (SAB) is clear and transparent, from the outset, that the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is a statutory process, with the purpose of organizational learning and improvement, and acknowledges any factors that complicate this goal

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you demonstrated strong overt leadership about the purpose of the SAR being learning and organisational improvement?
- Have you demonstrated clear expectations that people use the escalation pathway to you, if there is any non-engagement by providers, commissioners or other agencies involved in the SAR?
- Have any complicating factors been honestly acknowledged?
 - While the SAR is not designed to apportion blame, it can provide information that feeds into individual or corporate discipline processes, or clarify the grounds for needing to initiate them. As a result, claims that the purpose of the SAR is learning can ring hollow for those involved.
- Has consultation with legal departments been sought if appropriate?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Have you communicated with all the necessary parties (SAB members, involved agency/provider/commissioner leaders, as well as practitioners), a positive message about the purpose of the SAR being learning and improvement of social and organisational conditions to
 - enhance partnership working,
 - improve outcomes for adults and families,
 - and prevent similar abuse and neglect in the future?
- Is what you are saying underpinned by an agreed organisational accident or incident causation model to aid clarity and provide suitable vocabulary?
- Has meaningful multi-agency discussion allowed for all potential tensions and contradictions to be recognised and managed as best as possible?

Those providing practical support

- Is all standard correspondence clear, that when the SAB decides to arrange a SAR, it is a statutory process both when the case meets the statutory criteria for a SAR, and when the SAB has made the decision to use its power to arrange a SAR for other reasons?

Quality Marker 5: Commissioning

Quality statement: Decisions about the precise form and focus of the SAR to be commissioned take into account a range of case and contextual factors in order to make the SAR proportionate to the potential for learning and improvement. Decisions are made with input from the SAB Chair and members and in conjunction with the reviewers.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Has the right range of information been assessed, and the necessary expertise been brought to bear in deciding the precise form and focus of the SAR?
- Is the form and focus of the SAR best suited to maximising learning and improvement to the benefit of adults and their families?
- Does the judgement make meaningful reference to the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal and the six core safeguarding principles?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Have discussions about the precise form and focus of SAR to be commissioned taken into account the following:
 - Does the case indicate that there are system conditions leading to poor safeguarding practice or communication?
 - Does intelligence from other quality assurance and feedback sources (e.g. audits/complaints) suggest the kind of practice issues in the case and/or their systemic causes are new, complex or repetitive?
 - How do the issues and the system conditions indicated in this case, relate to SAB strategic plan as well as current and future priorities?
 - Has anything similar has happened before? If a SAR was commissioned, has learning from it been implemented or and is there likely to be new learning to be identified?
 - Is there evidence of sufficient good practice to indicate the potential to explore the supportive system conditions and share learning across the partnership?
 - What is the capacity of practitioners to be openly involved at this time?
 - What is the capacity of the SAB and member agencies at this time to carry out the review and to respond meaningfully to the review outputs?
 - Is there is media interest or serious public concern?
 - What is the availability of reviewers who are sufficiently experienced or qualified to undertake the review?

Those providing practical support

- Does the process allow the reviewer(s) appointed to influence the scope, nature and approach for the review?
- Do the scoping document or terms of reference clearly explain the rationale for decisions about proportionality, with reference to case and contextual features as relevant?
- Is the scoping process set up to confirm requirements about the breadth and depth of the investigation, any specific areas of focus, the method or approach for assembling and analysing information, the knowledge and skills needed of reviewers and the agencies to be involved?

Running the Review

Quality Marker 6: Governance

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review achieves the requirement for independence AND ownership of the findings by the Safeguarding Adults Board and member agencies

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you demonstrated strong, overt leadership about the significant degree of objectivity combined with sufficient understanding of context and organisational arrangements that is required for rigorous SAR analysis?
- Have you demonstrated clear expectations that when a consensus view can not be reached about the analysis and findings/recommendations, the differing positions will be articulated in the final report?
- In a review involving other SABs, have you achieved clarity and agreement from the outset about who leads the SAR (e.g. area for whom most learning is likely to emerge) and governance arrangements?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Are senior managers being kept up to date in order to cultivate ownership of the conclusions, and avoid any surprises about the learning being identified?
- Are there mechanisms in place to allow challenge to the information and analysis of the review, so that the findings/ recommendations have been thoroughly considered before the report is finalized and taken to the SAB?
- Have quality assurance mechanisms managed the tension in a fair and balanced way, between the independence of reviewer(s) AND local involvement, and avoided agency defensiveness and inappropriate pressure?

Those providing practical support

- Have governance arrangements and who is responsible for what been set out clearly from the start?
- Has the system for quality assurance of the process and sign-off of the report been set out clearly from the start?

Quality Marker 7: Management of the process

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is effectively managed. It runs smoothly, is concluded in a timely manner and within available resources.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you made yourself available to assist in addressing any challenges that arise during the SAR?
- Does the provision of administrative support and reviewer capacity match expectations about the quality and timing of the SAR outputs?
- Is there enough slack in the plan to allow for legitimate delays?

Those with delegated responsibility

- If there have been any changes in key personnel, has there been a reflection on any impact on the SAR?

Those providing practical support

- Is there a clear plan with allocated roles and responsibilities for the transmission of information?
- Are mechanisms in place to inform the SAB Chair of any delays and reasons for them?

Quality Marker 8: Parallel processes

Quality statement: Where there are parallel processes the SAR is managed to avoid as much as possible duplication of effort, prejudice to criminal trials, unnecessary delay and confusion to all parties, including staff, the person and relevant family members.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you made and supported efforts to communicate and cooperate with all relevant processes, to achieve the best fit for the circumstances?
- Is it clear who owns documents generated through the SAR so that the relevant body can make judgements on their disclosure?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Has early contact been made with all those managing all relevant processes, to achieve the best fit between them for the circumstances?
- Have you considered any parallel processes in the terms of reference/scoping document?
- Has there been early discussion with the police/ Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and/or coroner and the SAR and where necessary a face-to-face meeting?

Those providing practical support

- Are notes of interviews and meetings and copies of reports that might be considered relevant to criminal proceedings retained?
- Is an index being maintained, of material generated by the SAR which might be disclosable?

Quality Marker 9: Assembling information

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) gains sufficient information to underpin an analysis of the case in the context of normal working practices and relevant organisational factors.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you made it clear whether or not you expect the SAR to
 - establish whether any problematic practice identified in the case was more widespread at the time and/or
 - assess the current relevance of past practice issues identified in the case being reviewed?
- Does the structure of the SAR enable direct input by practitioners and managers (e.g. interviews, group meetings) as well as the person, and relevant family members or other important network members ?
- Have you demonstrated clear expectations that people use the escalation pathway to you, if there is any non-engagement by participating organisations?

Those conducting the review

- Has discussion about what information is needed and what level of detail is required, been informed by the decision making about the form and focus of the SAR commissioned?
- Does the type of information identified cover:
 - The facts of what happened in the case – who did what, and when?
 - The rationale for decision-making, action and inaction – why did people do what they did, what were they trying to achieve, what was influencing their practice?
 - How normal was their behaviour – is this the way things are usually done?
 - (where required) the current relevance of past practice issues and their systemic conditions?
- Have all sources of relevant information been considered?
- Is there sufficient clarity about the purpose of any plans to gather practitioners together, including the kind of information they are able to provide?
- In setting up practitioner events has the need for heightened group work skills to minimise the risk of harm occurring been taken into account?
- Is everyone clear about what kind of information they are looking for from different sources, be it people or paperwork?

Those providing practical support

- Has guidance been provided to participating organisations about what information is requested at the beginning of the review, and the level of detail required, and why?
- Has access been arranged for the reviewer(s) and relevant others to all the different sources of information deemed relevant?

Quality Marker 10: Practitioners Involvement

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) enables practitioners and managers to have a constructive experience of taking part in the review.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you communicated directly with practitioners invited to participate in the SAR, stressing the importance of their input, acknowledging their possible fears, clarifying the support that will be available, and the intention of creating a constructive and valuable experience for them?
- Are you planning to attend any of the practitioner events in whole or part, to reiterate your messages about the value of an open learning culture and the importance of their being able to 'tell it like it is'?
- Have you written to thank them personally once the SAR is completed?

Those conducting the review

- Is the purpose of any interviews, conversations, meetings or events that involve practitioners clear?
- Are participants being provided with clear information about the SAR and their role in it?
- Are agencies encouraging their staff to contribute their experiences and views to the SAR?
- Does the planning for the SAR include consideration of how to support individual practitioners? For example, those who played key roles in the case, or who are not part of core Safeguarding Adult Board (SAB) agencies, or are from agencies rarely involved in SARs.
- Are practitioners being provided with adequate protections within their own organisations?
- Are practitioners being provided with adequate support and protection in the planning of any group events?
- Has there been adequate consideration of whether there are any implications of the review for people now in senior management positions and if anything needs to be done to support them?

Those providing practical support

- Are participants being provided with clear information about the SAR and their role in it?
- Are there plans to gather feedback from participants about their involvement?

Quality Marker 11: Involvement of the person and relevant family members and network

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) is informed by the person and relevant family and network members' knowledge and experiences relevant to the period under review.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Has clear leadership been provided about the priority of enabling the person and relevant family and network members to contribute to the SAR?
- Is there clarity about why family members are being involved?
- If family members are not involved, are the reasons for non-involvement reasonable and are they documented?

Those conducting the review

- Does the person have support to be involved in the review, i.e. do they need statutory advocacy or any other form of support?
- Has there been discussion about which family members are involved and why?
- Is it agreed how family members are being supported to be involved?
- Is there clarity about how the person and/or their family and networks will be able to influence the focus of the review?
- Is there clarity about what the family is going to be asked?
- Has there been discussion about how the analysis will be informed by family members' knowledge and experiences relevant to the period under review?
- Has there been discussion about how families are to be represented in the final report?
- Are there mechanisms to allow the person and/or their family to feedback on the report before it is completed?
- Where there are criminal investigations and family members are witnesses or suspects, has the police senior investigating officer been enabled to understand the focus and scope of the review to help discussions about when and how family members can be involved?

Those providing practical support

- Has it been agreed who is best positioned to communicate with the family and how this will be facilitated?

Quality Marker 12: Analysis

Quality statement: The Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) analysis is transparent and rigorous. It evaluates and explains professional practice in the case, shedding light on routine challenges and constraints to practitioner efforts to safeguard adults.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Are you championing the practical value of analysis that identifies what has led to and sustained the kind of practice problems or good practice that the case reveals?
- Are you building expectation at Board level of an analysis that seeks out causal factors and systems learning?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Does the assessment of practice in the case reflect the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal and the six core adult safeguarding principles?
- Is the research evidence about what constitutes good practice, being used in the analysis, up to date and accurate?
- Is it clear what specific techniques have been used to minimise the bias of hindsight and outcome knowledge on the analysis?
- Does the presentation of the analysis show the working-out process adequately, allowing the interpretation to be critiqued and counter evidence to be brought to bear?
- Where reference is made to practice beyond the case, either at the time of the case or in the present, is it clear where the knowledge about the wider safeguarding system has come from?
- Does the analysis show clearly how the conclusions relate to the individual case as well as why they are relevant to wider safeguarding practice?
- Does the lead reviewer(s) access supervision or peer challenge to support the quality of analysis undertaken?

Those conducting the review

- Have the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal and the six core safeguarding principles underpinned your evaluation of safeguarding practice in the case?
- Has your analysis gone beyond commenting on compliance with relevant procedures, to provide explanations of professional behaviour that call on a range of cultural and organisational factors?
- Has your analysis draw attention to what professional activity in the case reveals about how service delivery worked at the time, or is working more generally and routinely?

Outputs, Outcomes and Impact from the review

Quality Marker 13: The Report

Quality statement: The report identifies clearly and succinctly the analysis and findings of the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR), while keeping details of the person to a minimum. Findings reflect the causal factors and systems learning the analysis has evidenced.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Has the report achieved the agreed commissioning specification?
- Does it provide insights into factors that increase the risk that people will not be effectively safeguarded?
- Does it illuminate conditions that are effective in enabling good safeguarding practice?
- Can you readily use it to inform work to enhance partnership working, improving outcomes for adults and families and preventing similar abuse and neglect in the future?

Those with delegated responsibility

- Does the report get beyond description and foreground deeper analysis about social and organisational conditions that help or hinder effective, personalised safeguarding?
- Does the amount of information provided in the report satisfy the need for privacy of the adult, relevant family members and individual staff while providing sufficient information to make accessible the SAR analysis, in order that it can support necessary improvement work?
- Does the report contain findings and/or recommendations that reflect the areas deemed priority for improvement?
- Is there transparency in how conclusions have been reached?
- Does the report adequately manage accessibility and explaining complex professional and organisational issues?
- Is the tone and choice of words appropriate to the review?
- Does the structure of the report make it straightforward to identify relevant analysis and findings and coding them for the national SARs Library?

Those conducting the review

- Are you focused on producing a report that is succinct, accessible and useful?
- Have you included demographic detail about the person and a brief description of the harm and consequences, whilst avoiding detailed description of events. Have you focused on details relevant to the learning?
- Have you captured learning for the services and partnerships involved, that focuses on causal factors and system conditions that explain how professionals engaged with and responded to the person, relevant family, and network?
- Have you avoided over-simplifying complex problems, but presented complex issues as straightforwardly as possible?
- Have you put yourself in the shoes of the person and/or relevant family members reading the report?

Those providing practical support

- Has editorial support been arranged?
- Is legal advice necessary to inform decisions about publication?
- Have you reminded people to cross-reference the report with the commissioning specification?
- If the person and/or family have the opportunity to comment on the report, what arrangements need to be made?

Quality Marker 14: Improvement Action

Quality statement: The Board enables robust, informed discussion and agreement by agencies of what action should be taken in response to the Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) report.

Those with ultimate accountability

- Have you provided clear leadership about the need for an open and mutually challenging discussion about what is said in the report about the effectiveness of the safeguarding system and its component parts and what needs to be done to improve outcomes for adults and families?
- Have you planned, with those who conducted the review, how to structure and run discussions about the report findings, and relative roles in facilitating this discussion?
- Have you held preparatory discussions with relevant partner organisations to minimise defensiveness in wider discussions?
- Are there implications for the SAB strategic plan?

Those who decide the follow-up to a review

- Have you put each finding in the bigger picture of activity, strategic plans and intelligence held by agencies, to help decide priorities?
- Have you considered who is best placed to decide what an effective response to the finding would be, and how to engage them?
- Have you identified which individuals or forums have it within their gift to tackle the systems findings raised?
- Have you distinguished causal factors and conditions that are relatively straightforward to address, from those more complex and/or difficult?
- Have you considered which findings may NOT be best addressed locally and instead be taken to national, regional or other forums for discussion about how best to address them?
- Are you using a model for change management or 'organisational development' to help think wider than changes to procedures and training for staff?

Those providing practical support

- Can you help with making accessible intelligence from other sources, that is relevant to findings in the report?
- Has a clear, considered process been planned, to avoid a last minute rush to agree responses?

Quality Markers 15-17 will be developed further during the SAR Regional Champion programme.

Quality Marker 15: Board Written Response

Quality statement:

Those with ultimate accountability

Those with delegated responsibility

Those conducting the review

Those providing practical support

- Has the process

Quality Marker 16: Publication

Quality statement:

Those with ultimate accountability

Those with delegated responsibility

Those conducting the review

Those providing practical support

Quality Marker 17: Implementation and Evaluation

Quality statement:

Those with ultimate accountability

Those with delegated responsibility

Those conducting the review

Those providing practical support

- Has the process

First published in Great Britain in June 2018

by the Social Care Institute for Excellence

© SCIE & RiPfa 2018

All rights reserved

Written by Sheila Fish