

Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board **Peer Challenge Report**

May 2017

Final

Table of contents

Executive Summary	2
Report	4
Key Recommendations.....	7
Leadership, Strategy and Working Together.....	9
Outcomes for and the experiences of people who use services	13
Commissioning, Service Delivery and Effective Practice... Performance	15
Safeguarding resources and contact details	17
Safeguarding resources and contact details	18
Appendix 1 – Safeguarding Adults Board Improvement Tool	

Executive Summary

The Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board (LSAB) requested that a peer challenge be undertaken by a partnership between the Local Government Association and East Midlands ADASS as a pilot site on behalf of the East Midlands Safeguarding Adults Network (EMSAN) and Safeguarding Adults Chairs Network in the Region. The work was commissioned by Jane Geraghty, Independent Chair of the Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board who was the client for this work. She was seeking an external view on the effectiveness of the LSAB which included the relationships with the three statutory partners. LSAB intends to use the findings of this peer challenge as a marker on its journey of improvement. The specific scope of the work was:

Scope:

A. How effective are LSAB and related partnership arrangements?

To what extent are we putting people who require the support at the centre of what we are doing (i.e. staff, service users)

B. How well does LSAB understand the impact it is having and how can we improve?

To what extent are we putting people who require the support at the centre of what we are doing (i.e. staff, service users)

The peer challenge team had the privilege of hearing from many of the partners involved in safeguarding adults in Leicester and conclude from what was read, heard and seen that LSAB is in a strong position with the relationships around the table and is ambitious to keep the people of the City of Leicester safe. Over the past eighteen months there have been clear improvements in terms of the Board's direction, activity and challenge which bode well for its future prospects.

The work of LSAB would gain clearer focus by producing a Strategic Plan. This should set out the vision for the next few years, and be able to link to the strategic priorities of the three statutory partners and the related organisations that influence safeguarding across the city. This would then be used to develop and set out a performance framework that guides the priorities, directs the sub-groups and acts to monitor the work over time so that milestones are reached and up-dates given to and with LSAB. This process would provide assurance to the Board that adults are being safeguarded and enable accountability, challenge and scrutiny where partners are under performing.

The LSAB should ~~consider increasing~~ seek to assure itself that the number of days available to the independent chair are adequate to fulfil the role requirements the capacity of allocated days for the Independent Chair so that all members, especially the three strategic partners (Leicester City Council, Leicester City Clinical Commissioning Group and Leicestershire Police) are fully engaged. This would include agenda setting, discussion of direction and the progress to the achievement of Board goals and the opportunity exists here to include political colleagues.

With a clear strategic vision from which priorities are set, it would then be possible to task sub-groups with work that speaks directly to the priorities within clear timeframes and terms of reference and report to the Board. This process would improve the accountability of the sub-groups and assurance for the Board that key issues are being addressed.

The LSAB is clearly committed to improvement especially with regards to hearing the voice of the service user and carer. This is a stated focus of the Independent Chair along with other key priorities such as the embedding of Making Safeguarding Personal, aiming for Care Act compliance and a review of multi-agency training needs. To ensure the service user and carer voice continues to be heard the peer team make several recommendations. Firstly that the statutory partners review and reconsider the video that has been produced, to assure themselves that it gives clear messages regarding what constitutes safeguarding in order to support the achievement of the Board's goals; secondly that a Chair for the associated sub group is nominated, and thirdly that the sub group reviews its membership and work-plan to consider what is realistically achievable within given time frames. Lastly the user group could be supported by being included as a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) in the strategy as further development of the user engagement model will help to drive forward the agenda with the diverse communities across the City.

Report

Background

1. The Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board (LSAB) requested that a peer challenge be undertaken by a partnership between the [Local Government Association and East Midlands ADASS as a pilot site on behalf of the East Midlands Safeguarding Adults Network \(EMSAN\) and Safeguarding Adults Chairs Network in the Region](#)~~Local Government Association and East Midlands ADASS~~. The work was commissioned by Jane Geraghty, Independent Chair of the Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board who was the client for this work. She was seeking an external view on the effectiveness of the LSAB which included the relationships with the three statutory partners. LSAB intends to use the findings of this peer challenge as a marker on its journey of improvement. The specific scope of the work was:

Scope:

A. How effective are LSAB and related partnership arrangements?

To what extent are we putting people who require the support at the centre of what we are doing (i.e. staff, service users)

B. How well does LSAB understand the impact it is having and how can we improve?

To what extent are we putting people who require the support at the centre of what we are doing (i.e. staff, service users)

2. A peer challenge is designed to help an organisation and its partners assess current achievements, areas for development and capacity to change. The peer challenge is not an inspection. Instead it offers a supportive approach, undertaken by friends – albeit ‘critical friends’. It aims to help an organisation identify its current strengths, as much as what it needs to improve. But it should also provide it with a basis for further improvement.
3. The benchmark for this peer challenge was the Safeguarding Adults Board Improvement Tool (Appendix 1). These were used as headings in the feedback with an addition of the scoping questions outlined above. The headline themes were:
 - Outcomes for, and the experiences of, people who use services
 - Leadership, Strategy and Working Together
 - Commissioning, Service Delivery and Effective Practice
 - Performance
4. The members of the peer challenge team were:
 - **Deborah Stuart-Angus**, Independent Chair, Kent and Medway Executive Safeguarding Adults Board
 - **Claire Bearder**, Group Manager Access and Safeguarding, Nottinghamshire County Council
 - **David Culy**, Safeguarding Board Manager, Lincolnshire Safeguarding Adults Board

- **Tabetha Darmon**, Interim Head of Safeguarding, Sherwood Forest Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
 - **Marcus Coulson**, Challenge Manager Local Government Association
5. The team were on-site for three days from Tuesday 16th May to Thursday 18th May 2017. The programme for the on-site phase included activities designed to enable members of the team to meet and talk to a range of internal and external stakeholders. These activities included:
 - interviews and discussions with councillors, officers and partners, especially those on the LSAB and people using services
 - reading documents provided by the LSAB and Council, including a self-assessment from LSAB
 6. The peer challenge team would like to thank LSAB, staff, people using services, carers, partners, commissioned providers and councillors for their open and constructive responses during the review process. The team was made very welcome and would in particular like to thank Lindsey Bampton, Kelly-Anne Hodgson and Tom Elkington from the Board Office along with Joanne Reed the Board Administrator and Adam Archer, Business Improvement Manager Adviser from Leicester City Council for their invaluable assistance in planning and undertaking this challenge.
 7. Our feedback to the LSAB on the last day of the challenge gave an overview of the key messages. This report builds on the initial findings and gives a detailed account of the challenge.
 8. The Care Act 2014 has placed Safeguarding Adults Boards on a statutory footing. The Care and Support Statutory Guidance defines adult safeguarding as “protecting a person’s right to live in safety, free from abuse and neglect”. The Care Act requires that each local authority must:
 - make enquiries, or ensure others do so, if it believes an adult is, or is at risk of, abuse or neglect. An enquiry should establish whether any action needs to be taken to other appropriate adult to help them.
 - cooperate with each of its relevant partners (as set out in section 6 of the Care Act) in order to protect adults experiencing or at risk of abuse or neglect
 9. The aims of adult safeguarding are:
 - To prevent harm and reduce the risk of abuse or neglect to adults with care and support needs.
 - To safeguard individuals in a way that supports them in making choices and having control in how they choose to live their lives.
 - To promote an outcomes approach in safeguarding that works for people resulting in the best experience possible.
 - To raise public awareness so that professionals, other staff and communities as a whole play their part in preventing, identifying and responding to abuse and neglect.
 10. There are six key principles that underpin all adult safeguarding work:

- **Empowerment** – Personalisation and the presumption of person-led decisions and informed consent. “I am asked what I want as the outcomes from the safeguarding process and these directly inform what happens.”
- **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.”
- **Proportionality** – Proportionate and least intrusive response appropriate to the risk presented. “I am sure that the professionals will work for my best interests, as I see them and they will only get involved as much as needed.”
- **Protection** – Support and representation for those in greatest need. “I get help and support to report abuse. I get help to take part in the safeguarding process to the extent to which I want and to which I am able.”
- **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 to get the best result for me.”
- **Accountability** – Accountability and transparency in delivering safeguarding. “I understand the role of everyone involved in my life.”

Key Recommendations

- A strong and ambitious SAB that has clear improvements in direction, activity and challenge
 - Create a Strategic Plan that sets a performance framework
 - Increase capacity for Independent Chair to fully engage all partners
 - Clarify the work of the sub-groups to improve accountability and assurance
 - SAB is clearly committed to improvement especially to hearing the voice of the user and carer and in consequence review and reconsider the new video
11. The peer challenge team had the privilege of hearing from many of the partners involved in safeguarding adults in Leicester and conclude from what was read, heard and seen that the board is in a strong position with the relationships around the table and is ambitious to keep the people of the City of Leicester safe. Over the past eighteen months there have been clear improvements in terms of the Board's direction, the amount of activity of the Board and its sub-groups and the level of challenge between members which bode well for its future prospects.
12. As an example of the positive relationships evident at the LSAB there is a plethora of positive activity by partners who are typically well engaged in the work of the Board and its sub-groups. The improvement that this peer team recommend is that (in line with the three Care Act core duties) the work of LSAB would gain clearer focus by producing a Strategic Plan. This should set out the vision for the next few years, and be able to link to the strategic priorities of the three statutory partners and the related organisations that influence safeguarding across the city. This would then be used to develop and set out a performance framework that guides the priorities, directs the sub-groups and acts to monitor the work over time so that milestones are reached and up-dates given to and with the Board. This process would provide assurance to the Board that adults are being safeguarded and enable accountability, challenge and scrutiny where partners are under performing. Furthermore key performance indicators (KPIs) for the strategic aims should be included in the strategy will help produce a clearer annual report.
13. The LSAB should seek to assure itself that the number of days available to the independent chair are adequate to fulfil the role requirements so that all members, especially the three strategic partners (Leicester City Council, Leicester City Clinical Commissioning Group and Leicestershire Police) are fully engaged~~The peer challenge team suggest that the Board consider increasing the capacity of allocated days for Independent Chair so that all members, especially the three strategic partners are fully engaged.~~ This would include agenda setting, discussion of direction and the progress to the achievement of Board goals. At present not all members feel as involved as they need to in order to add value to LSAB. Through this involvement of all key partners the opportunity also exists to include political colleagues which would ensure that this important dimension is included in the work of LSAB.

14. With a clear strategic vision from which priorities are set, it would then be possible to task sub-groups with work that speaks directly to the priorities within clear timeframes and terms of reference and report to the Board. This process would improve the accountability of the sub-groups and assurance for the Board that key issues are being addressed.
15. The LSAB is clearly committed to improvement especially with regards to hearing the voice of the service user and carer. This is a stated focus of the Independent Chair along with other key priorities such as the embedding of Making Safeguarding Personal, aiming for Care Act compliance and a review of multi-agency training needs.

The importance of the user and carer experience for LSAB is evidenced by membership for both a service user representative and Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living to champion this perspective.

To ensure the service user and carer voice continues to be heard the peer team make several recommendations:

- Firstly that the statutory partners review and reconsider the video that has been produced to assure themselves that it gives clear messages regarding what constitutes safeguarding in order to support the achievement of the Board's goals.
- Secondly that a Chair for the associated sub group is nominated.
- Thirdly that the sub group reviews its membership and work-plan to consider what is realistically achievable within given time frames.
- Fourthly that the user group could be supported by being included as a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) in the strategy as further development of the user engagement model will help to drive forward the agenda with the diverse communities across the City.

Leadership, Strategy and Working Together

Strengths

- A very ambitious LSAB
- Clear improvements since January 2016 in LSAB direction, levels of activity and challenge
- Relationships between partners are generally good
- Independent Chair is clearly committed to improvements especially to hearing the voice of the user and carer
- Two years of statutory partners equal financial contributions is a real success
- Engagement of Healthwatch a real strength
- Much sub-group activity well attended with some reports
- Board Office provides a robust administrative service whilst there have been significant changes therein
- You are seeking to gather data from partners

Areas for Consideration

- The significant successful activity of LSAB priorities, the business plan, sub-group work and planned data collection, could be further enhanced through a Strategic Plan, which creates a framework that distils into an achievable performance plan
 - Develop the awareness amongst both statutory and non-statutory SAB partners of their responsibility to consider where there is potential for an SAR and learning in a multi-agency context
 - Increase capacity for Independent Chair to fully engage all partners in development issues on a regular basis, that should include political colleagues
 - Clarify working practices and expectations between the Independent Chair, the Board Office and partners
 - Clarify the role, membership, connectivity and governance of the sub-groups in order to improve accountability and assurance
 - Consider enhancing SAB culture to one where partners see participation as integral to their “day job” and deployment of their role
16. The peer challenge team had the privilege of hearing from many of the partners involved in safeguarding adults in Leicester and conclude from what was read, heard and seen that the board is in a strong position with the relationships around the table and is ambitious to keep the people of the City of Leicester

safe. Over the past eighteen months there have been clear improvements in terms of the Board's direction, activity and challenge which bode well for its future prospects.

17. The relationships between partners are generally good allowing for discussion of the Board's priorities and challenge in a respectful manner that appears to generate trust. This is a positive position from which the Board can develop further.
18. The LSAB is clearly committed to improvement especially with regards to hearing the voice of the service user and carer. This is a stated focus of the Independent Chair along with other key priorities such as the embedding of Making Safeguarding Personal, aiming for Care Act compliance and a review of multi-agency training needs.

The importance of the user and carer experience is evidenced by LSAB membership for both a service user representative and Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living to champion the service user perspective.

To ensure the service user and carer voice continues to be heard the peer team make several recommendations. Firstly that the statutory partners review and reconsider the video that has been produced, to assure themselves that it gives clear messages regarding what constitutes safeguarding in order to support the achievement of the Board's goals; secondly that a Chair for the associated sub group is nominated, and thirdly that the sub group reviews its membership and work-plan to consider what is realistically achievable within given time frames. Lastly the user group could be supported by being included as a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) in the strategy as further development of the user engagement model will help to drive forward the agenda with the diverse communities across the City.

19. It was noticed by the peer team that all three statutory partners make equal and significant financial contributions to the LSAB and this has happened for two years in succession. In the experience of the peer team this is atypical and a real success.
20. Healthwatch are well engaged on the LSAB and recently were chairing of one of the four sub-groups which is a real strength.
21. There is an active set of sub-group meetings at LSAB with mostly decent attendance by partners and/or their deputies. In particular the Performance, Effectiveness and Quality (PEQ) group has published a comprehensive performance report demonstrating much activity.
22. The LSAB Board Office provides a robust administrative service for the agenda setting, management of Board meetings and sub-group activity. This good work has been delivered at a time of significant changes in personnel which have been disruptive for those involved.
23. The LSAB is seeking to gather data from partners through a number of different routes such as the use of single templates, information on activity and reports. The Board is then seeking to use this to inform progress. However the peer team recommend that the deployment of information collection is matched to

strategic priorities, which need to be set and aligned with sub group activities, and that information is collected for very specific purposes, which aims to fulfil a strategic goal.

24. The significant successful activity of LSAB priorities, the business plan, sub-group work and planned data collection, could be further enhanced therefore through the development of a Strategic Plan, which would create a framework that distils into an achievable performance plan.
25. The peer team recommend the LSAB develop the awareness amongst both statutory and non-statutory partners of the responsibility they hold to consider where there is potential for a Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR) and learning in a multi-agency context. Whilst the challenge team acknowledges that it is not appropriate to comment on the number of safeguarding adults reviews undertaken it would suggest that the absence of referrals for the LSAB to consider any review process (including a SAR) perhaps indicates a lack of understanding in all agencies about when to refer. It was clear from the information received that all agencies address any serious incidents within their organisation through their internal and commissioning processes. However it was unclear if any incidents were considered to have multiagency involvement and consequently may meet the SAR requirements. This could be addressed easily through the Assessment, Review and Learning Group (ARLG) sub-group of the Board and as well as exploring situations when things did not work well by providing useful insights into the way organizations are working together to prevent and reduce abuse and neglect of adults. SARs may also be used to explore examples of good practice to identify lessons that can be applied.
26. The peer challenge team suggest that the Board consider increasing the capacity of allocated days for Independent Chair so that all members, especially the three strategic partners are fully engaged. This would include agenda setting, discussion of direction and the progress to the achievement of Board goals. At present not all members feel as involved as they need to in order to add value to LSAB. Through this involvement of all key partners the opportunity exists to include political colleagues which would ensure that this important dimension is included in the work of LSAB.
27. To attain more efficient working it is imperative the LSAB work towards clarifying working practices and expectations between the Independent Chair, the Board Office and partners.
28. Clarify the role, membership, connectivity and governance of the sub-groups in order to improve accountability and assurance. With a clear strategic vision from which priorities are set, it would then be possible to task sub-groups with work that speaks directly to the priorities within timeframes and terms of reference and report to the Board. This process would improve the accountability of the sub-groups and the assurance for the Board that key issues are being addressed.
29. With the changes in structure there should also be a consideration of enhancing the culture of LSAB to one where partners see participation as integral to their “day job” and deployment of their role. At the moment it appears participation is seen as additional to their role not central to it. This change could be achieved through by partner governance structures and line management to enhance the

understanding of the work of the LSAB, how strategy will align with their own and how statutory personnel make valid and meaningful contributions to shared LSAB decision making and strategy.

Outcomes for and the experiences of people who use services

Strengths

- Individual Management Reports are candid (which wasn't the case some years ago) and facilitate greater learning
- The SAB is obviously committed to developing mechanisms to hearing the voice of the user and carer

Areas for Consideration

- Continue to raise the profile of safeguarding to address perceived under-reporting in the diverse communities in the City and adult social care settings
 - Consider creative ways of rewarding service users for their LSAB engagement
 - Develop agency responses to assure the LSAB that Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) is integral to service delivery
 - Consider involving service users and carers in staff recruitment and training
 - You recognise that Transitions needs addressing
 - All statutory partners to review new video prior to next steps
30. Individual Management Reports (IMRs) are the reports agencies submit when a Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR) or Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR) is undertaken. Their format will be determined by the terms of reference for a particular review. The IMRs, produced for the DHRs and SARs commissioned by the LSAB are always candid ensuring the learning is proportionate, appropriate and agency targeted that facilitates greater learning.
31. The priorities of the LSAB demonstrate a commitment to developing mechanisms to hearing the voice of the user and carer. This work is an issue that all boards across the country are seeking to find a balance between hearing an authentic voice whilst doing so efficiently. Therefore any solution is likely to be an ongoing and nuanced piece of hard work.
32. The LSAB should continue to raise the profile of adult safeguarding to address perceived under-reporting from the number of diverse communities in the City as well as from the variety of adult social care settings such as residential, nursing, domiciliary care and supported living settings.
33. The LSAB should consider rewarding service users for their engagement with the Board. Whilst this can be problematic as payment in cash can adversely affect benefits, the experience of team members suggests that it is possible to arrange payment in kind by the use of, for example, vouchers and therefore this is worth exploring.

34. Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) has been a national initiative for the past few years. As this is now seen as business as usual there may be an assumption that it is 'embedded' in service delivery at the frontline across all partners. It would therefore be important that the LSAB develop thoughtful responses from each partner to assure the LSAB that MSP is actually integral to service delivery rather than an aspiration.
35. When working to hear the voice of the user and carer consideration should be given to involving service users and carers in staff recruitment and the design and delivery of training. Experiences from elsewhere inform indicates that these contributions can be powerful aids to effective learning for all.
36. LSAB recognises that the transition of children into adult care settings whilst in receipt of some type of assistance needs addressing. However it is the case that everyone involved is acutely aware that the City Council's Children's Services Directorate is working hard to addressing its 'inadequate' Ofsted rating from March 2015. In order to start to address shared priorities between the LSAB and the Leicester City Local Safeguarding Children's Board, it was evident that Deputy membership is currently being addressed and there was clear commitment to developing a joint objective between the LSAB and LSCB to look at transitions with appropriate consequent activity when capacity allows.
37. All statutory partners should work together to review the new safeguarding video prior to next steps to ensure it adds value to the understanding of adult safeguarding across the partnership and gives clear messages about what constitutes safeguarding.

Commissioning, Service Delivery and Effective Practice

Strengths

- Clear MSP focus is evident
- ARLG is a well organised and cohesive group that works together to ensure the DHR and SAR process is effective
- PEQ is developing well with some strong leadership and engagement
- Some partners report that working with the LSAB has improved their own safeguarding systems and processes

Areas for consideration

- Define the requirements of LSAB members to include the use of deputies and the potential for co-opted members
- With a clearer Strategic Plan and priorities, fund sub-group activity accordingly

38. The Board has a clear MSP focus which is evident in the stated aims of the LSAB and those who give it direction.

39. The Assessment, Review and Learning Group (ARLG) is a well organised and cohesive group that works together to ensure the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) and Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR) processes are effective. The group has a clear policy and process in place to ensure the initial decisions to commission any review is within Home Office and Care Act Guidelines. The same approach supports the process once a DHR or SAR is commissioned right through to publishing the report.

40. The PEQ group is developing well with some strong leadership from Ruth Lake, Director of Adult Social Care at Leicester City Council and engagement from a range of other partners to produce a comprehensive performance report. The group are also engaged with the collection of performance information from a wide range of partners and this activity would further benefit from being aligned with LSAB strategic priorities.

41. The peer team heard from a number of partners that working with LSAB has improved their own internal safeguarding systems and processes. This is a good example of the positive benefits that Board membership can bring to organisations across the City.

42. The peer team saw membership lists for LSAB that indicated a number of partners were not attending, however a more detailed understanding emerged that they are not expected to attend more than once per year (for example CQC) whilst other partners regularly send deputies. It would appear to be more useful to clearly define the requirements of LSAB membership to include the use of deputies and the potential for co-opted members and quoracy for decision making.

43. If LSAB creates a Strategic Plan and resulting priorities it should then be possible to fund sub-group activity accordingly, which would then add support to defining and clarifying the Board's priorities and ensuring targets are achievable, realistic and affordable. These priorities could then be transposed into the current business plan which would then be used to formulate a work programme for the sub-groups. This would give clearer guidance for the sub-groups and ensure no work is duplicated.

Performance

Strengths

- The use of a single template for data collection from partners is a clear strength

Areas for consideration

- Performance information needs to inform strategic priorities
- Ensure that sub-group activity follows strategic planning with clear achievable outcomes
- A clear Strategic Plan should improve the content and structure of the Annual Report which needs to have readability
- Awareness and deployment of VARM could be improved across the partnership

44. Due to the differing footprints of local services and organisations some of the LSAB partners also sit on the Leicestershire Safeguarding Adults Board and thus are faced with significant demands on their capacity. This is recognised by both Boards, who work together to reduce some of this burden by sharing some sub-groups within a governance structure and use the single template for data collection, which is a clear strength.

45. As part of the key messages of this report the creation of a strategic plan from which all other LSAB business flows should also lead to the collection of performance information that in turn informs the strategic priorities. Furthermore is it important to ensure that sub-group activity follows strategic planning with clear achievable outcomes and lastly that a clear strategic plan should improve the content and structure of the Annual Report that also needs to have greater readability.

46. Awareness of Vulnerable Adult Risk Management (VARM) policy could be improved across the partnership to ensure it works as a risk management tool to better support practitioners working with individuals who exhibit "risky" behaviour. All agencies should be aware of the VARM process and how to access it to support those individuals who are at risk but do not meet the requirements for a Section 42 safeguarding referral.

Safeguarding Adults Board resources

1. LGA Safeguarding Adults resources web page

<http://www.local.gov.uk/topics/social-care-health-and-integration/adult-social-care/safeguarding-resources>

2. Safeguarding Adults Board resources including the Independent Chairs Network, Governance arrangements of SABs and a framework to support improving effectiveness of SABs

<http://www.local.gov.uk/topics/social-care-health-and-integration/adult-social-care/resources-safeguarding-adults-boards>

3. LGA Adult Safeguarding Knowledge Hub Community of Practice – contains relevant documents and discussion threads

<https://khub.net/web/adultsafeguardingcommunityofpractice>

4. Adult Safeguarding Peer Challenge

<http://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/peer-challenges/peer-challenges-we-offer/safeguarding-adults-and-adult-social-care>

5. Making links between adult safeguarding and domestic abuse

<http://www.local.gov.uk/topics/social-care-health-and-integration/adult-social-care/safeguarding-and-domestic-abuse>

6. Making Safeguarding Personal

<http://www.local.gov.uk/topics/social-care-health-and-integration/adult-social-care/making-safeguarding-personal>

7. Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) pages on safeguarding.

<http://www.scie.org.uk/adults/safeguarding/index.asp>

Contact details

For more information about this Safeguarding Adults Board Peer Challenge at Leicester please contact:

Marcus Coulson

Programme Manager – Adults Peer Challenges

Local Government Association

Email: marcus.coulson@local.gov.uk

Tel: 07766 252 853

Read the Adults Peer Challenge Reports here: <http://www.local.gov.uk/peer-challenges-adult-peer-reviews-reports>

Appendix 1 – Safeguarding Adults Board Improvement Tool

Overview

There are four key themes for the standards, with a number of sub-headings as follows:

Themes	Outcomes for, and the experiences of, people who use services	Leadership, Strategy and Working Together	Commissioning, Service Delivery and Effective Practice	Performance and Resource Management
Elements	<p>1. Outcomes</p> <p>2. People’s experiences of safeguarding</p> <p>This theme looks at what difference to outcomes for people there has been in relation to Adult Safeguarding and the quality of experience of people who have used the services provided</p>	<p>3 Collective Leadership</p> <p>4.Strategy</p> <p>5 Local Safeguarding Board</p> <p>This theme looks at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the overall vision for Adult Safeguarding the strategy that is used to achieve that vision how this is led the role and performance of the Local Safeguarding Board how all partners work together to ensure high quality services and outcomes 	<p>6. Commissioning</p> <p>7. Service Delivery and effective practice</p> <p>This theme looks the role of commissioning in shaping services, and the effectiveness of service delivery and practice in securing better outcomes for people</p>	<p>8. Performance and resource management</p> <p>This theme looks at how the performance and resources of the service, including its people, are managed</p>

Safeguarding Adults Board Improvement Tool here: <http://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/adult-safeguarding-improv-ddd.pdf>