



SAR Quality Markers Guidance for Panel Members / Review Participants

Overview of Role and Responsibility of Panel Members and Review Participants in relation to SARs:

- Attend and contribute to panel meetings (or learning events / audits etc depending on methodology used)
- Contribute agency information and/or specialist knowledge to the review
- Support the development of a positive learning environment across the partnership and support the SAR author to extract learning from the review
- Analyse information provided and support the SAR author to develop review recommendations
- Have an awareness of the legislation and statutory guidance in relation to SARs and ensure that appropriate learning is developed whilst adhering to review timelines
- Quality assure drafts of Overview Report, Executive Summary and Action Plan, ensuring that the review is of a sufficiently high standard and that, wherever possible, multi-agency actions are SMART and have allocated action owners
- Arrange for sign off (at senior officer level) final draft reports prior to them being sent to Review Subgroup and the Board
- Ensure that the review is informed through engagement with frontline practitioners and managers
- Ensure an accessible report is produced
- Ensure reviews are conducted in a timely manner

Not all Quality Markers are relevant to the Panel Members and Review Participants, as not all link in with their role and responsibilities. The relevant Quality Markers and the questions to be asked for each are listed on the following pages.

Running the Review – Relevant Quality Markers

Quality Marker 9: Assembling Information

Quality statement – The SAR gains sufficient information to underpin analysis of the case in the context of normal working practices and relevant organisational factors

Quality Marker 10: Practitioners involvement

Quality statement – the SAR enables practitioners and managers to have a constructive experience of taking part in the review

Questions to ask:

- Has discussion about what information is needed and what level of detail is required, been informed by the decision making about the form and focus of the SAR commissioned?
- Does the type of information identified cover:
 1. The facts of what happened in the case –who did what, and when?
 2. The rationale for decision-making, action and inaction –why did people do what they did, what were they trying to achieve, what was influencing their practice?
 3. How normal was their behaviour –is this the way things are usually done?
 4. (where required) the current relevance of past practice issues and their systemic conditions?
- Have all sources of relevant information been considered?
- Is there sufficient clarity about the purpose of any plans to gather practitioners together, including the kind of information they are able to provide?
- In setting up practitioner events has the need for heightened group work skills to minimise the risk of harm occurring been taken into account?
- Is everyone clear about what kind of information they are looking for from different sources, be it people or paperwork?

Questions to ask:

- Is the purpose of any interviews, conversations, meetings or events that involve practitioners clear?
- Are participants being provided with clear information about the SAR and their role in it?
- Are agencies encouraging their staff to contribute their experiences and views to the SAR?
- Does the planning for the SAR include consideration of how to support individual practitioners? For example, those who played key roles in the case, or who are not part of core Safeguarding Adult Board (SAB) agencies, or are from agencies rarely involved in SARs.
- Are practitioners being provided with adequate protections within their own organisations?
- Are practitioners being provided with adequate support and protection in the planning of any group events?
- Has there been adequate consideration of whether there are any implications of the review for people now in senior management positions and if anything needs to be done to support them?

Running the Review – Relevant Quality Markers

Quality Marker 11: Involvement of the person and relevant family members and network

Quality statement – The SAR is informed by the person and relevant family and network members' knowledge and experiences relevant to the period under review

Questions to ask:

- Does the person have support to be involved in the review, i.e. do they need statutory advocacy or any other form of support?
- Has there been discussion about which family members are involved and why?
- Is it agreed how family members are being supported to be involved?
- Is there clarity about how the person and/or their family and networks will be able to influence the focus of the review?
- Is there clarity about what the family is going to be asked?
- Has there been discussion about how the analysis will be informed by family members' knowledge and experiences relevant to the period under review?
- Has there been discussion about how families are to be represented in the final report?
- Are there mechanisms to allow the person and/or their family to feedback on the report before it is completed?
- Where there are criminal investigations and family members are witnesses or suspects, has the police senior investigating officer been enabled to understand the focus and scope of the review to help discussions about when and how family members can be involved?

Quality Marker 12: Analysis

Quality statement – The SAR analysis is transparent and rigorous. It evaluates and explains professional practice in the case, shedding light on routine challenges and constraints to practitioner efforts to safeguard adults.

Questions to ask:

- Have the principles of Making Safeguarding Personal and the six core safeguarding principles underpinned your evaluation of safeguarding practice in the case?
- Has your analysis gone beyond commenting on compliance with relevant procedures, to provide explanations of professional behaviour that call on a range of cultural and organisational factors?
- Has your analysis drawn attention to what professional activity in the case reveals about how service delivery worked at the time, or is working more generally and routinely?

Outputs, Outcomes and Impact from the Review – Relevant Quality Markers

Quality Marker 13: The Report

Quality statement – the report identifies clearly and succinctly the analysis and findings of the SAR, while keeping details of the person to a minimum. Findings reflect the causal factors and systems learning the analysis has evidenced

Questions to ask:

- Are you focused on producing a report that is succinct, accessible and useful?
- Have you included demographic detail about the person and a brief description of the harm and consequences, whilst avoiding detailed description of events. Have you focused on details relevant to the learning?
- Have you captured learning for the services and partnerships involved, that focuses on causal factors and system conditions that explain how professionals engaged with and responded to the person, relevant family, and network?
- Have you avoided over-simplifying complex problems, but presented complex issues as straightforwardly as possible?
- Have you put yourself in the shoes of the person and/or relevant family members reading the report?