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Tools to support SABs achieve the SAR Quality Markers

# Tool B – decision tool provided by Hampshire Safeguarding Adults Board

|  |
| --- |
|   **Subgroup SAR Decision Tool**  Purpose of a Safeguarding Adults Review  - The SAR process is designed to establish whether there are any lessons to be learnt from the circumstances of a particular case, and about the way in which local professionals and agencies worked together to safeguard the adult at risk.  The SAR brings together and analyses findings from investigations carried out by individual agencies involved in the case, in order to make recommendations for future practice where this is necessary.  The purpose of the SAR is to: • Determine what might have been done differently to prevent the harm or death; • Identify lessons and apply these to future cases to prevent similar harm again;  • Review effectiveness of multi-agency safeguarding arrangements;  • Inform and improve future practice and partnership working;  • Improve practice by acting on learning; and   • Highlight any good practice identified.  SAR decision making -  If the incident triggers a mandatory investigation or review within the organisation concerned (e.g. Serious Incident Requiring Investigation, Critical Incident Review, etc.), this should take place without delay and in line with the organisation’s internal policy requirements. A referral for a SAR should be a considered decision, informed by consideration and evaluation of all relevant information by the professionals involved in the specific case. Information should be sought from a range of sources including referral response forms from agencies and professionals working with the individual, details of any criminal investigation, Serious Incident reports, Coroner processes, internal agency investigations, or industry regulator investigations (NHSE, CQC, Social Work England etc.). The role of the SAR sub-group is not to determine whether an agency/organisation is culpable of organisational abuse or neglect, but to utilise the expertise of those qualified to make that decision when determining whether the SAR criteria is met.  |
| **Case Summary**  |
|     |
| **Mandatory SARs**  | **Y/N**  | **Evidence**  | **Any actions**  |
| 1. **Is there evidence of the adult having care and support needs?** **AND**  | **Guidance** – care and support needs relate to help needed by an adult to manage and remain independent, arising from issues of **learning or physical disability, mental illness or substance misuse.** A care package does not need to be in place (Care Act 2014).  |   |   |   |
| 2. **Is there reasonable cause for concern about how the services have** **worked together to safeguard the adult** **AND**  | **Guidance** – consider if the case has highlighted that **several agencies have not worked together effectively to protect the adult.** If only one sector or one agency’s practice raises concern, then a single agency may be asked to undertake a review of the case.     |   |   |   |
| 3.**If the adult died, do we know or suspect that the** **death resulted** **from abuse or neglect?** (Care Act 2014, section 44, 2) **OR**  | **Guidance** – we need reason to know or suspect a **direct causal link between the death and an instance of abuse or neglect.**  Categories of abuse and neglect: physical abuse, domestic abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse, discriminatory abuse, organisational abuse, neglect and acts of omission, self-neglect and financial abuse.  |   |   |   |
| 4. **If the adult is alive, do we know or suspect that they experienced serious abuse or neglect?** (Section 44, 3)  | **Guidance** - Serious abuse equates to the adult having been likely to have **died but for an intervention** or **having suffered permanent harm** or **reduced capacity of quality of life** as a result of the abuse or neglect.  |   |   |   |
| **Discretionary SARs**  | **Learning focus and strategic reason for commissioning**  |
| **Any other case of an adult with care and support needs** (Section 44, 4)  | **Guidance** - Irrespective of whether the LA has been meeting any of those needs. Allows flexibility for the SAB to undertake learning review activity where they are aware that there are weaknesses (or strengths) in the safeguarding system that need to be better understood.  |   |
| **Recommendations for the SAR methodology:**  | **Comments and ideas**  |
| Do we already have knowledge or understanding of how our system is functioning in this area?  |   |
| Are there any conflicts of interest to consider?   |   |
| What should the TOR focus on?   |   |
| What reviewing activity will be proportionate and effective for producing learning?  |   |
| Subgroup recommendation  |   |
| Date of recommendation  |   |
| Chair Decision   |   |
| Date of decision  |   |
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