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1. Purpose

To provide a firm foundation for the initiation of the project. It is the basis of the Project Initiation Document, which gives the direction and scope of the project and forms the 'contract' between the project team and the LondonADASS programme team. Any significant change to the material contained in the Project Brief will thus need to be referred to the LondonADASS programme team.

2. Background

Adult safeguarding is the process of protecting adults with care and support needs from abuse or neglect (hereafter referred to as “adults”). It is an important part of what many public services do, but the key responsibility is with local authorities in partnership with the police and the NHS. The Care Act 2014 puts adult safeguarding on a legal footing and from April 2015 each local authority must:

- Make enquiries, or ensure others do so, if it believes an adult is subject to, or at risk of, abuse or neglect. An enquiry should establish whether any action needs to be taken to stop or prevent abuse or neglect, and if so, by whom
- Set up a Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) with core membership from the local authority, the Police and the NHS (specifically the local Clinical Commissioning Group/s) and the power to include other relevant bodies
- Arrange, where appropriate, for an independent advocate to represent and support an adult who is the subject of a safeguarding enquiry or Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) where the adult has ‘substantial difficulty’ in being involved in the process and where there is no other appropriate adult to help them
- Cooperate with each of its relevant partners in order to protect adults experiencing or at risk of abuse or neglect.

It also updates the scope of adult safeguarding:

Where a local authority has reasonable cause to suspect that an adult in its area (whether or not ordinarily resident there) –

a. Has needs for care and support (whether or not the authority is meeting any of those needs),
b. Is experiencing, or is at risk of, abuse or neglect, and (c) as a result of those needs is unable to protect himself or herself against the abuse or neglect or the risk of it.

The Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) programme has been running since 2010. The Care Act 2014 guidance required adult safeguarding practice to be person led and outcome focused, aiming towards resolution or recovery. This embodies the MSP approach. During 2014/15 the programme was mainstreamed. All local authorities were supported to develop plans focused on implementing the MSP approach to adult safeguarding. This was achieved through regional workshops and direct contact with the MSP project support team.
The 2014/15 MSP programme was evaluated by Research in Practice for Adults (RiPfA), commissioned by the Local Government Association (LGA), who published their report in 2015 (Pike & Walsh, 2015). It indicated that many areas were still in the early stages of their MSP journey. Some councils focused on implementing the broader approaches to the Care Act 2014 which led to them putting MSP on hold.

Given the questions raised by the RiPfA 2015 evaluation and other concerns about quantity and quality of safeguarding alerts and referrals, ADASS commissioned a national 'Temperature Check' in early 2016 to:

- Measure progress towards full implementation of MSP
- Gather information and views from safeguarding leads in order to shape the 2016/17 safeguarding development programme
- Offer reflective coaching and expert advice to MSP leads in local authorities

Findings were published in July 2016 https://www.adass.org.uk/media/5453/making-safeguarding-personal-temperature-check-2016.pdf and included responses from 76% of English Local Authorities. When compared to previous MSP evaluations, the results highlighted the progress that had been achieved over the last few years. The vast majority of those interviewed had built MSP into their mainstream services and were achieving better outcomes for people needing care and support who had experienced abuse or neglect.

Within London, 26 out of 33 local authorities were included within the survey. The national report recommended (Recommendation 20) that ‘the remaining Councils that were not part of this temperature check should have a temperature check conversation during 2016/17 and, together with feedback collected in this report, this would inform regional programmes for sharing, developing and improving safeguarding practice and multi-agency working and support further embedding of the MSP approach’.

In order to implement Recommendation 20, a paper was presented to the London SAB meeting (12/01/2016) seeking approval to commission MSP temperature checks in the seven London local authorities that were not included within the national report and collate the findings within a London report. This was approved by the Board and this project brief aims to implement the London SAB decision.

3. Project Definition

3.1 Aim:

To undertake one hour coaching interviews (temperature checks) with the MSP lead nominated by the relevant DASS in each of the remaining 7 local authorities in London, scribe the findings from each of the 7 interviews, thematically analyse the findings and then produce a London report drawing on the findings from each of the 33 London local authorities.

3.2 Scope

The following should be addressed in the report:
The report must capture regional analysis of progress towards full implementation of MSP by each of the 33 local authorities.

The report must also include a comparison of London against the national position.

The report must clearly set out specific recommendations.

In order to capture the relevant data to include within the regional report, the following should be addressed in the telephone interviews (each interview approximately one hour duration) – see appendix 1 for more details:

- Progress implementing MSP
- Impact of MSP on people experiencing safeguarding
- Staff and practice
- Recording systems
- Evaluation of outcomes and performance monitoring
- Strengths and good practice

The telephone interviews must also:

- Gather information and views from safeguarding leads in order to shape the 2016/17 regional safeguarding development programme
- Offer reflective coaching and expert advice to the interviewee

### 3.3 Deliverables

The key deliverables will be

- Coaching interviews completed with the MSP leads in each of the remaining 7 local authorities
- Transcripts of the seven interviews
- Thematic analysis of the findings from the 33 local authorities (collation of the data will be provided by a third party)
- Regional report similar format to the recently published national report with clear recommendations for London

### 3.4 Support provided by LondonADASS

LondonADASS programme team will provide the following support to the project:

- Identify the MSP lead in each of the 7 local authorities
- Organise the interviews
- Oversee the collation of the findings from the 7 interviews with the data already collected from the 26 local authorities that participated in the national study

### 4. Project Approach

#### 4.1 Delivery mechanism

The following outlines how the project will be delivered:
• It is proposed that an external consultancy resource is secured to undertake the interviews, transcribe the findings, thematic analyse the data and write the report.

Key Tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake interviews</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribe the findings from the 7 interviews</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the data into excel spreadsheet</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematically analyse the findings</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Initial Report</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Cost

Total number of days: please confirm with submission

Daily rate: please confirm within submission

5 Risks

Any risks which are identified during the lifetime of the project will be transferred to the risk register within the project workbook when it is generated.
Appendix 1: MSP INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Preamble:

Explain that this is about us learning about their experience with developing MSP to date in order to inform a programme of support for MSP for 2016/17. We hope it will give you the chance to take stock of where you are up to and what the next steps might be for you. The conversation may offer the chance for me to offer input from experience of the MSP programme elsewhere.

This is not a league table/competition. It is simply about seeing where the benefits of MSP are being realised and where the challenges that may need support are. We will not feed back to your LA/SAB anything that you tell me and Local Authority areas will not be identified as a matter of course in the feedback from these interviews. However, would you be happy for us to share good practice examples that you offer?

MSP Lead for the Local Authority (specify)
Click here to enter text.

Which Local Authority area do you represent?
Click here to enter text.

In what capacity do you represent the Local Authority? (areas of responsibility)
Click here to enter text.

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

Q1: What does MSP mean to you? (PROMPTS: Is there agreement among partners on what MSP means? Does your workforce understand and share the meaning of MSP? What has the organisation and/or Board used to reach a common understanding e.g. MSP literature, the statutory guidance...was anything particularly helpful?)
Click here to enter text.

Q2: How would you describe where MSP fits into your organisation’s strategies? (Use categories as prompts and then choose one)
☐ The overriding strategic objective
☐ One of our main strategic objectives
☐ A particular task among a collection of others
☐ It isn’t in the strategy
☐ We don’t yet have a strategy
☐ Other (please specify)
Click here to enter text.

PROMPT: What about in the SAB’s strategy?
Click here to enter text.
**Q3: How well is MSP engaged with at various levels?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/partnership/board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate within your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4: How involved have the agencies listed below been in using an MSP approach in your Local Authority's area?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Fairly involved</th>
<th>Not very involved</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Too soon to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Adult Social Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Council departments, e.g. trading standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specialist NHS provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify other organisation, e.g. prisons, fire service, probation:

Click here to enter text.
SECTION 2: MEASURING OUTCOMES

Q5a: Are people who experience safeguarding processes asked about what outcomes they want?
☐ Yes
☐ Partly
☐ No
Comments:
If yes: Is there evidence that this drives deeper engagement of people in achieving those outcomes and to what extent?
If partly: To what extent?
If no: what are you doing to bring about this change?
Click here to enter text.

Q5b: What mechanisms exist, in addition to individual feedback through safeguarding work, for the service user voice to be heard in respect of safeguarding adults? (e.g. links from a service user forum to the Safeguarding Board)?
[Prompt - This question is here because in the bid we say, We would contact local groups or organisations separately to ask them their views on experiences of safeguarding in their localities and about the mechanisms that exist to feed these back, e.g. to the Local Authority or Safeguarding Adults Board. Asking this question will help identify any groups/forums we could speak with.]
Click here to enter text.

Q6: Has your organisation and/or SAB made the shift to measuring how you are making a difference to people’s lives? (Prompts – e.g. outcome measures reported; a dashboard/score card which shows key outcomes)
☐ Yes
☐ Partly
☐ No
Comments:
If yes, then briefly describe how it does it and would you be willing to share it with other organisations?
If partly, then what do you need to complete this shift?
If no, then what would help the SAB to achieve this shift?
Click here to enter text.

Q7: Have you changed any of your reporting and recording systems to implement MSP?
☐ Yes
☐ No
If yes, then which systems and in what ways?
(Prompts - IT systems, case files, referral routes, assessment systems, safeguarding specific forms/processes, etc.)
If no, how far are you in your planning to update them?
☐ Almost there
☐ About halfway there
☐ Just starting
☐ Not yet started
What is hindering you and what would help to move it on?

SECTION 3: IMPACT

Q8a: What level of impact do you think the MSP approach has had on the experience of people who use safeguarding services in your area?

Q8b: How confident are you that you can measure/are measuring that impact?
☐ Totally confident
☐ Reasonably confident
☐ Partially confident
☐ Not very confident
☐ We’re not measuring it at all

Q9: In what areas, if any, have you changed or developed your practice in safeguarding due to involvement in MSP?

Q10: What is your organisation and/or your Board doing to develop staff and promote MSP?
(Prompts - what have you tried/what have you learned? Are there any specific practice tools you have used or areas of training that have been important in promoting MSP?; What are the key areas of focus for workforce development?)

Q11: What are the strengths of your MSP implementation? (Prompt: what factors have most helped you to successfully use an MSP approach in your area?)
Q12: What are the blockages to implementation and what would help to remove these blocks?

[Prompts e.g.: lack of people; lack of financial resources; organisational churn and recruitment issues social work teams not on board or too hard pressed in other areas of work; lack of management/leadership support; lack of political support; lack of support from other services in council e.g. IT, Human Resources/Training partnership problems SAB not playing its part]

Is there anything in particular you want to highlight?

Click here to enter text.

Q13: Broadly, how have social work staff reacted to the culture change needed to implement the MSP approach in your area?

☐ Very positively
☐ Fairly positively
☐ Not very positively
☐ Not at all positively
☐ Don’t know
☐ Too soon to tell

Follow up question:
What would help to make their reaction more positive?

OR
Why do you believe the reaction has been positive?

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 4: COACHING

Q14: How can you take MSP forward in your position?

(Prompts: What ideas do you have to take MSP forward? What would help you?; Give any advice or information that would help the respondent to make this happen?)

Click here to enter text.

Q15: What single thing would really help to advance MSP within your organisation?

Click here to enter text.

Q16: What would you like to see in the 2016/17 safeguarding development programme?

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 5: SELF EVALUATION

Q17: Now, having completed the interview, how would you rate your organisation’s achievement of MSP at the moment?
(Prompt - ensure that we say this is not hierarchical and is not a scale of 1-6. It is a description of where the council area has got to).

Select one of the following categories:

☐ A) Fully implemented
☐ B) Planning completed and rolling out
☐ C) Roll out currently stalled
☐ D) Piloting and testing stage
☐ E) Still developing and planning
☐ F) Have not yet really started

INTERVIEWER EVALUATION: State where you see the LA on the A-F scale and briefly describe your reason.

☐ A) Fully implemented
☐ B) Planning completed and rolling out
☐ C) Roll out currently stalled
☐ D) Piloting and testing stage
☐ E) Still developing and planning
☐ F) Have not yet really started

Briefly describe your reasons:

Click here to enter text.