



Item No. 13

Meeting Date: Wednesday 10th October 2018

Glasgow City Integration Joint Board Finance and Audit Committee

Report By: Ann-Marie Rafferty, Assistant Chief Officer, Public Protection and Complex Needs

Contact: Liz Crichton, Service Manager, Adult Support and Protection

Tel: 0141 287 0040

ADULT PROTECTION JOINT SELF EVALUATION

Purpose of Report:	To advise members of the IJB Finance and Audit Committee of the HSCP planned annual self -evaluation activity into Adult Support and Protection, and to brief members on a report published by The Care Inspectorate in July 2018 outlining the findings of a thematic inspection undertaken into Adult Support and Protection in six partnership areas in Scotland.
---------------------------	--

Background/Engagement:	The HSCP carries out an annual Adult Protection Joint Self Evaluation.
-------------------------------	--

Recommendations:	The IJB Finance and Audit Committee is asked to: a) consider the information relating to the Joint Self Evaluation by the HSCP, GGCNHS and the Care Inspectorate; b) note the information contained in the Care Inspectorate Thematic Inspection Report and the intention to use the findings and recommendations to shape the scope of the planned HSCP self-evaluation; and c) request that the outcome of the planned self-evaluation is brought back to a future IJB Finance and Audit Committee.
-------------------------	--

Relevance to Integration Joint Board Strategic Plan:

Workforce planning, monitoring and review of the delivery of statutory duties directly noted in the Adult Support and Protection Act 2007 and any other relevant legislative duties.

Implications for Health and Social Care Partnership:

Reference to National Health & Wellbeing Outcome:	Workforce planning, monitoring and review of the delivery of statutory duties contained within the Adult Support and Protection Act 2007 and any other relevant legislative duties. Ensuring we reference and acknowledge the importance of working towards the nine National health and wellbeing outcomes.
Personnel:	Consider workforce planning to deliver these recommendations and developments.
Carers:	Consideration to the Carer's Act as fundamentally linked to supporting and protection of vulnerable adults at risk of harm and their families and unpaid carers.
Provider Organisations:	HSCP in partnership with other statutory agencies, third sector and voluntary organisations.
Equalities:	No implications
Financial:	No implications
Legal:	No implications
Economic Impact:	No implications.
Sustainability:	No implications
Sustainable Procurement and Article 19:	N/A
Risk Implications:	Failure to carry out regular self-evaluation activity could mean duties under Adult Support and Protection legislation are not being met.
Implications for Glasgow City Council:	Local Authorities have the lead role under the Adult Support and Protection Act 2007
Implications for NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde:	Delegated responsibilities to meet the Local Authorities duties under the Act.

1. Background

- 1.1 Glasgow Adult Support and Protection Committee in agreement with the partnership have made a commitment to undertake the necessary monitoring of our Adult Support and Protection processes, interventions, policies and procedures. We have made a commitment to evaluate and respond to the duties under the Adult Support and Protection Act to support adults who are at risk of harm. We have undertaken at least two self-evaluations annually since 2015.
- 1.2 From the findings of our previous evaluations we have ensured that any learning and development is taken forward. This applies to incorporating any learning into both our single agency training and multi-agency training and development. Whilst developing the training needs of our staff and partner agencies based on self-evaluations, and National Health and Wellbeing indicators we also consider any other National developments including Inspection findings. We will therefore be working this year in partnership with the Care Inspectorate to plan and take forward our annual self-evaluation.
- 1.3 Since 2015, we have used a model developed by Professor Hogg and Dr May on self-evaluation of Adult Protection interventions. However, it was agreed that this year we would use the Care Inspectorate model of reviewing Adult services and specifically Adult Support and Protection. This discussion took place prior to the Care Inspectorate's recently published thematic inspection report covering six partnership areas.

2. Care Inspectorate ASP Thematic Inspection

- 2.1 The Care Inspectorate undertook a Thematic Inspection of six partnerships across Scotland during 2017. This involved the Care Inspectorate and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary in Scotland inspecting adult support and protection activity in a number of partnership areas across Scotland. Healthcare Improvement Scotland was also involved in this exercise. This was the first time any of the Scottish scrutiny bodies had scrutinised adult support and protection. They focused on outcomes for adults at risk of harm, the partnerships actions to make sure adults at risk of harm were safe, protected, supported, involved, and consulted, as well as leadership for adult support and protection. The six adult protection partnerships inspected were selected to reflect the diverse geography and demography of Scotland.
[Link to 'Joint Inspection of ASP' Report](#)
- 2.2 The findings acknowledged the significant challenge for the Inspectorates involved due to the complexities of adult protection and the different methods and processes of recording ASP interventions across the country. Comment was made on the overwhelming evidence of adult protection lagging somewhat behind child protection, but recognising that good progress has been made on developing awareness of adult protection, creating and training the workforce, and putting effective governance systems in place since the inception of the legislation just over 10 years ago.

2.3 There was also recognition given to the staff who work in adult support and protection, in that they are knowledgeable, skilled and highly motivated and that they “skilfully walk a tightrope between risk mitigation and positive risk enablement”. Comment is made on the challenge of balancing the rights of adults to self-determination and choice with keeping them safe and protecting them from harm and the fact that the systems they work within need to be as clear and well defined as possible.

2.4 Inspection activity was based on measuring performance against three quality indicators

- Quality indicator 1; **Outcomes** for adults at risk of harm safe, protected and supported.
- Quality indicator 2; **Key processes** referrals of adult support and protection concerns including physical and sexual abuse, neglect, emotional abuse and financial harm; initial and subsequent investigations; case conferences; adult protection plans; and the use of removal orders and banning orders.
- Quality indicator 3; **Leadership and Governance** Leadership and governance for adult support and protection exercised by senior leaders and managers, the adult protection committee, the chief officers group and the chief social work officer.

3. Some of the Key messages from the Inspection

3.1 Partnerships should:

- Systematically measure outcomes for adults at risk of harm and their unpaid carers.
- Regularly elicit the lived experience of adults at risk of harm and their unpaid carers.
- Ensure the key processes for adult support and protection are as clear and simple as possible so all of the stakeholders understand them, and consistently execute key activities.
- Set out clear, unambiguous timescales for the completion of work related to each phase of the adult protection process to prevent delays.
- Ensure that comprehensive and up-to-date chronologies, risk assessments and risk management plans or protection plans are in place to keep adults at risk of harm safe.
- Ensure that all of the required partners attend adult protection case conferences, particularly police and health.
- Conduct regular audits of records to determine key areas for improvement.
- Self-evaluate practice to sustain and improve best practice.

4. 2018 Planned self-evaluation in Glasgow

4.1 It is encouraging to note that the thematic inspection report reflects current practice, developments and challenges already being identified and considered within our own partnership. This is therefore a positive opportunity to benchmark our ASP processes and systems with the findings of this recent inspection activity.

- 4.2 The self- evaluation will take place over four days and will comprise of examining approximately 33 cases. The methodology being adopted is “on site” file reading. We will pair file readers from different disciplines of practice. The key objectives underpinning our evaluations are to ensure that our intervention is measured, it is the least restrictive, and it is of benefit to the adult at risk of harm. We will evaluate our intervention with regard to the adult and any unpaid carer. We will evaluate the outcome for the adult to consider whether the risk of harm was reduced or removed.
- 4.3 We will consider our practice in terms of our engagement with the adult, unpaid carers and other professionals and evaluate whether decisions made reflect service user engagement and a multi-agency partnership approach. The evaluation will also allow us to consider our own systems and whether we can plan and record our interventions more accurately within the current processes.
- 4.4 The self-evaluation findings will allow us to consider future workforce planning, learning and developments to ensure staff and partners feel confident in their working knowledge of Adult Support and Protection.
- 4.5 In addition to this, we are currently undertaking a review of the adult protection social work duty systems across the three localities, and a review of Social Care Direct. This will all be considered alongside the findings of the self-evaluation exercise and key messages emanating from the Care Inspectorate thematic inspection.
- 4.6 We are also reviewing our Care First 6 processes and our business support requirements relating to Adult Support and Protection.
- 4.7 We have, from previous self-evaluation exercises, identified the need to strengthen our engagement with service users and promote the use of independent advocacy services, and will be considering what progress has been made in these areas.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 The IJB Finance and Audit Committee is asked to:
- a) consider the information relating to the Joint Self Evaluation by the HSCP, GGCNHS and the Care Inspectorate;
 - b) note the information contained in the Care Inspectorate Thematic Inspection Report and the intention to use the findings and recommendations to shape the scope of the planned HSCP self-evaluation; and
 - c) request that the outcome of the planned self-evaluation is brought back to a future IJB Finance and Audit Committee.