

Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Business Development Plan 2017-18

Priority: SAB1 Prevention

Priority Statement: Develop a clear approach for Prevention of harm to adults, including increasing the unacceptability of abuse across the community

Rationale:

Gap regarding Prevention Strategy identified by Care Act Compliance Self-Assessment
 No single prevention strategy regarding adult safeguarding in place in or across Leicestershire & Rutland
 Prevention is key in reducing harm and fear of harm, improving safety and quality of life
 Development from community based work in previous years
 Reduce demand on stretched services
 Early intervention can reduce pressure on higher level, higher cost services (learning from Early Help work in Children’s Services).

What do we want to be different?:

Clear Prevention approach in place for Board area and safeguarding is clear within existing prevention strategies
 People feel safer in the community and in community based services
 People understand pathways into care and support better
 More vulnerable adults continue to be supported by Local Network – less requiring statutory svcs / intervention
Fewer people see abuse as acceptable
 Notes – Need to strengthen links with Public Health.

Partnership Lead: Rutland County Council – John Morley

Board Officer: Sanj Pattani

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
Scope Prevention strategy and practice in place relating to Safeguarding	Identify current approaches Assess how these operate in practice Identify outcomes and impact of current approaches Make recommendations to develop prevention	October 2017	J Morley	Completion of scoping report		

Develop Prevention approach to support effective safeguarding (e.g. community awareness and resilience)	Identify action to be taken based upon scoping Commence implementation of prevention approach	March 2018	TBC	To be determined based upon the specific elements to be taken forward		
---	--	------------	-----	---	--	--

Priority: SAB2 Making Safeguarding Personal

Priority Statement: Further embed Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) across the Partnership (include hidden harm)

Rationale:

- Developing culture, attitude, approaches
- Ensuring Voice of the person
- Ensuring Rights and choices
- Don't want to lose momentum
- Address hidden harm

What do we want to be different?:

- See the outcomes of person centred approach
- Evidence that principles of MSP are evident within multi-agency Safeguarding Adults practice

Partnership Lead: Leicestershire ASC – Laura Sanderson

Board Officer: Helen Pearson

Key delivery mechanism: LLR Multi-Agency Group

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
Embed principles of MSP across multi-agency safeguarding practice	Awareness, training and service development strategy – already set out in the MSP plan	Check MSP plan	LLR Multi-Agency Group	Regular reporting to Joint LLR Executive and Board	The Executive on the 6 th March was advised that the work of the LLR Task and Finish Group was coming to an end and that a MSP agency temperature check is undertaken. Further	
Assess use of MSP in safeguarding	Audit programme	Quarterly	SEG	LA database 1 further multi-agency audit and peer review (City and County Local Authorities)		
Assess outcomes from implementing Making Safeguarding Personal	Agree quality assurance and performance management framework to test impact of MSP	May 2017	SEG	Quarterly reporting		

					work becomes 'business as usual' through audit and SEG. The City Board have agreed to this	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Priority: SAB3 Thresholds

Priority Statement: Ensure adult safeguarding thresholds are understood and being utilised correctly

Rationale:

- Low conversion rates – **establish agencies where particular issues of ‘over-reporting’ prior to plan commencing**
- Lack of alerts from (*certain*) professionals / organisations – **Need to establish particular agencies ‘under-reporting’ prior to plan commencing**
- Look for more effective use of increasingly stretched resources
- Lack of clarity on application of thresholds
- Needs multi-agency focus / joint work with City
- Confident that all providers understand and operate in line with thresholds.

What do we want to be different?:

Consistent applications of thresholds across all organisations
 Better conversion rates
 Assure thresholds working effectively – appropriate referrals
 Thresholds are used as a tool for staff across agencies, rather than just in Social Care (e.g. as per Children’s Services)

Partnership Lead: CCG – Jan Harrison

Board Officer: Chris Tew

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
Understand areas for further development or assurance regarding compliance with the Care Act 2014 and use and understanding of thresholds	Monitor compliance against local S42 guidance to identify areas requiring further development	Nov 2017	SEG	Consider direction of travel within PRF data		
	Monitor SAB PRF data to identify other areas requiring further development (e.g. effect of Leics Adult Social Care pathway restructure)	Nov 2017	SEG	Consider direction of travel within PRF data		
	Multi-agency audit incorporating assessment of use of thresholds	Sep 2017	SAB MA Audit Subgroup	Practice and learning points regarding thresholds		
Improve understanding of and use of thresholds	Respond to issues identified through monitoring and assurance	March 2018	TBC	TBC		

Priority: SAB 4 Self-Neglect

Priority Statement: Develop a clear consistent response to self-neglect and safeguarding for front line workers

Rationale:

- Process across LLR (where self-neglect is safeguarding or not) is not clear
- Lack of consistency of approach
- Unclear levels of understanding of and application of legislation
- An issue that has a significant time impact upon all partner agencies
- Agencies feel that effectiveness of decision making could be improved across agencies

What do we want to be different?:

Assurance that we have:

- Clear LLR process of working with Self-Neglect
- LLR communication strategy including development of LLR Multi-Agency VARM

Partnership Lead: LPT – Rachel Bradley

Board Officer: Gary Watts

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
Secure clarity and consistency in policy, procedures and practice in relation to self-neglect	Develop clear self-neglect decision making process (across LLR) – VARM	May / June 2017	Priority Lead and Board Officer	Evidence of effective communication strategy across LLR that demonstrates VARM being embedded into practice of partner agencies By end of Q2, Board will need to be assured that awareness has been cascaded to appropriate agencies through briefings etc.		
Assurance of appropriate and effective response to self-neglect	Develop a quality assurance and performance management framework to test impact	Q1 for VARM data to commence	Laura Sanderson	1. Count of cases going into VARM Leics CC applying ICT fix to assist in identifying VARM cases. Rutland CC will also make changes to identify VARM cases following approval and adoption of VARM	Leics CC has been using their VARM since Sept 2016	

					<p>LCC have held 3 training sessions for Service Managers around the new VARM, these have been single agency</p> <p>A multi-agency VARM workshop will be part of the MCA event/s held this year</p>	
		Q3/Q4 for M/A Audit		2. Multi-Agency audit (Q3/Q4 2017/18)		