# **Provider S42 Audit Form**

N	ame of Service User:		
	SWIFT ID:		
F	Relates to SV2 dated:		
Inv	restigation Undertaken by:		
1	Name of Practitioner:		
	Date of Audit:		
The	auditor must confirm the	e following outcomes of the investigation:	
No	Investigation Outcome		Tick as applicable
1	Allegation Not Upheld		
2	Allegation Partially Uphel	d	
3	Allegation Upheld		
No	Mental Capacity Outcor	ne	Tick as applicable
1	Mental Capacity- Assess	ed and Lacked Capacity	
2	Mental Capacity- Assessed and Not Lacking Capacity		
3	Mental Capacity- Not Assessed and Don't Know		
No	Outcomes		Tick as applicable
1	Outcomes were expresse	ed and were fully achieved	
2	Outcomes were expresse	ed and were not achieved	
3	Outcomes were expresse	ed and were partially achieved	
4	Outcomes were not expressed		
No	Advocacy Outcomes		Tick as applicable
1	Person had capacity and	was supported by family/friend	
2		was supported by paid advocate	
3	Person lacked capacity a	nd was supported by family/friend	
4		nd was supported by paid advocate	
	n pick		
1	expressed	asked about outcomes and no outcomes were	
2	Person or advocate was a expressed	asked about outcomes and outcomes were	
3		not asked about outcomes	
No	Risk Assessment Outco	omes	Tick as
4	Did I de la la c	T.	applicable
1	Risk Identified and Action		
2	Risk Identified and No Ad		
3	Risk Assessment Inconcl		
4	Assessment Inconclusive		<u> </u>
5	No Risk Identified and Ad		
6	No Risk Identified and No		<u> </u>
7	Enquiry Ceased at Individ	luals Request and No Action Taken	

Process	Criteria linked to process	Y/N	Comment/ Actions/ Guidance
General presentation	Person's name, date of birth and dates in relation to start date and finish dates recorded. All other names and contact details of who informed the enquiries recorded. Outline of the concern which has caused the enquiry.		
Risk assessment	Immediate action taken to minimise the risk to the adult and others where applicable. Explanation of what measures have been put in place to reduce future risks. Where applicable, rationale for how person causing harm remains fit to work and what measures are taken to provide assurance of this.		
Duty of Candour	Evidence of openness and transparency in the enquiry process. Responsibility to inform a person that they have been harmed by the provision of a care service and to offer an appropriate remedy regardless of whether a complaint has been made.		
Mental Capacity, and Consent	The person is involved in decision making. Advocate/family member support has been considered. Appropriate use of IMCA/ DoLS where required. The person must have an advocate if they lack mental capacity to understand the process of enquiry.		
Initial enquiries	Assurance that further safeguarding issues that come to light as a result of the enquiry, including those that require a response from the Police, are disclosed to the safeguarding team without delay.		

Process	Criteria linked to process	Y/N	Comment/ Actions/ Guidance
Safeguarding Plan	Have care and support plans been amended to reflect any changes and risks identified and mitigated.		
Outcome focused and person centred	The person/advocate is consulted about the outcome they want from the enquiry and it is recorded whether this outcome was met. They are included and kept up to date with the enquiry.		
Lessons Learnt	Lessons learnt are clearly documented with actions and timescales to address any further issues.		

#### **Outcomes**

### 1. Poor

Typically such cases fail to demonstrate an initial weighing up of risks and protective factors and little or no managerial oversight, they also lack a clear focus in terms of the Enquiry, and protection plans are weak with respect to who will do what and by when. Contingency planning is absent. Equalities issues will not have been considered. Inadequate cases are hard to follow, and often drift. Service users are not adequately involved and may be disempowered by the process. Service users may also be left at risk. Poor structure and language make them difficult to read.

## 2. Adequate

The initial response demonstrates that risks and protective factors have been considered, and that a manager has provided input the process. The Enquiry plan is purposeful, procedural timescales are adhered to and discussions and meetings are clearly recorded. The voice of the user is clear – or their representative/advocate. As appropriate, the service user has been safeguarded and outcomes are improving. Equalities issues will have been considered. There is evidence of a robust Safeguarding plan and timely and flexible intervention. The Safeguarding Plan has been reviewed. The approach is proportionate. The 'story' is relatively easy to follow.

#### 3. Good

All or many of the elements of an adequate case are present. In addition, the service user is central to the process and empowered. A focus on strengths and a personalised approach to safeguarding may be evident. The measures to reduce risk may well be innovative – they will clearly reflect the user's choices and preferences. There is clear evidence of review and follow through, and of managerial sign-off. Managerial input will be clear at all stages of the process. Recording will be clear, easy to follow and demonstrate a positive attitude towards risk (including, as appropriate, exploration with the service user of the potential benefits of any risk taking, and a clear weighing up of protective factors and strengths of the user or network). A degree of forensic rigour in the Enquiry is evident. As appropriate, advocacy, the IMCA service and specialist services/assessments will have played a part. Equalities issues will have been considered. There is evidence of improving outcomes for the service user. The investigator was properly supported throughout.

## 4. Excellent

All or many of the elements of a good case are present. In addition, excellent cases will evidence high quality, skilled, case work, networking with a range of agencies and professionals and the service user empowered as a full partner in the process. A focus on strengths and a personalised approach to safeguarding is evident. Excellent cases demonstrate, as appropriate, post-abuse work and continuous managerial oversight. Safeguarding work has been reviewed in supervision or through analysis and reflective practice and learning is evidenced. Any training and development needs are identified and acted on. Where the case has wider implications, lessons have been learnt, commissioners informed and as appropriate, vetting and barring referrals made; and also referral to CQC, Police etc. An evaluation of how prevention could have played a part and avoided abuse in the first place has taken place. The service user and other participants in the process have provided feedback on both process and outcomes.

Poor	
Adequate	
Good	
Excellent	

Res	nonse	to n	rovider
1/62	POHISE	to pi	Ovidei

No	Outcome	Tick as applicable				
1	We are satisfied that the incident(s) has been investigated thoroughly and with the outcome you have provided. There will be no further action from the safeguarding team.					
2	We are satisfied that the incident(s) has been investigated thoroughly and with the outcome you have provided. However, we would make the following recommendations based upon your investigation. (Add in box below). Please could you provide confirmation that these have been acknowledged and actioned by (Add date in box below)					
3	We are not satisfied that the incident(s) has been investigated thoroughly, based upon the report you have submitted. Please undertake the following (Add in the box below) and send to <a href="mailto:adult.protection@bedford.gov.uk">adult.protection@bedford.gov.uk</a> by (Add date in the box below).					
Ask	the provider to undertake the following and then re-send their investigation	ation:				
Any other observations/feedback on the investigation:						

Please complete this sheet and then pass to the Team Administrator