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A context of concern

- Two tier workforce
  - checked and unchecked (ISA and CRB)
  - trained and untrained
- Vulnerability and isolation of service users and carers
- Lack of intervention powers
- Easy prey
- Practitioners ‘policing’ roles
- Under protection and over protection
- Much articulated in the Consultation on the Review of *No Secrets*
'What aspects of safeguarding do we need to build into personalisation? What training, risk assessment and risk management should we use? Please tell us what you are doing locally and what more needs to be done?'
Question 5

‘What aspects of personalisation – greater independence, choice and control – can we build into safeguarding? How do we better reflect service users’ informed choices? How do we facilitate informed self-determination in risky situations and in the safeguarding process? How can we move forward on this agenda?’
Perceived areas of risk

- Poorer quality services
- Service users being overwhelmed by the need to manage the IB
  - If there’s a problem they can’t just ring us up and say, ‘Sort it’. Because if they’re actually employing the person, they’ve got to sort that out with whoever it is that’s supporting them to employ that person (Team manager people with learning disabilities team).
- IB used inappropriately and unproductively
More perceived areas of risk

- Hiring suitable and firing unsuitable workers
  - Are they able to deal with the problems of employing people that aren’t up to what they should be providing? (Care coordinator, people with learning disabilities)

- More open to physical and financial abuse
  - And I think we may have to consider with phenomena like domestic abuse could play a part in choosing to pay a family member. (ASCS)

- Loss of collective ‘voice’
Progress: Local policy development

- Increasing involvement of safeguarding professionals
  - Transforming Social Care
  - Local approaches to risk assessment
- Local Safeguarding policies under review
  - ...they will have IB at the forefront when they start reviewing the adult safeguarding policy’. (ASCS)
- IBs discussed with local Safeguarding Boards
- Definitions of ‘vulnerable people’ to include people using Direct Payments?
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Progress:
Local practice developments

- Publicity and information to people using services and general public eg use of local free newspaper
  - For example, on how to respond to allegations, seek advice and make a referral. (ASCS)

- Training for people using services and carers
  - We are setting up user groups to advise on the policies and we are going to other service users’ training on policy and categories of abuse’ (ASCS)
Progress: 
Local practice developments

- Following up complaints
- Decisions about payments for CRB and POVA checks for Direct Payment users
- Streamlining risk assessments and integrate all IB risk assessments
We found

- Parallel tracks – little engagement of the IB pilots with adult safeguarding
- Little building on adult safeguarding experiences among social workers
- This reflected some uncertainties around Direct Payments etc & duties of care
- Fears that raising safeguarding issues was at best reactionary, at worst subversive
What can be done?

- Converging of systems
- Mutual understanding of values
- Skills sharing between safeguarding and self-directed support
- No quick solutions or transfers (e.g., a Risk Enablement Panel)
- Meaningful practice guidance
- Revised policy and procedures
What aspects of safeguarding do we need to build into personalisation?

- Not a bolt on
- Risk and recording
- Finance is a fear
- Don’t neglect neglect
- Addressing carer issues (see Cooper et al BMJ 2009)
What training, risk assessment and risk management should we use?

- Training (actually skills development) is not the same as information
- An adult learning approach
- Ensure legalities are addressed
- Embed
- Multi-agency
- Local context
- Evaluate
Please tell us what you are doing locally & what more needs to be done?

- So this means monitoring? (how and who? And who pays?)
- Role of new regulator? (Care Quality Commission) and GSCC?
- Bricks without straw (yes, we mean resources)
- Will debates surface about rights of entry/intervention? (the Scottish experiment)
What aspects of personalisation – greater independence, choice & control – can we build into safeguarding?

What links a support plan with a safeguarding plan?

What links a best interests decision with a right to risk?

Who will stand up ‘come the inquiry’?

How are outcomes for people who are vulnerable built into safeguarding investigations?
How do we better reflect service users’ informed choices?

- Recording (being clear)
  - on paper? on video?
  - use of advance decision making processes?
- Best interests debates
- Learning from IMCAs and MHAs
- Duties of care
How can we move forward on this agenda?

- Not just a council affair
- Nor even statutory sector
- Way of revitalising adult safeguarding
- But there will be decisions about monitoring (over and under protection)
- And the safety net of social care may be tested.