

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

This consultation questionnaire sets out the consultation questions from within the relevant sections of the revised Adult Support & Protection Code of Practice.

The revised Code of Practice is a larger and more comprehensive document than the original Code and we welcome your views on any of the changes made. In particular, we would appreciate your views on the following matters.

Please insert your response to the questions in the text boxes provided.

### Question 1: Chapter 3

This chapter of the Code sets out the principles of the Adult Support and Protection legislation and the definition of an adult at risk.

Does this chapter help in your understanding of the legislation and whom it applies to?

If not, what changes would you suggest?

We think the section on “Problematic alcohol and drug use” is a helpful, practical addition for the revised code in defining who might be considered an adult at risk.

It may be that some discussion of the relative powers (i.e. between the 2003 and 2007 Acts) in respect of a “duty to Inquire” may also be helpful – particularly in respect of those adults for whom there are concerns in relation the risk of self-harm and/or suicide.

Section 24: appears the word “emphasis” should be replaced by “emphasise”.

It is less clear what the section on SDS actually adds to the guidance at this point (any definition of an “adult at risk” is not dependent upon what type support the adult receives or how it is arranged). Discussion on SDS may have been more helpful at the section on multi-agency decision making (Chapter 11) and protection planning. Here discussion of what components might work together to create an effective support and protection plan might highlight the flexible use of self-directed, personalised supports

### Question 2: Chapter 5

This chapter of the Code considers the principle of ensuring full regard is given to the wishes of the adult, and ensuring that the adult participates in decisions as fully as possible.

Does this chapter adequately covers the issues arising from ensuring as far as possible full participation by adults in decision making?

If not, what changes would you suggest?

This section is helpful

### **Question 3: Chapter 6**

This chapter includes new guidance on large scale inquiries. Does this provide sufficient clarity for this type of inquiry or are there additional matters you would wish considered?

Helpful addition: however we wonder whether some delineation of the key, high-level steps which might be involved in a large scale inquiry (LSI) would still be useful to describe/ set out.

### **Question 4: Chapter 11**

This chapter is a new addition to the Code and considers a multi-agency approach. Does this provide sufficient clarity and support for your organisation in handling multi-agency assessments and practice?

Are there other matters that you consider should be included in this chapter?

This section appears brief. We wonder whether there might be value in bringing together the Thistle foundation guidance and the process implicit in the JIT “Working together” documentation to structure a more detailed section on “good practice in Protection Planning”.

### **Question 5: Users and Carers**

The Code seeks to develop and articulate good practice as regards service user and carer involvement, particularly in chapters 5 and 16. Does it succeed in this? If not please suggest ways in which this area could be improved on.

Appears to be successful

### **Question 6:**

Do you consider this revised Code of Practice will enable you to carry out your professional responsibilities effectively? Please feel free to comment on any areas of the Code which you consider could be improved in any way.

This revised code does seem to represent an improvement on previous guidance. In the spirit of the section on “problematic alcohol and drug use” we would welcome the inclusion of more explanatory sections where the definitions used in the act are explored in the practice context. For example we would welcome practice scenarios to show where lack of consent to an order has been overridden because “there are no steps which could be reasonably taken with the adult’s consent which would protect the adult from harm which the order or action is intended to prevent”

### **Any further comments**

Comments