

## **Berkshire West Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB)**

### **Multi Agency Audit Framework Strategy**

1. In accordance with the [Berkshire West Safeguarding Adults Board Quality Assurance framework](#) under the Qualitative Feedback quadrant the SAB will direct partner agencies and providers to undertake safeguarding adult audits to ensure Care Act Compliance and provide quality assurance measures in its discharge of safeguarding duties and prevention principles as defined under the Care Act 2014.
2. The SAB will direct the following audits as a minimum, audits can and will be commissioned if directed by the SAB or their subgroups:
  - a. Case File Audits, each Local Authority (LA) partner will be required to undertake a monthly audit of 10% of completed safeguarding enquiries that will focus on Making Safeguarding Personal Principles. The case file audit data will be submitted to the SAB on a six-monthly basis for the periods 1<sup>st</sup> April – 30<sup>th</sup> September and 1<sup>st</sup> October- 31<sup>st</sup> March using an agreed template (see appendix 1). These findings will be considered by the Scrutiny and Impact Group.
  - b. Safeguarding Concerns, NFA decisions, each LA partner will be required to undertake a monthly audit of safeguarding concerns, where there was an outcome of NFA, to offer assurance LA's statutory duties are being discharged correctly. Due to the fluctuating levels of safeguarding concerns LA's receive a minimum audit size will not be set by the SAB however the LA's must be able to demonstrate that the number of audits conducted is proportionate.
  - c. Multi-Agency Case File Audits, when submitting case file audit data, each LA partner will provide the individual reference numbers for each audit submitted where there was multi-agency involvement in the safeguarding enquiry, a minimum of three SAB partners. Two cases identified by each LA partner will be selected at random, these cases will be subject to a multi-agency peer review audit that will take place once a year and the findings will be analysed by the Scrutiny and Impact Group. The audit will include examining performance against SAB priorities and learning from Safeguarding Adult Reviews (SARs)
3. SAB Audit Rating Tool, the SAB has provided a rating scale to be used to provide some standardisation for the board on audit achievements. The rating scale can be applied to measure results from any audit criteria /standard defined by the authors. It is based on aiming to achieving good practice for reporting on results or finding from audits. The SAB accept that LA's may use different ratings for their own internal audit process but do require each LA to submit data based on the following rating tool.

Rating scale	Standard	Rag rated
1	If all the criteria on the audit standard question is met in full 100% a rating of achieved standard is assigned.	Achieved standard
2	If 50% or of the criteria on the standard question is met than a rating of partially achieved can be assigned if there are no critical omissions noted for example: a criminal offence has not been identified and acted on, lack of individual involvement, appropriate agencies have not been consulted, relevant history has not been considered, inappropriate practice has been followed This list is not exhaustive auditors are required to use their professional judgement.	Partly achieved standard
3	If 50% of the criteria on the audit standard question is not achieved or a critical omission has been made (see rating above for examples) then a rating of not met the standard must be assigned or a critical element is not met Example – criminal offences, involvement of agency, person involvement, inappropriate practice (not following MCA).	Not met the standard
4	Where an audit criteria, is not applicable to the case, then the rating of Not Applicable must be assigned.	Not Applicable

4. Learning/recommendations from Safeguarding Adults Reviews (SARs) where appropriate this strategy will be used to seek assurance required.
5. Governance, all completed SAB audits must be endorsed by the Scrutiny and Impact Group before being signed off or shared with the full SAB meeting. The Scrutiny and Impact Group will determine if any areas of concern/celebration should be escalated to the SAB and the format for that escalation.
6. West Berkshire Council are unable to adhere to the data requirements set out in Appendix 1, this is because their casefile system does not have the functionality to report in this way, the way this is shown in Appendix 2. This will be reconsidered when West Berkshire Council commission a new case file system. West Berkshire Council will provide assurance to the SAB that they are undertaking case file audits and will share the learning from these audits.

**Endorsed by Scrutiny and Impact Subgroup - May 2024**

**Endorsed by SAB – June 2024**

**Date of Review – June 2026**

Appendix 1



**NFA Safeguarding Concerns Audit and Completed Safeguarding enquiries Case File Audit – summary report for the West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board (SAB)**

In accordance with the SAB’s Multi Agency Audit Framework Strategy each partner Local Authority is required to submit data on their:

- Completed NFA Safeguarding Concern Audits and:
- Completed safeguarding enquiry audits focusing on the Making Safeguarding Personal Principals standards (detailed within the template). Data is collected on a six-monthly basis and a minimum of 10% of completed safeguarding enquiries in the reporting period are to have been audited.

Data is collected on a six-monthly basis. For completed NFA Safeguarding Concerns, the Local Authority is required to demonstrate that the number of cases audited is proportionate to offer assurance to the SAB. For safeguarding enquiry audits a minimum of 10% of completed safeguarding enquiries in the reporting period are to have been audited.

RAG standards are provided at the end of the document.

Completed templates are to be submitted by the agreed deadline to the SAB Business Manager:

[Lynne.Mason@Reading.gov.uk](mailto:Lynne.Mason@Reading.gov.uk)

<b>Reporting Period</b>	
<b>Deadline for Submission</b>	
<b>Date to be considered by Scrutiny and Impact Group</b>	
<b>Local Authority (delete as applicable)</b>	Reading Borough Council Wokingham Borough Council West Berkshire Council

NFA Safeguarding Concern Audits							
A – Number of NFA safeguarding concerns during the reporting period				B- Number of case file audits completed in the reporting period			
% B/A				If % is less than 10% please explain how the % is proportionate in offering the required SAB assurance.			
<b>Total achieved standard</b>		<b>Total partly achieved standard</b>		<b>Total not met standard</b>		<b>Not Applicable</b>	
<b>For SAB to Note</b>							

Safeguarding Enquiry Audits			
A – Number of completed safeguarding enquiries during the reporting period		B- Number of case file audits completed in the reporting period	
% B/A		If % is less than 10% please explain how this will be addressed and by when.	
<p><b>Empowerment:</b> People being supported and encouraged to make their own decisions and informed consent: <i>‘I am asked what I want as the outcomes form the safeguarding process and these directly informs what happens’</i></p> <p><b>Considerations for auditors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the individual been consulted and asked for their views and desired outcomes?</li> <li>• Did we have a strengths-based conversation that explored what matters to the person and what they care about?</li> <li>• Did we treated the person with respect, listen to them and take time to build a relationship?</li> <li>• Has it been identified whether the individual has Mental Capacity in relation to the Safeguarding issued and if they lack capacity, has the reasoning for this been clearly articulated and evidenced? Have the 5 key principles of MCA been followed?</li> <li>• Decisions that service users lack capacity to consent, demonstrate compliance with application of the diagnostic and functional tests.</li> <li>• Has advocacy been considered?</li> <li>• If advocacy is required has an appropriate advocate been identified and contacted and asked for a view and desired outcome?</li> </ul>			
<b>Total achieved standard</b>		<b>Total partly achieved standard</b>	<b>Total not met standard</b>
			<b>Total Not Applicable</b>
<b>For the SAB to note</b>			
<p><b>Protection:</b> Support and representation for those in greatest need. <i>“I get help and support to report abuse and neglect. I get help so that I am able to take part in the safeguarding process to the extent to which I want.”</i></p> <p><b>Considerations for auditors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does initial response within first 48 hours (Part 1) demonstrate risks and protective factors have been fully considered?</li> <li>• Review of RAG decision.</li> <li>• Have procedural timescales at Part 1 been adhered to (decision within 2 working days of referral)?</li> <li>• Is the decision at the end of Part 1 appropriate, clear, well-articulated and evidenced?</li> <li>• The work explored what is happening within the situation rather than making assumptions or accepting things at face value?</li> <li>• If ending at Part 1 is there a clear protection plan in place or if progressing to Part 2 is there an Interim Safety Plan in place?</li> <li>• If progressed to Part 2, has a full risk assessment been completed and is it appropriate?</li> <li>• The work provides a sound analysis of risk. Positive risk taking was enabled.</li> <li>• Is there adequate detail in the assessment and safeguarding plan to evidence the assessment undertaken and the rationale for decisions made / actions taken?</li> <li>• Does the work demonstrate professional curiosity?</li> <li>• Has their expressed views impacted how enquiry has been undertaken, outcomes focused?</li> <li>• Have we explored the person’s background, life experiences and so on and facilitated them to build on these to make positive changes in their life that have helped stop abuse or neglect or protect them from experiencing it in the future?</li> </ul>			

- Has there been a determination of whether abuse or neglect occurred, and the root cause established?
- Has the individual been safeguarded and is there a robust protection plan in place?
- Has transferrable risk been considered and responded to and is this evidenced?
- If the alleged perpetrator is a vulnerable adult, have their needs been addressed?
- Have they been involved in the Safeguarding Plan?
- Have their views been sought at the conclusion of the enquiry?
- Has the enquiry made a difference to the risk of abuse or neglect of the person?

Total achieved standard		Total partly achieved standard		Total not met standard		Total Not Applicable	
-------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------	--	----------------------	--

**For the SAB to note**

**Partnership** Local solutions through services working with their communities. Communities have a part to play in preventing, detecting and reporting neglect and abuse. *“I know that staff treat any personal and sensitive information in confidence, only sharing what is helpful and necessary. I am confident that professionals will work together and with me to get the best result for me.”*

*Considerations for auditors:*

- Has the funding Authority been notified if not host LA funded or self-funded individual?
- Has Care Governance/ Commissioning been notified?
- If the allegation constitutes a possible criminal offence, has the matter been reported to Police and have they been consulted with regard to any strategy?
- Were relevant agencies consulted and appropriate information shared (and if no strategy meeting, were these recorded as strategy discussions)?
- Were the right agencies involved, at the right time, in the right way?
- Was a strategy meeting convened at the appropriate time? Is there evidence of that meeting or discussion being robust and effective?
- Was their appropriate attendance at the strategy meeting?
- Were relevant agencies represented, including service users view?
- Was the discussion and outcomes / action plan clearly recorded?
- Is there evidence of a coordinated multiagency response?

Total achieved standard		Total partly achieved standard		Total not met standard		Total Not Applicable	
-------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------	--	----------------------	--

**For the SAB to note**

**Proportionality** The least intrusive response appropriate to the risk presented *‘I am sure that the professionals will work in my interest, as I see them and they will only get involved as much as needed’*

*Considerations for auditors:*

- Review of RAG decision
- Has the approach been proportionate i.e. least intrusive possible whilst fully discharging Duty of Care?

Total achieved standard		Total partly achieved standard		Total not met standard		Total Not Applicable	
-------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------	--	----------------------	--

**For the SAB to note**

**Prevention** It is better to take action before harm occurs. *“I receive clear and simple information about what abuse is, how to recognise the signs and what I can do to seek help.”*

*Considerations for auditors:*

- Has the individual previously been subject to a safeguarding referral in the last 12 months?
- Has this investigation identified any learning from previous investigations?
- Has the individual’s carers needs been considered and appropriate action taken?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there evidence that information has been shared about abuse and how to report and protect themselves and develop strategies to keep themselves safe.</li> </ul>							
<b>Total achieved standard</b>		<b>Total partly achieved standard</b>		<b>Total not met standard</b>		<b>Total Not Applicable</b>	
<b>For the SAB to note</b>							
<p><b>Accountability</b> and transparency in delivering safeguarding. <i>“I understand the role of everyone involved in my life and so do they”</i></p> <p><i>Considerations for auditors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the referrer been informed of the outcome of the investigation?</li> <li>Is there evidence of management oversight / contributions from SAM?</li> <li>Has each contributor to the enquiry been informed of their role in the investigation?</li> <li>Has the person been informed throughout the enquiry of the role of each organisation?</li> <li>Has information about the conclusions of the enquiry been shared with involved parties where appropriate?</li> </ul>							
<b>Total achieved standard</b>		<b>Total partly achieved standard</b>		<b>Total not met standard</b>		<b>Total Not Applicable</b>	
<b>For the SAB to note</b>							
<p><b>SAR Learning Points:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description – link to SAR</li> <li></li> </ol>							
<b>Total achieved standard</b>		<b>Total partly achieved standard</b>		<b>Total not met standard</b>		<b>Total Not Applicable</b>	
<b>For the SAB to note</b>							
<b>List a maximum of three strengths identified in the audits reported on</b>							
<b>Strength 1</b>							
<b>Strength 2</b>							
<b>Strength 3</b>							
<b>List a maximum of three areas for improvement identified in the audits reported on</b>							
<b>Area for improvement 1</b>							
<b>Area for improvement 2</b>							
<b>Area for improvement 3</b>							
<p>Please provide unique reference numbers for cases audited where there was multi-agency involvement (minimum of 4 SAB partners) in the safeguarding enquiry, these cases will be available for selection for the annual multi-agency peer review audit.</p>							

Rating scale	Standard	Rag rated
1	If all the criteria on the audit standard question is met in full 100% a rating of achieved standard is assigned.	<b>Achieved standard</b>
2	If 50% or of the criteria on the standard question is met than a rating of partially achieved can be assigned if there are no critical omissions noted for example: a criminal offence has not been identified and acted on, lack of individual involvement, appropriate agencies have not been consulted, relevant history has not been considered, inappropriate	<b>Partly achieved standard</b>

	practice has been followed This list is not exhaustive auditors are required to use their professional judgement.	
3	If 50% of the criteria on the audit standard question is not achieved or a critical omission has been made (see rating above for examples) then a rating of not met the standard must be assigned or a critical element is not met Example – criminal offences, involvement of agency, person involvement, inappropriate practice (not following MCA).	<b>Not met the standard</b>
4	Where an audit criteria, is not applicable to the case, then the rating of Not Applicable must be assigned.	<b>Not Applicable</b>

## Appendix 2 – West Berkshire Councils S42 Internal Audit Form

Audit Type:

Enquiry Start Date:

Person:

Worker being Audited:

Auditor:

**MSP Principles, has the response adhered to the principle of:**

Empowerment Y/N

Protection Y/N

Partnership Y/N

Proportionality Y/N

Prevention Y/N

Accountability Y/N

**Auditor Conformation:**

Principles of MSP considered throughout audit Y/N

Mental Capacity Act considered throughout audit Y/N

Advocacy considered throughout audit Y/N

Service User involvement considered throughout audit Y/N

Feedback to Referrer Y/N

Carers issues responded to Y/N

Quality of case notes Y/N/Partially achieved standard

Was risk considered? Y/N

Was a risk assessment completed on this case? Y/N

**Please comment on the quality of case recording – Free Text**

**Any other comments – Free Text**

**Outcome – Achieved standard/Partly achieved standard/Did not achieve standard**

End Date:

Status: