

Analysis of safeguarding adult reviews: April 2017 – March 2019: Brent Adult Safeguarding Conference Week

The first national analysis of SARs

- Commissioned by CHIP - the sector-led Care and Health Improvement Programme co-produced and delivered by the Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services in England
- Authors: Michael Preston-Shoot, Suzy Braye, Oli Preston, Karen Allen and Kate Spreadbury
- Project Oversight: Adi Cooper, CHIP

Voices of Experts by Experience

- When asked what he needed, Terence replied: “Some love, man. Family environment. Support.” He wanted to be part of something real, part of real society and not just “the system”. (reported in a thematic review on people who sleep rough, Worcestershire SAB (2020)).
- From the Leeds Thematic Review (2020):
 - “I lost everything all at once: my job, my family, my hope.”
 - “Without [this help in Leeds], I’d already be dead. I’ve no doubts about that. If the elements hadn’t got me, I would have got me. Sometimes I have rolled up to this van in a real mess and they have offered help and support and got my head straight.”
- Ms I’s partner commented (Tower Hamlets SAB (2020) Thematic Review):
 - At times “she could not help herself” because of the feelings that were resurfacing; access to non-judgemental services was vital and helpful, and that support is especially important when individuals are striving to be alcohol and drug free. It was during these times that stress, anxiety and painful feelings could “bubble up”, prompting a return to substance misuse to suppress what it was very hard to acknowledge and work through.

Helen's Message

- “What hope do I have to ever recover or feel better when this keeps happening? I encourage anyone who truly cares to come and spend a day with me to see what it's like to be helpless, when days feel like weeks, weeks feel like months.” (reported in a Luton SAB SAR).

Learning from the voices of lived experience

- Seeing the whole person in their situation
- A trauma-informed, whole system response to the person in context
- The problem is not the problem; it is the solution that is the problem. Tackling symptoms is less effective than addressing causes.

“Attempting to change someone’s behaviour without understanding its survival function will prove unsuccessful. The problem is a way of coping, however dysfunctional it may appear. Too often we are responding to symptoms and not causes. Put another way, individuals experiencing multiple exclusion homelessness are in a “life threatening double bind, driven addictively to avoid suffering through ways that only deepen their suffering.”

Methodology

Reviews
completed
1/4/17-
31/3/19

- Request to all SABs
- National repository
- Websites trawl
- 129/132 (98%)

The
sample

- 231 SARs
- Data collection tool completed for each SAR: structured & unstructured data


Analysis

- Quantitative analysis
- Qualitative analysis
- Thematic framework


The analytic framework: five domains



Two key sets of findings



1. SAB governance: Key questions for SABs & SAR authors



2. The 231 cases: demographics


- 263 subjects, 80% deceased
- 129 male, 109 female
- Average age 55
- Little information about sexuality or ethnicity
- Range of health concerns and complex interplay
 - Physical comorbidities
 - Physical and mental ill-health + significant life events
- Living situations:
 - Living alone (36%)
 - Group care (33%)
- Location of abuse
 - Own home (48%)
 - Residential/nursing care (18%)
- Perpetrator
 - Self (48%)
 - Care providers (30%)
- Concluded prosecution = 16.2%

The 231 cases: types of abuse/neglect


- Modern slavery/sexual abuse/sexual exploitation more prevalent in younger subjects
- Neglect/abuse by omission more prevalent in older subjects
- Psychological/emotional abuse and modern slavery more prevalent for females
- Financial, physical abuse and self-neglect are (slightly) more prevalent for males
- No correlation with types of abuse/neglect subject to s.42 enquiries
- Some types of abuse/neglect positively correlated with each other (e.g. domestic, financial, physical and emotional abuse); some appear unrelated to other types (self-neglect, neglect/omission)

Type of abuse/neglect	Reviews n	%
Self-neglect	104	45.02%
Neglect/omission	85	36.80%
Physical abuse	45	19.48%
Organisational abuse	33	14.29%
Financial abuse	30	12.99%
Domestic abuse	22	9.52%
Psychological abuse	19	8.23%
Sexual abuse	12	5.19%
Sexual exploitation	5	2.16%
Modern slavery	2	0.87%
Discriminatory abuse	2	0.87%
Other	11	4.76%
Not specified	29	12.55%


Good practice across the domains



Poor practice across the domains



Recommendations across the domains



Direct practice – best practice (self-neglect)

Person-centred,
relationship-
based practice

Professional
curiosity
(history)

Assessment of
care & support,
and mental
health

Transitions –
opportunities
not cliff edges

Assessment &
review of risk
and capacity

Family
involvement
(think family)

Availability of
specialist advice

Legal literacy

Balancing
autonomy with a
duty of care

Inter-organisational environment – best practice (self-neglect)

Guidance on
balancing
autonomy with a
duty of care

Information-
sharing &
communication

Working together
on complex,
stuck and stalled
cases

Use of multi-
agency meetings
and safeguarding
enquiries

Clear roles and
responsibilities
(lead agencies
and key workers)

Shared record-
keeping

Organisational environment – best practice (self-neglect)

Development, dissemination & review of guidance

Clarifying management responsibilities and oversight

Staffing, supervision, support & training

Recording standards

Commissioning & contract monitoring

Culture of openness, challenge and escalation

SAB governance – best practice (self-neglect)

Audit & quality
assurance of what
good looks like

Multi-agency training

Review of
management of
SARs

Workplace as well as
workforce
development

Continual review of
outcome of
recommendations

Use of SARs to
inform policy
development,
practice audits and
training

Examples of specific issues in the 231 cases

- 57 cases involve alcohol-dependence issues (25%)
- 25 reviews involving homelessness (11%)
- 35 cases involving skin integrity (15%)
- 34 cases involving diabetes (15%)
- 161 cases involving mental health (70%)
- Advocacy referred to in 64 SARs (28%)
- Focus on “think family” in 12 SARs (5%)

Alcohol-related SARs

- 57 cases (25%) where the principal focus was on a person with alcohol-related concerns
- Correlations with self-neglect and/or homelessness
- Examples of fire deaths involving alcohol abuse
- Impact of loss and trauma
- Additional 5 cases where someone in the person's environment was alcohol-dependent
- Highlights the importance of thinking family (domestic abuse, impact on children, understanding family and relational dynamics)
- One case of a paid carer being alcohol-dependent

Good practice in alcohol-related reviews

- Thorough and robust care and support, risk and/or mental capacity assessments
- Routine monitoring of, and treatment for, physical health issues
- Liaison with drug and alcohol teams
- Information-sharing

Practice shortfalls in alcohol-related reviews

Direct practice

- Superficial or missed assessments (impact of alcohol on capacity)
- Focus on single issues rather than holistic (risk) assessment
- Lack of think family approach
- Lack of curiosity (History)
- Reliance on self-report
- Labelling and prejudice, assumptions about life-style choice
- Alcohol abuse not seen as self-neglect

Partnership work

- Mental health and drug and alcohol services not working together
- Inflexible thresholds and referral bouncing
- Law seen as complex (mental capacity and alcohol-dependence; mental health and alcohol-dependence)
- Absence of safeguarding referrals

Service response

- Loss of services
- Lack of services (mental health support; supported accommodation; outreach)
- Lack of policies and protocols to guide staff
- Need for training
- Need for more robust, humane and flexible approach

Findings on multiple exclusion homelessness

- 14 references to good practice
 - Rapport building, expression of humanity, provision of care and support and emergency accommodation, health services outreach, colocation of practitioners, clear referrals
- 42 references to practice shortfalls
 - Delayed or missing risk, mental health and mental capacity assessments, unclear referral pathways, discharges to no fixed abode, lack of use of available legal rules, absence of consideration of vulnerability
- 18 recommendations
 - Wrap-around support (health and care and support as well as housing), coordination of response, legal literacy, commissioning for health and social care as well as housing, governance oversight

Findings on skin integrity

Good practice

- Good communication, for example between GPs and DNs/TVNs
- Use of adult safeguarding procedures
- Quality of care and advice given
- Support for care home staff

Practice shortfalls

- Failure to escalate concerns about worsening conditions
- Poor recording of assessments, visits and plans
- Lack of training for care home staff
- Deficits in (risk) assessments and care plans
- Delays in following up hospital discharge
- Frequency of visits
- Lack of supervisory oversight

Findings on diabetic care

Good practice

- Included in a holistic assessment of physical and mental health
- Involvement of dieticians
- Availability of policies and guidance
- Thorough assessments and care plans

Practice shortfalls

- Absence of or failure to review care plans
- Lack of response to non-compliance
- Poor focus on diet
- Gaps in staff knowledge, for example in care homes
- Lack of communication between practitioners
- Failure to consider impact on self-care and mental capacity

Findings on mental health


Good practice

- Timely and thorough assessments
- Understanding and use of law
- Referral practice
- Effective collaboration and communication
- Use of adult safeguarding
- Assertive outreach and follow-up

Practice shortfalls

- Failure to differentiate between mental health and MHA 1983 assessments
- Poor (risk) assessments and reviews
- Failure to think family and assess dynamics
- Lack of outreach
- Case bouncing/revolving door
- Referral pathways into mental health – who can refer?
- Lack of secondary mental health services for people not in immediate crisis
- Lack of understanding of MHA 1983
- Failure to use safeguarding procedures
- CPA guidance not followed
- Parity of esteem, for example mental health overshadowing physical health concerns

1. Advocacy in the SAR process: key questions for SABs & SAR authors



Findings and recommendations: advocacy

Do practitioners and commissioners give sufficient attention to advocacy? Is SAB oversight of advocacy sufficient?

Notable findings on advocacy

Advocacy not considered - omissions

Good advocate practice recorded

Provided – but sometimes very late

Waiting list – adequacy of provision

Cultural barriers to engaging advocates

Lack of understanding of role of advocates

Individuals not engaging with advocates

Use of family and/or staff as advocates

Recommendations about advocacy

Ensure advocacy considered

Involve advocates

Services to review practice of engaging with advocates

Services to review commissioning

SABs to audit provision and practice for assurance

SABs to develop guidance for staff

Training

National governance of advocacy

Thinking Family – Working with Individuals and their Families

- Information gathering from family, neighbours and friends
- Information-sharing to safeguarding and promote wellbeing/welfare
- Family involvement in assessing and care planning – circle of support?
- Recognising the contributions of carers
- Understanding (changing) family relationships and dynamics, for example between carer and cared-for person
- Considering both neglect and self-neglect, victim and perpetrator of abuse/neglect
- Family Group Conferences
- Drawing on different legal mandates to addressing need and minimise risk
- Guarding against the rule of optimism and “starting again”

Thinking Family – Organisations around the Person

- Importance of an organisational and multi-agency partnership culture that always “thinks family”
 - Strategic cooperation between Safeguarding Adults Boards, Community Safety Partnerships and Local Children’s Safeguarding Arrangements
 - Protocols on “think family”, including shared records, carer assessments, domestic abuse
- Importance of close collaboration between Children’s Services and Adult Services
 - Working with and focusing on the whole family
 - Joint visits
 - Participation in child protection and adult safeguarding meetings
 - Convening the whole (multi-agency) system
 - Shared records

The national context


Do SARs give sufficient attention to the legal, policy and financial context in which safeguarding practice takes place?

Notable issues	Target bodies
Impact of austerity	Department of Health & Social Care
Legal rules	Ministry of Justice
Recognition of impact on victims	Department for Work & Pensions
Regulation of services	Home Office
Statutory guidance	Crown Prosecution Service
Coordination of parallel review systems	Care Quality Commission
National commissioning shortfalls	NHS England
	Local Government Association
	Health & Safety Executive
	National Probation Service
	Prison Service


Sector-led improvement priorities



The forward process



Key questions for adult safeguarding communities of practice



What does this evidence tell us about the systemic factors that make adult safeguarding so challenging and change so apparently difficult to achieve?

- What does this evidence tell us about how we can enhance good practice in adult safeguarding and remove the barriers that impede it?

- What still needs to be achieved locally and nationally to provide the best context for preventing and protecting individuals from different types of abuse and neglect?

Contact details

Professor Suzy Braye

Emerita Professor of Social Work, University of Sussex
Independent Adult Safeguarding Consultant
s.braye@sussex.ac.uk

Professor Michael Preston-Shoot

Professor Emeritus Social Work, University of Bedfordshire
Independent Adult Safeguarding Consultant
Independent Chair, Brent and Lewisham Safeguarding Adults Boards
michael.preston-shoot@beds.ac.uk

Lisa Smith

Assistant Director, Research in Practice
Lisa.Smith@researchinpractice.org.uk

Care & Health Improvement Programme

chip@local.gov.uk



Local Government Association
Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

Telephone 020 7664 3000
Fax 020 7664 3030
Email info@local.gov.uk
www.local.gov.uk

© Local Government Association

