

PE1596/G

Petitioner Letter of 1 March 2016

Consideration of Petition PE1596

**Feedback from
Paul Anderson & Chris Daly**

Scottish Government Response by Jessica McPherson

Engagement & Consultation

Paragraphs 2-8

Petitions Committee Question: *What consultation was undertaken by the Scottish Government before coming to the new brokering model?*

In paragraph 3 the last sentence discusses the InterAction Plan and consideration of a “*Support Fund*”. Note we were consulted on just that and not a brokered model Support Service.

Paragraph 4 There was substantial consultation on the various remedies to in care abuse. However during the consultation process there was no talk of a specific Support Service. Also the future of the current In Care Survivor Service Scotland {ICSSS} was not consulted on.

Paragraph 6 On the identified needs we very much have common ground with the Scottish Government. The needs listed here came up time and again during the consultation process. Within this paragraph at the last sentence Scottish Government comment on existing services being “supported and expanded”. However funding to the current ICSSS will run out in a few weeks at the end of March 2016.

Paragraph 7 We would emphasis here that it should be about the current ICSSS enhancing the new broker model.

Paragraph 8 Scottish Government describe here a very positive outlook with “favourable outcomes” . However what of those older care experienced who don't have requirements around education employment etc?

Cost of Current ICSSS and new In Care Survivor Support Fund
Paragraphs 9-10

Petitions Committee Question: *What are the costs of the current service?*

The current service costs £200,000 per annum. 94% of the funding goes to direct service delivery with only 6% on management costs and in all reality overspends on travel and supervision often mean that the management costs cannot be claimed.

Transition Arrangements

Paragraphs 11-13

Petitions Committee Question: *How will the transition from the current service to the new one be*

managed?

The petitioners would ask, could Scottish Government give a guarantee funding is being extended?

The Petitioners understand there has been an extension confirmed to June 2016 but this will not allay client concerns only being a further four months. A transition to a new service without appropriate support in place would be a risk to clients transitioning to it. The term transition is difficult as it removes the aspect of client choice and potentially could not be achieved without breaching client confidential information.

Paragraph 12 and 13 There appears to be a contradiction here; “This will not require personal data or case files to be shared with Scottish Government”. Yet paragraph 13 discusses “We need to know what their individual needs are and when/where services are required to meet those needs”. Further, “We have limited knowledge about the services survivors are receiving at present from Open Secret however we hope to work constructively with Open Secret on these matters of transition arrangements”.

The petitioner's would ask if the Scottish Government has limited knowledge about those accessing the ICSSS how will they obtain that information without accessing strictly confidential data?

The Future of In Care Survivors Service Scotland

Paragraphs 14-16

Petitions Committee Question: *Whether the current service run by Open Secret could form part of the new model and attract continuing funding?*

The Petitioners understand that Open Secret would be happy to deliver the service as part of the new model and in fact they consider that without the current ICSSS service the model would not be fit for purpose.

How The Support Fund Will Work In Practice

Paragraph 17

Again we welcome the positive aspects of the Survivor Support Fund. However the needs identified here would be for younger care experienced. What of the older survivors? Will there be discretionary “**cash in hand**” payments for them?

Survivor Support Policy and Priorities

Paragraphs 18-22

These outcomes and priorities of; “*A Healthy Life, Choice and Control, Safety and Security*” underpinned by the In Care Survivor Support Fund are positive and ambitious but please don't lose sight of the dedicated ICSSS development workers and their considerable experience over 7 years delivering; support , advocacy and a whole lot more to survivors.

We believe their work could inform and enhance the New Service Model.

FBGA Response by Jennie Bristow, Secretary 15th Feb 2016

The Petitioners would like to thank FBGA for taking the time to respond to the petition. There positive input to the establishment of the service ICSSS is well documented from the work they engaged in with the Survivor Scotland Sub Group in 2005.

Discussed within paragraph four of the FBGA submission are the previous concerns raised in a petition in 2010 by Helen Holland and Chris Daly. That petition was *PE1351 Time For All To Be Heard*.

FBGA correctly reference Point 10 within PE1351. Within the petition Chris Daly and Helen Holland use the term "not fit for purpose" referring to ICSSS. FBGA continue, "we understand the service did instigate changes and address a number of issues of concern".

Given there has been six years passed since the oral presentation of *PE1351 Time For All To Be Heard* it has little relevance to the situation here and now.

Moreover Chris Daly can't speak for his co-principle petitioner Helen Holland but he feels he was misinformed and not qualified when then in 2010 he raised concerns within the previous petition. On reflection and with the knowledge that there have been very positive evaluations of the current ICSSS he now has entirely different views on the current service. These evaluations in 2011 included an internal one and an independent external one by Napier University's Thanos Karatzias which was very positive:

"The model of care adopted by ICSSS which incorporates three strands (i.e. counselling, advocacy and informal support) was found to be highly valued by survivors, support workers and managers. Service attendance was found to have a positive impact on mental health problems and behavioural issues of survivors as demonstrated by quantitative and qualitative data. In particular, the counselling strand was found to be effective at 6-weeks and 12-weeks for general psychological distress. There was also a positive effect of counselling on self-harm, alcohol consumption, use of illicit substances and on illegal and antisocial behaviours of survivors." Report prepared by Dr Thanos Karatzias; Edinburgh Napier University August 2011

3 Year Report 2011 Voices of Clients ICSSS:

'When I first met S, I had just attempted suicide and had been placed in a homeless unit. I had hit rock bottom and could see no future. I thought my issues were to do with the physical and mental abuse I endured at a children's home. However, somehow during our sessions I gained the courage to talk about the sexual abuse I suffered at the hands of my brother. I had never told anyone about this and didn't think I ever would. With S's help, I went on to access my records, which helped answer some questions for me. In less than a year, I now have my own tenancy and I am now more self assured and confident. S arranged for me to join the IT Group at 'B', which helped with my computer skills, as well as being good for me socially. Thanks to S's recent referral onto an employability programme with 'A', I am now looking forward with hope to the future.'

3 Year Report 2011 Voices of Clients ICSSS continued:

"Without ICSSS I would be dead by now, just knowing there was someone out there who cared, and who would phone every week stopped me giving up on myself and helped me feel less isolated"

"My dad is a client of in care survivors service Scotland. So far L has been so much help to me and my dad that has made so much a change to our life styles. My dad can now sometimes come

for a walk with me. I know it will take a long time to recover but I just pray that L is around for long enough for it to happen as she has been so much help and support to me and my dad and it has helped me a lot too.” Age 11

ICSSS 3 Year Report Rennie, J , Patterson , L Open Secret 2011

On the fifth bullet point within the FBGA submission there is discussion on the talks between the current ICSSS and Survivor Scotland. The petitioners have the view that the outcomes have to be what’s in the best interest of a very vulnerable group within society the in care abuse survivors.

The petitioners agree with the points made by FBGA in point 6.

We maintain as we did when we presented in the oral hearing to the current petition PE1596 In Care Survivor Service Scotland that the current ICSSS could enhance the new brokering model. FBGA discuss the “discretionary element” to the new broker model. The petitioner on the membership of the Review Group welcomes the very helpful paper submitted to the InterAction Review Group by FBGA.

On point 8 the petitioners agree that legal ownership of the files is with the clients.

Comment here from Paul Anderson in his words:

“Response to the FBGA (Former Boys & Girls Abused in care)

PE1596: In Care Survivors Service Scotland (ICSSS)

On the second page of the letter responding to the above mentioned Petition, the last line mentions:

“The majority of the survivors who attended the meetings wanted the broker model.”

There were a number of open supported events for victims-survivors including service specification presentation day. The Scotland Survivor Team answered any queries that individuals or groups had. We were reassured as to the continuity of current care for current service users, including any transitional period. As one of the Petitioners states 26/2/2016 to the Committee,

“The majority of the survivors who attended the meetings wanted the broker model.”

I was the petitioner, Paul Anderson you have mentioned, you have quoted me out of context. I agree that the broker model is what survivors want, please remember there were only 5 who supported the broker model, this does NOT include the 100’s who were not consulted from the ICSSS.

There were 18 survivors who attended the consultation in Glasgow, only 5 openly supported the broker model.

What about the 100’s of survivors from the ICSSS who were not consulted or been involved in the meetings that were arranged by the Scottish Government & Survivors Scotland, regarding these issues. The matters relating to the one-to-one counselling was NOT covered, and of the other services the ICSSS provide.

I also mentioned that the Broker model and the ICSSS could work together to provide a broader range of services that all survivors desperately need, giving them more choice gives them more support. Please check the draft of my oral presentation at the Public petitions committee, to confirm

my comments.” Paul Anderson

Survivors at the final consultation meeting supported the model as a model to distribute the support fund. Survivors were not told that the ICSSS service would not be included and this was something raised at all previous meetings as a necessity. At the final meeting there were around 18 participants and only approximately 5 supported the model. The model was misrepresented as only one to distribute funding with the element of support not included.

Survivors were not offered any alternative model. The comment that survivors supported the model was in reference to the small minority who spoke up. In comparison ICSSS clients have written and commented at meetings to say that without ICSSS the model does not meet their needs. Currently this is around 65 survivors.

**Centre of Excellence for Looked After Children in Scotland Response by Jennifer Davidson,
Director**

Paragraph 1

We petitioners agree that currently there are anxieties felt by survivors about the uncertainty of some of the remedies.

The petition is about service users of ICSSS losing the support given by the current service and it's dedicated Development Workers.

Paragraph 2

Both points made here are equally valid to the specifics of the petition. There does need to be more clarity around the new Survivor Support Fund model. In particular ; transitioning of clients from ICSSS, issues around confidentiality including an individuals case notes, there needs to be a firm commitment from the Scottish Government on the discretionary element and the process of risk assessing ICSSS clients during “transitioning”.

New Support Fund / Service Model

Paragraph 3

Just to add here in 2010 the Scottish Human Rights Commission published a Framework for Justice and Remedies for Historic Abuse of Children in Care (the SHRC Framework). That “Framework” has underpinned the InterAction on Historic Abuse of Children in Care. It's a human rights based approach.

Paragraphs 4&5

The report on the consultation process published in April 2015 summarised the consensus around what such a fund would look like. It would include access to; advocacy specialised trauma counselling, education, employment , benefits and practical support.

Paragraph 6

There needs to be clarity from the Scottish Government about future funding to Open Secret for ICSSS.

Paragraph 7

Reparation “ *The aim of reparation is to the extent possible , to redress all the consequences of the illegal act and re-establish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed if that act had not been committed*”.

A human rights framework for the design and implementation of the proposed

“Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum” and other remedies for historic child abuse in Scotland. SHRC 2010

Paragraph 8

ICSSS service users have not been part of the consultation process or involved in Scottish Government , CELCIS and SHRC events and consultations. There has been no membership for these service users on any key groups of the large number of service users of ICSSS.

Paragraphs 11 & 12

Entirely agree with this point from Jennifer Davidson regarding the scale and specifications of the new service and yes they are very different.

Paragraph 13

The new model should “encompass” the existing ICSSS. The existing could enhance the new model. Also there could be a transfer of skills from the dedicated Development Workers of ICSSS.

In Care Survivors Service Scotland

Paragraph 14

The evaluation {Karatzias 2011} was external and independent. Most importantly here the survivors / service users gave positive feedback. See attached documentary evidence.

Paragraph 16

The Scottish Government needs to give a clear unambiguous answer here. Are they to continue for the immediate future funding the current ICSSS.

Paragraph 17

This sums up very well the arguments within the petition regarding the current ICSSS enhancing the new model.

Paul Anderson
Chris Daly
Principal Petitioners