

Independent Review of Adult Social Care in Scotland

Note of meeting – 12 November 2020 – 9:00 – 11:00

Present – via MS Teams	
Chair	Derek Feeley
Advisory Panel Members	Malcolm Chisholm
	Stuart Currie
	Anna Dixon
	Caroline Gardner
	Ian Welsh
	Jim Elder-Woodward
Scottish Government Attendees	Alison Taylor Christina Naismith Secretariat support
Apologies	Göran Henriks
1) Welcome and Introductions	
Mr Feeley welcomed the panel and gave apologies for Mr Henriks.	
2) Minute of last meeting – 29 October 2020 (IRASC (022))	
The minutes of the previous meeting were signed off without amendment.	
3) Purpose of social care; specific improvement aims and a definition of “high quality”	
<p>The panel discussed the written submissions to the Review, noting the quantity of material to be read, and how thoughtful and helpful the contributions were. Mr Feeley stated that they were broadly reinforcing the direction of the panel’s thinking.</p> <p>Mr Elder-Woodward said it showed the amount of concern and interest there was in the work of the Review.</p> <p>It was explained that the secretariat team are engaged in drawing out summaries of each written submission to be shared with the panel alongside the original work.</p> <p>Action: <i>Secretariat to continue summarising main points of submissions/evidence and sharing this work with the panel.</i></p> <p>The panel then moved on to clarifying their statements on the vision, purpose and aims of social care with a description of who and what social care is for, drawing on both their previous discussions and the wealth of expert thinking from stakeholders across Scotland they have been referencing.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the specificity of the language used in the statement of purpose and the importance of clarifying the message to reflect the human rights approach as so much in the recommendations would then flow from this statement. Specific references were made to thinking from a citizen point of view rather than a provider point of view; the implications of personal independence versus interdependence and community; how to focus on social care as an investment in people rather than any connotation of a handout; and that this should be a statement of intent and rights rather than being aspirational.</p>	

The discussion then moved on to the importance of and explorations of practical actions that would support human rights , with Mr Feeley stressing that every recommendation they made must include suggestions of *how* to deliver, not just *what* to deliver.

Action: *Secretariat to support Mr Feeley in drafting a summary document on the human rights approach, with an emphasis on practical actions, drawing on his discussions with Professor Alan Miller about the Human Rights Taskforce*

Mr Feeley presented the panel with a short list of proposed performance measures. These stimulated reflection on repeated attempts to draw up a manageable suite of measures in the past, the delicate balancing act between process and outcomes and the danger of measures needed to track progress morphing into being minimum targets. Consideration was given to peer review models, self-reported health and wellbeing status and links to people's choice, control and experience.

Mr Feeley summarised that targets were not the answer, but that their recommendations should address the goal of continuous improvement. It was also agreed that social care measures needed to intersect with health measures to the benefit of people using and working in both.

It was agreed that Mr Feeley would draw up, with support from the secretariat, a new list of measures to present back to the panel incorporating their points and with consideration to outcomes and process and balancing measures.

Action: *Secretariat to support Mr Feeley drafting a further iteration of outcomes and process and balancing measures.*

Mr Feeley then moved the discussion on to a definition of 'high quality' social care, presenting the panel with a list of quality dimensions that he had drawn from his conversations with people using services, as well as members of the workforce expressing frustration with current systems and limitations.

Cllr Currie agreed that these statements were self-evident, but that the panel needed to come back to deliverability in the context of resourcing and finance, and the balance of power in decision making processes.

Again there was a discussion about the specificity and simplicity of language in these statements to ensure they encompass the rights and views of service users. Ms Dixon encouraged user feedback testing of these statements.

Mr Feeley agreed to revise the quality dimension statements and engage people using services and supports to redraft and road test them.

Mr Feeley then directed the panel's attention to a draft document describing the changes needed to improve social care in Scotland. There was some discussion about refining this driver diagram and the panel were invited to continue to input their ideas via email.

4) Three Questions: The panel's position on the human rights approach

Continuing from the previous meeting the panel were each asked to consider the following questions: **In order to ensure that Scotland has a 'human rights approach' to adult social care, what should be recommended...**

1. To strengthen the capability of rights holders to participate and to secure the outcomes to which they are entitled?
2. To improve the ability of 'duty bearers' to deliver?
3. To say about implementation of a rights-based approach and about accountability and redress?

Mr Feeley stated he had gone through the contributions the panel members had emailed in, pulling out the areas of common ground and consensus. These included overwhelming support for this human rights based approach, the importance of ensuring that people had the information, support and advocacy that they needed and that this should be more clearly set out in legislation. There was also consensus that this approach needed to be embedded at all levels including assessment, eligibility and budgeting processes, and that the people making decisions about rights were not constrained by their allocation of resources.

There was discussion over the compatibility of human rights and asset based approaches, and the danger of the misapplication of a strength and asset based approach. Mr Feeley proposed returning to this when they next considered eligibility and access.

The panel considered various models in respect to accountability and redress, recognising the need for enforcement of a human rights approach in a clear, independent and implementable system, while being cogent that implementing such changes would take time and that sequencing and phasing of recommendations within the report would be important.

Mr Feeley stated that he was in a position to synthesise the panel's points with conversations he had been having into a summary document of the 'what' of the report and they could now move onto the 'how', making recommendations of the means needed to implement changes.

5) Agenda items for meeting on 26/11

- Fair Work – Note, this was changed from eligibility and access after this meeting, which will now be discussed on 10 December.

6) Future Meeting Dates

1	Thursday 26 November 2020	9:00am – 11:00am
2	Thursday 10 December 2020	9:00am – 11:00am
3	Thursday 17 December 2020	9:00am – 11:00am
4	Thursday 7 January 2021	9:00am – 11:00am
5	Thursday 14 January 2021	9:00am – 11:00am
6	Thursday 21 January 2021	9:00am – 11:00am

Revised and new dates passed.