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Adult safeguarding in England

• Local Authorities (LAs) - lead agencies
• The Care Act 2014 creates a *duty* on LAs to:
  – ‘make enquiries, or ensure others do so, if it believes an adult is, or is at risk of, abuse or neglect.’ (Care Act Statutory Guidance, 2014 p192)
• However, still no prescription on **how** Local authorities (LAs) organise adult safeguarding
Methods: narrative synthesis

• Phase 1
  – Research review
    • Qualitative data valued
    • Social work & social policy literature
    • ADASS / CQC
    • From 2000 (No Secrets)
Models of Safeguarding: Key questions

• Literature review:
  – How have models of adult safeguarding been addressed in the research literature and other evidence?
  – What distinct organisational models of safeguarding can be identified?
  – What are the key variables between any different models?
  – What outcomes are linked to different models of safeguarding?
### Searching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Refined search</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Any article referring to adult safeguarding / adult protection / adult abuse / elder abuse</td>
<td>Where searches produced large numbers of results (for example ‘elder abuse’ a combined search was developed using these terms:</td>
<td>• Abuse • Adult services • Alert • Case conference • Decision Making • Intervention • Investigation • Local authorities • Multi-agency working • Organisation • Outcome • Protection plan • Referral • Response • Risk • Strategy • Structures • Thresholds • Training</td>
<td>• Literature pre 2000 • Safeguarding Children • Self-neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>• Investigation • Outcomes • Referral • Intervention / response • Organisation • Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any article referring to safeguarding activity (as above) but regarding specific groups (‘elder’, learning disabilit*, physical disabilit*, mental health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Search results from electronic databases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially relevant</th>
<th>Included in initial analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic databases:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIA</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycinfo</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingenta</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Online</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Abstracts</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hand searched journals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Adult Protection</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Directors of Adult Social Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Quality Commission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Institute of Excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snowballed references</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined results</strong></td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After duplicates removed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retrieval and relevance:

• Does the publication explore or describe the organisation of adult safeguarding?

• Does the source make reference to the process of safeguarding investigations/enquiries?

• Does the source make reference to:
  – the outcomes (results) of safeguarding investigations
  OR
  – factors that may influence the outcomes of safeguarding investigations?
### Final inclusions and exclusions by relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Included in review</th>
<th>Excluded after reading</th>
<th>Not found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1*-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal articles</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books &amp; Book Chapters</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; guidance material</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two primary studies were found:

Cambridge et al. (2006) Exploring the incidence, nature and responses to adult safeguarding referrals.


- Degree of specialism
- Decision making & Thresholds
- Multi-agency working
- Outcomes & Survivor experience
Degree of Specialism

• Continuum – embedded specialist

• Adult Protection Coordinator: various incarnations
  – APC – Kent and Medway: high referrals / institutional / create consistency / improve MA working
  – APC – ADASS: specialist advice / chairing meetings / monitoring
  – US – specialist elder financial abuse teams
Decision-making and thresholds: Factors

Self-determination
- Protection

Organisational impacts
- Shifting interpretations

Likelihood of substantiation
- Poor practice?

Ascribed vulnerability

Referral rates noted to vary by specialism and seniority
Multi-agency working

- Poor communication
- Ambiguity: Roles and Responsibilities
- Housing
- Specialist Roles
- MASH

Positive outcomes
Outcomes

• Traditionally judged by substantiation / monitoring / NFA Safety in Care Act
• Timing – length of investigation
• Monitoring – different for different groups

• APC role explored (Cambridge et al 2006):
  – Association between APC role and likelihood of an investigation in institutional settings
  – Associated with a substantiated outcome
  – Associated with increased joint working
  – Associated with decreased likelihood of insufficient evidence and NFA outcomes
  – Associated with increased monitoring and post abuse work.
Key findings

• Safeguarding as a concept is evolving
• Degree and nature of specialism important
• Gaps in the literature remain:
  
  – How do models of practice impact upon the process and outcomes of investigations?
  – The experience of being perceived as an ‘adult at risk’
  – The impact of the different approaches on the workforce
  – The development of the relationships necessary for effective multi-agency working
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