

## **PE1596/Z**

Wellbeing Scotland Submission of 5 September 2019

Wellbeing Scotland have over 25 years of experience in supporting survivors of historic child abuse. We have a deep understanding of sequela of Complex Trauma, how it differs from conditions such as PTSD and the challenges that presents in respect of treatment and support for survivors of historic child abuse. We are COSCA recognised and consistently score highly in client feedback. We created and developed the In Care Survivors Scotland Support Service 11 years ago that was, until the creation of Future Pathways, the bedrock upon which support services for survivors historic abuse was based. Future Pathways are three years old as a service with limited experience of working with abuse at all.

There are today a very large number of organisations offering a wide range of support services to survivors. That is no bad thing. But no other service has been working in this field for anywhere near to the time Wellbeing Scotland have served the interest of survivors. No service therefore has our pedigree, experience or knowledge. The landscape of support providers remains the same as it did when ICSSS started and 2,500 survivors chose the In Care Survivor Service Scotland. Survivors have reported that the current system is confusing and distressing.

An evaluation by Napier University in 2011 provided evidence that the ICSSS model was the one preferred by survivors offering counselling, advocacy, informal support, groups, helpline and access to records from one service, an aspect valued by survivors and the petitioner as he has highlighted. Clients did not wish to access NHS services in many cases due to the clinical approach and lack of understanding of the needs of survivors of complex trauma. Survivors do not identify with mental health services and the approaches used by them. That has been the significant concern highlighted by the petitioner. Only 30% of survivors have been diagnosed with mental illness.

With our vast experience we perceive that there are several issues that the Committee should explore in relation to the current arrangements for providing support to survivors of in care abuse. They are:

1. Future Pathways being the only gate keeper organisation and therefore the complete lack of flexibility within the system. Survivors have to register with Future Pathways to access the support fund. They are then being directed to a range of other providers to the exclusion of Wellbeing Scotland. Those seeking counselling are required to attend an assessment with the Anchor, even those who are already attending the In Care Survivor Service.
2. An apparent lack of understanding of international academic research into the diagnosis and treatment of Complex Trauma and how that differs from (complex) PTSD and other conditions

### 3. The continued refusal or unwillingness to refer to Wellbeing Scotland

Future Pathway's submission has many inaccuracies as we have indicated in the document below. The organisation is costing the Scottish purse over £1.4m per annum on staff costs to broker other services. Survivors have proven that they are able to choose without the support of a support co-ordinator. The associated cost of this additional layer reduces the level of funds directly available to survivors.

We feel that Wellbeing Scotland are a vital service for in care survivors going forward, particularly with the redress scheme approaching. However, by blocking referrals Future Pathways will potentially shrink our service and we will lose key staff. We still have no confirmation of funding after March 2020. Wellbeing Scotland are a cost-effective service with a lower unit cost than all other providers with a service satisfaction level reported as highly satisfied by 97% of survivors.

#### **Wellbeing Scotland Clarification on the Future Pathways Submission**

##### **For review by the Committee prior to the meeting**

##### **Background**

Future Pathways (FP) said "Survivors were clear that the Survivor Support Fund should be a needs-led service that enables the coordination of the supports that survivors specify to meet the needs and outcomes that survivors describe"

Wellbeing Scotland (WS) response

– only a small number of survivors were in favour of the broker model as reported by survivors in attendance. The model was presented in the last half hour of the final session. Of the 2,000 survivors that we had supported at that time only about 20 were invited to consultations and none supported the broker model.

##### **Operating Model**

FP said "Future Pathways was developed according to the wishes of survivors and is governed through an Alliance Agreement."

WS response

- A very small number of survivors as stated above. A significant majority of survivors preferred a model of a discretionary fund with support services continuing to be provided by ICSSS.

FP highlighted that "1133 registered to July 2019"

"326 people were in receipt of support from Wellbeing Scotland from November 2016 to March 2018"

WS response

- Wellbeing Scotland worked with over 500 survivors to March 2019 with new referrals and some ending – we note FP gave numbers to March 2018 as a comparison.
- Wellbeing Scotland have worked with over 2,500 survivors abused in care over the past ten years. It should be noted we offered only support not financial benefit.

FP said “Feedback from survivors who use Future Pathways is that this brokerage model of support increases choice and control.”

WS response

- Feedback from survivors accessing our services is that the model reduces choice and control. Survivors feel disempowered. Feedback from the majority of survivors using our service is that find it re-traumatising.

### **Waiting List**

FP said “940 have received support from Future Pathways to July 2019”

WS response

- Of those 940, at least 271 were referred by Wellbeing Scotland equating to 29%. Future Pathways stated 95 in their paper, which is incorrect. Other survivors are working with both services but not referred by Wellbeing Scotland as they wished to make their own approach. This equates to between 29% and 42% of clients.

### **Future Pathways and Wellbeing Scotland**

FP said that WS received £820,000 funding to March 2019.

WS response.

To March 2019 Wellbeing Scotland received £814,292.74 equating to £336,948.72 per annum.

- Wellbeing Scotland delivered over a third of the services of Future Pathways for 10% of the funding.
- While we recognise it is important for survivors to be aware of the discretionary fund funding to Wellbeing Scotland is less than the Future Pathways Administration and Communications budgets combined by £213,458

FP said

“Wellbeing Scotland is the only Support Provider out of the 70 to not sign up to common quality standards and reporting requirements.”

WS response

- Future Pathways wanted individualised data on each client. We asked for client permission to share this information and over 80% refused to allow information sharing of this kind. Even if they were registered with Future

Pathways, they did not want us sharing information with them. We understand from the Anchor at a recent meeting that they do not have to provide individualised data. We have requested a revised GDPR compliant contract and Future Pathways have promised this since 2017. They have failed to provide it.

### **Counselling Referrals**

Future Pathways presented a comparison with only counselling providers to March 2019. Wellbeing Scotland offer counselling, advocacy, access to records, informal support, helpline and groups.

- Other counselling providers offered under 12 sessions to 190 people being maximum 2,280 sessions with the average more likely to be 1,140
- They offered more than 12 sessions to 111 people with sessions provided likely to be around 1,665
- It should be noted that we were correct that referrals are being made to Health in Mind, one of the Alliance partners and their private counselling service rather than Wellbeing Scotland. We would question that this was due to client choice.
- Wellbeing Scotland have delivered **20,857** sessions over the same timescale.

### **Unit Costs**

- From Future Pathways own figures provided in their submission salary costs were £1.8m to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019. That equates to around £720,000 per annum. Salary costs will now be around £1.4m per annum (data gathered from recruitment ads) which is almost double. In comparison Wellbeing Scotland have agreed to a reduced budget of £300,000.

### **Glasgow Psychological Trauma Service (The Anchor)**

FP said “One of the strengths of Future Pathways is the relationship we have with the Glasgow Psychological Trauma Service. This is a service that is entirely optional for someone registered with Future Pathways and we are glad to offer this clarification to the Committee and to the petitioners.”

“An assessment is offered only if it is deemed relevant to someone’s expressed needs for psychological or mental health support.”

WS response

- Therefore, the Anchor is not entirely optional as clients requiring counselling must attend an assessment. This has been made clear to our workers and clients repeatedly. The Anchor charge for this assessment. In the submission £402,249 was charged for this assessment and for offering supervision and training to Future Pathways staff.

FP said “The Glasgow Psychological Trauma Service matches the presenting difficulties with evidence-based treatments as specified within MATRIX, SIGN and NICE guidelines.”

WS response from documents publicly available

- Unlike PTSD, there are no current NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) guidelines on, or Cochrane review of, the effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological interventions for CPTSD in the UK. The Board of the UK Psychological Trauma Society (UKPTS), therefore, proposed a review of published evidence and accepted good clinical practice to develop a guideline for those working clinically or planning services for people with CPTSD
- The most effective trauma-focused therapy for the treatment of CPTSD is unknown. There is currently insufficient evidence to recommend any particular therapy over another ***Guideline for the treatment and planning of services for complex post-traumatic stress disorder in adults UK Psychological Trauma Society***

From the Matrix on trauma – “This section will focus on the prevention and treatment of PTSD, where there is a reasonable evidence base, and the management of complex trauma, where the evidence for effective treatments is much sparser.”

“Courtois and Ford (26) have concluded that there is limited treatment outcome research on complex traumatic stress and further research in the area is required. This is in part because it is a heterogeneous condition and most outcome studies in the area of psychological trauma have screened out patients with complex trauma.”

Therefore interventions are not evidence based for complex trauma as this is a new way of describing the diagnosis for survivors of abuse. The Matrix refers to professional opinion not an evidence base as that is limited.

Bessel A. van der Kolk, M.D., states: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (and “Trauma Focused CBT”), talk therapies, and prolonged exposure therapies can make some changes in people’s distress, but traumatic stress has little to do with cognition—it emanates from the emotional part of the brain that is rewired to constantly send out messages of dangers and distress, with the result that it becomes difficult to feel fully alive in the present. Blasting people with the memories of the trauma may lead to desensitization and numbing, but it does not lead to integration: an organic awareness that the event is over, and that you are fully alive in the present. The Veterans Association seems to be surprised by how many veterans drop out of prolonged exposure therapy. It would be helpful for them to find out why, but the likely answer is that it is re-traumatizing them.

The Blue Note Foundation has excellent research on Complex Trauma where accepted low cost treatments like CBT are challenged.

### **How funding is allocated to survivors**

56.5% of Future Pathways funding is provided to survivors through the support fund or support.

82% of the funding we receive from Future Pathways is spent directly on survivors.

Only £2,000 per annum of our budget is spent on publicity/ communications and around £18,000 on administration compared to £568,094 for Future Pathways per annum.

Amalgamated CORE 34 scores showed improvements in all aspects with significant results in “have hurt myself physically” to 100% reduction from session 1 to end of therapy. Reduction of risk was reported in all cases.

On CORE 10 overall scores were reduced by 51% with improvements in 100% of cases and 73% improvement in suicidal ideation. By end of therapy survivors report no risk. Due to our emphasis on risk and stabilisation there is a significant improvement in suicidal ideation at an early stage.

Survivors said:

“The service has helped me to move forward with my life and helped me cope with life. I no longer self harm as a result.”

“Person centred and holistic approach to counselling, having used a range of counselling services in the past, this has most definitely been the best.”

“No other service has given so much help to myself. I can relate to some of my problems after years of no help. The service is way beyond price. So much trust and acceptance.”