Factors				Guidance and considerations		
1. Vulnerability of the	Less More		_	Does the adult have needs for care and	Does the person lack mental capacity?	
adult at risk	vulnerable vulnerable		rable	support?	 Is the person dependent on the alleged 	
				Can the adult protect themselves?	perpetrator?	
				Does the adult have the communication skills	Has the alleged victim been threatened or	
				to raise an alert?	coerced into making decisions?	
The abusive act Less serious More Serious		Questions 2-9 relate to the abusive act and/or th	- , ,			
	1000 0011000			likely to be dealt with at initial enquiry stage only, whilst the more serious concerns will progress to		
				further stages in the safeguarding adults process.		
2. Seriousness of	Low	Low Significant Critical Refer to t		Refer to the table overleaf. Look at the relevant	categories of abuse and use your knowledge of the	
Abuse	LOW		Critical	case and your professional judgement to gauge the seriousness of concern.		
3. Patterns of abuse	Isolated	Recent abuse	Repeated	• Most local areas have an escalation policy in place e.g. where safeguarding adults procedures will		
	incident	in an ongoing	abuse	·	r of concerns in a specific time period. Please refer	
		relationship		to local guidance.		
4. Impact of abuse on		Some impact	Serious	Impact of abuse does not necessarily correspond to the extent of the abuse – different people will		
victims	No impact	but not long-	long-lasting	, i i		
		lasting	impact	impact of the abuse.		
5. Impact on others	No one else Others Others			Other people may be affected by the abuse of another adult. • Are relatives or other residents/service users are distressed or affected by the abuse?		
	affected	indirectly	directly		•	
C. Jutant of allowed		affected	affected	Are other people intimidated and/or their environment affected? Are other people intimidated and/or their environment affected?		
6. Intent of alleged	l lociosta o ala al /		Dalibanata /	 Is the act/omission a violent/serious unprofessional response to difficulties in caring? Is the act/omission planned and deliberately malicious? Is the act a breach of a profession 		
perpetrator	Unintended/ ill-informed	Opportunistic	Deliberate/ Targeted	of conduct?	lalicious? Is the act a breach of a professional code	
	III-IIIIOITIIeu		rargeteu	*The act/omission doesn't have to be intentional to meet safeguarding criteria		
7. Illegality of actions	Bad practice		Serious	Seek advice from the Police if you are unsure if a crime has been committed.		
7. Inegality of actions	- not illegal	Criminal act	criminal act	ŕ		
8. Risk of repeated				Is the act/omission poor or bad practice (but not illegal) or is it clearly a crime? Is the abuse loss likely to resurry with significant changes of a training supervision results.		
abuse on victim	Unlikely to	Possible to	Likely to	 Is the abuse less likely to recur with significant changes e.g. training, supervision, respite, support or very likely even if changes are made and/or more support provided? 		
abase on victim	recur	recur	recur	support of very fixely even if changes are ma	de and/or more support provided:	
9. Risk of repeated	Are others (adults and/or children) at risk of being abused:				ng abused:	
abuse on others	Others not at	Possibly at risk	Others at	• Very unlikely?		
	risk		serious risk			

Types of abuse and seriousness	Concerns may be notified to the Local Authority but these are likely to be managed at Initial Enquiry stage only. Professional judgement or concerns of repeated low level harm will progress to further stages in the safeguarding adults process.	Concerns of a significant nature will receive additional scrutiny, and progress further, under safeguarding adults procedures. Some examples of significant harm include criminal offences which will need to be referred to the Police.	Concerns of a critical nature will receive additional scrutiny, and progress further, under safeguarding adults procedures. The Police will need to be contacted.
	Low	Significant	Critical
Physical	 Staff error causing no/little harm e.g. friction mark on skin due to ill-fitting hoist sling. Minor events that still meet criteria for 'incident reporting' accidents. Medication Adult does not receive prescribed medication (missed/wrong dose) on one occasion – no harm occurs. Isolated incident involving service on service user. Inexplicable marking found on one occasion. Minor event where users lack capacity. Medication Recurring missed medication or administration errors that cause no harm. 	 Inexplicable marking or lesions, cuts or grip marks on a number of occasions. Accumulations of minor incidents. Medication Recurring missed medication or errors that affect more than one adult and/or result in harm. Inexplicable food, drinks or aids to independence. Inexplicable fractures/injuries. Assault. Medication Deliberate maladministration of medications. Covert administration without proper medical authorisation. Potential serious consequences or harm occurs. 	 Grievous bodily harm/assault with a weapon leading to irreversible damage or death. Medication Pattern of recurring errors or an incident of deliberate maladministration that results in ill-health or death.
Sexual	Isolated incident of Minimal verbal	Recurring sexualised Attempted penetration by any	Sex in a relationship
(including	teasing or low-level sexualised teasing or	touching or isolated or means (whether or not it occurs	characterised by authority
sexual exploitation)	unwanted sexualised banter. attention (verbal or touching) directed at one adult by another whether or not capacity exists.	recurring masturbation without consent. • Voyeurism without consent • Being subject to indecent exposure. • Grooming including via the internet and social media. within a relationship) without consent. • Being made to look at pornographic material against will/where consent cannot be given.	inequality or exploitation e.g. receiving something in return for carrying out a sexual act. • Sex without consent (rape).
Psychological/ Emotional	 Isolated incident where adult is spoken to in a rude or inappropriate way – respect is undermined but no/little distress caused. Occasional taunts or verbal outburst. Withholding of information to disempower. 	 Treatment that undermines dignity and esteem. Denying or failing to recognise adult's choice or opinion. Humiliation. Emotional blackmail e.g. threats or abandonment/harm. Frequent and frightening verbal outbursts or harassment. 	 Denial of basic human rights/civil liberties, over- riding advance directive. Prolonged intimidation. Vicious/personalised verbal attacks.

	Low		Significant		Critical
Financial	 Staff personally benefit from users funds e.g. accrue 'reward' points on their own store loyalty cards when shopping. Money not recorded safely and properly. 	 Adult not routinely involved in decisions about how their money is spent or kept safe – capacity in this respect is not properly considered. Non-payment of care fees not impacting on care. 	 Adult's monies kept in a joint bank account – unclear arrangements for equitable sharing of interest. Adult denied access to his/her own funds or possessions. 	 Misuse/misappropriation of property or possessions of benefits by a person in a position of trust or control. Personal finance removed from adult's control. Ongoing non-payment of care fees putting a person's care at risk. 	 Fraud/exploitation relating to benefits, income, property or will. Theft.
Neglect	 Isolated missed home care visit where no harm occurs. Adult is not assisted with a meal/drink on one occasion and no harm occurs. Adult not bathed as often as would like – possible complaint. 	 Inadequacies in care provision that lead to discomfort or inconvenience- no harm occurs e.g. being left wet occasionally. Not having access to aids to independence. 	 Recurrent missed home care visits where risk of harm escalates, or one miss where harm occurs. Hospital discharge without adequate planning and harm occurs. 	Ongoing lack of care to the extent that health and wellbeing deteriorate significantly e.g. pressure wounds, dehydration, malnutrition, loss of independence/confidence.	 Failure to arrange access to lifesaving services or medical care. Failure to intervene in dangerous situations where the adult lacks the capacity to assess risk.
Self-Neglect	Incontinence leading to health concerns	• Isolated/ occasional reports about unkempt personal appearance or property which is out of character or unusual for the person.	 Multiple reports of concerns from multiple agencies Behaviour which poses a fire risk to self and others Poor management of finances leading to risks to health, wellbeing or property 	Ongoing lack of care or behaviour to the extent that health and wellbeing deteriorate significantly e.g. pressure sores, wounds, dehydration, malnutrition	 Failure to seek lifesaving services or medical care where required. Life in danger if intervention is not made in order to protect the individual.
Organisational (any one or combination of the other forms of abuse)	 Lack of stimulation/ opportunities for people to engage in social and leisure activities Service users not given sufficient voice or involve in the running of the service 	 Denial of individuality and opportunities for service user to make informed choice and take responsible risks Care-planning documentation not person-centred 	Rigid/inflexible routines Service user's dignity is undermined e.g. lack of privacy during support with intimate care needs, sharing under-clothing	 Bad/poor practice not being reported and going unchecked Unsafe and unhygienic living environments 	 Staff misusing their position of power over service users Over-medication and/or inappropriate restraint used to manage behaviour Widespread consistent ill- treatment

	Significant		Critical
ent of ated by citudes dult's ferences cere planning that fails to address an adult's specific diversity associated needs for a short period Occasional taunts	 Inequitable access to service provision as a result of a diversity issue. Recurring failure to meet specific care/support needs associated with diversity. 	 Being refused access to essential services. Denial of civil liberties e.g. voting, making a complaint. Humiliation or threats on a regular basis, recurring taunts. 	 Hate crime resulting in injury/emergency medical treatment/fear for life. Hate crime resulting in serious injury or attempted murder/honour-based violence.
s about modern slavery are deemed to ificant/critical level.	 Limited freedom of movement. Being forced to work for little or no payment. Limited or no access to medical and dental care. No access to appropriate benefits. 	 Limited access to food or shelter. Be regularly moved (trafficked) to avoid detection. Removal of passport or ID documents. 	 Sexual exploitation. Starvation. Organ harvesting. No control over movement / imprisonment. Forced marriage.
ent of Occasional taunts or verbal outbursts	 Inexplicable marking or lesions, cuts or grip marks on a number of occasions Alleged perpetrator exhibits controlling behaviour Limited access to medical and dental care 	 Accumulations of minor incidents Frequent verbal/physical outbursts No access/control over finances Stalking Relationship characterised by imbalance of power 	 Threats to kill, attempts to strangle choke or suffocate Sex without consent (rape). Forced marriage. Female Genital Mutilation (FGM). Honour based violence.
SH Ris	k Assessment Checklist should be		The latter was a second and a second as a

Appendix A

Further guidance on using the risk threshold tool

Purpose

The risk threshold tool has been developed to assist practitioners in assessing the seriousness and level of risk associated with a safeguarding adults concern. It is primarily for use by Safeguarding Adults Managers, in the Local Authority, to assist with their decision-making at the point of receiving a safeguarding adults concern; however others may find it helpful to refer to this tool when responding to a concern of abuse or neglect. The aim is to ensure that everyone understands the threshold consideration. The tool is not intended to replace professional judgement.

A clear threshold and process, together with a common understanding across local partnerships and agencies will improve consistency. A number of reasons are provided to support the need for a threshold tool. These include:

- A benchmark to assess the level of vulnerability of an individual;
- A measure of consistency;
- Managing the demand of low, significant, and critical level concerns.

Consistency

There is a need for a consistent approach to safeguarding adults. Appropriate thresholds are seen as a good way to achieve this. The risk threshold is clearly explained in the multi-agency procedures and in learning and development opportunities. Practitioners are encouraged to use their professional judgement and to consider each case on an individual basis. Additional processes may need to be considered for some sections of the community who are harder to reach.

The Care Act

The Care Act statutory guidance states that:

"Local Authorities must make enquiries, or cause others to do so, if they reasonably suspect an adult:


- Has needs for care and support (whether or not the local authority is meeting any of those needs) and;
- Is experiencing, or at risk of, abuse and neglect; and
- As a result of those care and support needs is unable to protect themselves from either the risk of, or the experience of abuse or neglect."

There is no longer a "significant harm" threshold for action under safeguarding adults procedures. However, any actions taken must be proportionate to the level of presenting risk or harm and be driven by the desired outcomes of the adult or their representative. Referring agencies need to use their professional judgement, consider the views of the adult at risk and where appropriate, seek consent for sharing information on a multi-agency basis.

If a decision is made **not** to refer to the Local Authority, the individual agency must make a record of the concern and any action taken. Concerns should be recorded in such a way that repeated, low level harm incidents are easily identified and subsequently referred. Not referring under safeguarding adults procedures, does not negate the need to report internally or to regulators/commissioners as appropriate.

Where a concern is referred on a multi-agency basis, a Local Authority Safeguarding Adults Manager will then use the Risk Threshold Tool to determine whether safeguarding adults procedures will continue beyond the Initial Enquiry stage.

The following diagram highlights the different stages of a Safeguarding Adults (Section 42) Enquiry:



Managing the different levels of harm

In order to manage the large volume of concerns which come under safeguarding adults policy and procedures, there is a need to differentiate between those concerns relating to low level harm/risk and those that are more serious. Whilst it is likely that concerns relating to low level harm/risk will not progress beyond an initial enquiry stage, the concern will be recorded by the Local Authority and proportionate action taken to manage the risks that have been identified. This may include: provision of information or advice; referral to another agency or professional; assessment of care and support needs. The sharing of low level concerns helps the Local Authority to understand any emerging patterns or trends that may need to be taken into consideration when deciding whether safeguarding adults procedures need to continue.

The practice tool

The risk threshold tool has been designed to consider both the vulnerability of the adult at risk, the seriousness of the abuse that is occurring, the impact of the abuse and the risk of it recurring.

Regular, low level concerns can amount to a far higher level of concern which then requires more in-depth investigation or assessment under safeguarding adults procedures. Each local area has an escalation policy in place to aid professional judgement in these circumstances. This means that a specified number of safeguarding adults concerns reported to the Local Authority in a specified timeframe will result in further action under safeguarding adults procedures. Please refer to each area's policy and procedure.

The tool is not designed in way in which further actions are determined by achieving a score or a specified number of ticks. It is there to provide guidance and key considerations for practitioners who are assessing and managing risk.