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Introduction

• Personalisation and risk
• Personalisation and safeguarding concerns raised
• Risk, Safeguarding and Personal Budgets
  – Aims and objectives
  – Methods
  – Emerging findings
Emerging concerns

- 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)

- Service users being overwhelmed by managing IBs
  - 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 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’

Glendinning et al 2008 – IBSEN study,
Risk, Safeguarding and Personal Budgets

• Any evidence that abuse (including neglect) is more or less likely (or has a different form) amongst PB holders than non-PB holders,

• The extent of awareness and understanding amongst safeguarding practitioners and care coordinators (or similar) in local authorities

• The extent, availability and quality of support offered to PB (in particular DP) users or their proxy budget holders.

• What practitioners, budget holders and their carers consider ‘best practice’ in minimising risks of abuse.
Methods and sample

• Ethics and governance approvals
• Safeguarding Annual Reports – read and coded
• National and local AVA and Community Care Activity data analysed
• Threes in-depth sites
  – 16 managers and professional interviews
  – 16 Service user and carer interviews
Analysis of national and local data

AVA Returns → National Datasets → Community Care Statistics

- Local Dataset 1
- Local Dataset 2
- Local Dataset 3

- Multiple deprivation indices
- Urban/Rural classification
Emerging findings

• Limitations of aggregate data and differing definitions
• Analysis of Personal Budget and Direct Payment uptake produced no statistically significant associations with:
  – Numbers of safeguarding referrals
  – Location of abuse
  – Likelihood of substantiating abuse
• Some indications amongst Self-Directed Support users:
  – Increased financial abuse
  – Perpetrators more likely to be domiciliary staff
• Some different patterns in rural areas – greater variation
Emerging themes

• Mental capacity – duty of care
• Approaches to balancing risk and choice
• Transfer of responsibility
• Adapting Assessment, support planning, review and monitoring
• Supporting Direct Payment employers
• Views of increased/decreased risk
• Impact on safeguarding process
Planned outputs

• Practitioner approaches
• Employment support
• Impact of direct payment on levels and patterns of reported abuse
• Data considerations
Disclaimer
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