

SAR QA check	
Completed by	
Date completed	
Job role	

Safeguarding Adult Reviews (SARs) quality markers

Supporting dialogue about the principles of good practice

The Merton Safeguarding Adults Board (MSAB), via its SAR Evaluation Group will use these quality markers to review the quality of each review. Covering the whole process, the quality markers provide a consistent and robust approach to SAR quality review and audit. They are based predominately on established principles of effective reviews as well as SAR practice experience and expertise, and ethical considerations.

	Quality Marker	Descriptor	QA/Evidence
Setting up the review			
1	Referral	The case is referred for a SAR consideration with an appropriate rationale and in a timely manner.	
2	Partnership engagement in commissioning a SAR	Sufficient information is gathered, on which, to base a decision about whether to have a SAR and to determine the nature of the SAR that is required and whether it makes the criteria. The rationale for these decisions is clear, defensible and reached in a timely fashion. Reference to Care Act 2014 and Making Safeguarding Personal. There is transparency among the MSAB members about the decision-making process and outcome.	
3	Engaging the relevant people to shape the review	The person/relevant adults/family members/network are told what the SAR is for, how it will work, and the parameters, and are treated with respect. They will inform the Terms of Reference.	
4	Clarity of scope and partnership buy in	The Board is clear and transparent, from the outset, that the purpose of the SAR is organisational learning and improvement and acknowledges any factors that complicate this goal. The scope needs to be clear and clarity around partnership buy in regarding, for example,	

		in the submission of agency information, that all partners are aware they need to sign off on their contribution to the process at Chief Officer level. Whatever the methodology selected, if the criteria are met then there is clarity that the review constitutes a SAR.	
5	Commissioning	The decisions about the commissioning of the SAR take into account a range of relevant factors and are made with input from the MSAB members and in conjunction with the MSAB Chair. The methodology will be proportionate to their presenting circumstances.	
Running the review			
6	Management of the process	The SAR is effectively managed and achieves the requirements of independence and ownership of the findings of the Board. It runs smoothly, is concluded in a timely manner and with available resources.	
7	Parallel processes	Where there are parallel processes, the SAR is managed to avoid duplication of effort, prejudice to criminal trials, unnecessary delay and confusion to all parties. Any multi-borough review requires clarity on who leads and good governance arrangements agreed at the outset.	
8	Assembling information	The SAR gains sufficient information to understand professional practice in the case, its context and relevance today. This includes chronologies from all involved organisations.	

9	Practitioners' involvement	The SAR enables practitioners and managers from relevant agencies and organisations to have a constructive experience of taking part in the review.	
10	Person/Family involvement	The SAR is informed by the person/family knowledge and experience relevant to the period under review and drives the process appropriately (integrating the Making Safeguarding Personal approach). To ensure person/family/network engagement.	
11	Analysis	The SAR analysis is transparent and rigorous. It evaluates and explains professional practice in the case to illuminate routine challenges and constraints to practitioner efforts to safeguard adults.	
Outputs, outcomes & impact from the review			
12	The report	The report has the voice of the person throughout and their voice is heard; it reflects the Care Act 2014. The report clearly identifies the analysis and findings of the SAR that are key to making improvement. Findings reflect the explanations for professional practice that the analysis has evidenced. The Board uses communication channels for cross boundary learning however, there may be boundaries other than geographical.	
13	Improvement action	The Board enables robust discussion by agencies of what action should be taken in response to the SAR report.	

		There is an opportunity for a review of the review process itself to capture anything that went particularly well or any learning for a future review.	
14	Board written response	The Board agrees a written response ready for publication that explains, clearly and succinctly, what action should be taken in response to the SAR report. The SAR is reported in the MSAB annual report.	
15	Publication	The Board considers the impact of publishing the SAR report and response and decides how best this can be achieved.	
16	Learning	There is learning from SARs within, between and outside of MSAB. How will MSAB be assured that the intended learning had taken place including the implementation and evaluation of impact. Consideration to be given to feed any learning into the London/ADASS online repository resource.	