

Meeting:	Adult Protection Committee
Meeting date:	15 June 2022
Title:	Social Work Case File Audit
Report Author:	Ian Thomson, Head of Service

1 Purpose

This report is presented to the Committee for:

- Assurance
- Discussion

This report relates to:

- A case file audit of 32 social work files which were read at the end of December 2021. These were read by 6 social workers and the results were recorded on a Care Inspectorate template
- Of the 32 files:
 - 11 cases were terminated after an ASP1&2 Assessment (Initial Inquiry)
 - 10 cases included an ASP3 Assessment (Investigation)
 - 9 cases included an ASP4 Assessment (Case Conference)
 - 2 cases included an ASP5 Assessment (Review Case Conference)

2 Findings summary

2.1 Duty to Inquire?

- 31 of 32 files audited were assessed to have carried out an appropriate duty to inquire – 97%
- 31 of 32 files audited were assessed to have had an outcome of the duty to inquire which was in keeping with the needs of the individual – 97%
- 31 of 32 files audited were assessed to have had the “three point test” correctly applied – 97%
- 1 of 32 files audited was assessed not to have: carried out an appropriate duty to inquire; had an outcome in keeping with the needs of the individual; nor to have correctly applied the “three point test”.
- 10 of 11 files which stopped at ASP1&2 were assessed to have stopped appropriately.
- 1 of 11 files which stopped at ASP1&2 was assessed to have stopped inappropriately – it was considered that it should have progressed to a full Investigation/Risk Assessment

2.2 Investigation/Risk Assessment quality?

- 22 of 32 files audited included a full Investigation/Risk Assessment (ASP3)
- 22 of these 22 files were assessed to have risk issues relating to “a protection type risk”
- 22 of these 22 files were found to have a risk assessment on file.
- In 22 of these 22 files it was assessed that the timing of the risk assessment was in keeping with the needs of the individual.
- The quality of the 22 risk assessments were graded as follows:
 - 1 – Unsatisfactory (1)
 - 4 – Adequate (3)
 - 7 – Good (4)
 - 6 – Very Good (5)
 - 4 – Excellent (6)
- The average grading across the 22 files was 4.42.

2.3 Sharing Information?

- 29 of 32 files audited evidenced that partners were sharing information
- 1 of 32 files audited did not evidence that partners were sharing information.

2.4 Protection Planning?

- 19 of 22 files going to full Investigation had a Risk Management Plan in place.
- 2 of 22 files going to full Investigation did not have a Risk Management Plan in place – and this was assessed to be appropriate.
- 1 of 22 files going to full Investigation did not have a Risk Management Plan in place – however this was not considered appropriate.
- 20 of 22 cases were assessed as cases where all concerns regarding protection type risk had been dealt with well.
- 2 of 22 cases were assessed as cases where all concerns regarding protection type risk had not been dealt with well.
- The quality of the 19 Protection Plans were graded as follows
 - 3 – Adequate (3)
 - 7 – Good (4)
 - 4 – Very Good (5)
 - 5 - Excellent (6)
- The average grading across the 19 files was 4.64

2.4 Timescales?

- 31 of 32 cases rated demonstrated that the Duty to Inquire was either completed within timescales or in a timescale in keeping with the needs of the individual
- 1 of 32 cases was not rated against this category: however it did sit outwith timescales.

- 18 of 22 Investigations/Risk Assessments were either completed within timescales or in a timescale in keeping with the needs of the individual.
- 3 of 22 Investigations/Risk Assessments were neither completed within timescales nor in a timescale in keeping with the needs of the individual.
- In 1 of 22 files compliance with timescales was considered to be unclear.

- 8 of 8 files assessed were considered to have met timescales in relation to the review of the initial Case Conference.

2.5 Outcomes?

- 22 of 24 files assessed were considered to have demonstrated improved outcomes for the individual as a result of AP processes
- 2 of 24 files assessed were not considered to have demonstrated improved outcomes for the individual as a result of AP processes.
- The reasons cited for improved outcomes included:
 - Multi-agency working – 17
 - Social Work Involvement – 8
 - Police Involvement – 3
 - Individual's efforts – 2(Multiple factors were included in single cases).

3 Conclusion

In general terms: the duty to inquire is discharged appropriately, and the three-point test is properly applied in the great majority of cases. The quality of risk assessments and protection plans is good; and the timescale for work being done seems to be in keeping with the needs/risks of individuals. There is also evidence of good outcomes in most cases.

However, there was one file which caused the readers particular concern – and this was immediately addressed at a practice level. Here, the three-point test appeared to have been misapplied and the duty to inquire was not properly discharged. There was concern that the person's capacity (and with it their ability to protect

themselves) seemed to be assumed – whereas the readers considered there was significant doubt about this assumption.

There was one file where the risk-assessment was found to be unsatisfactory and two files where the protection plans put in place were not considered to have been comprehensive.

The Practice Improvement Sub-group is aware that there are issues arising from the Audit, and plans are currently being put in place to ensure that these are highlighted and discussed at the Social Work Team level.

Ian Thomson
Head of Service, ASC, QA