

## **Summarised Notes of Capacity and SDM Workstream:**

### **Video conferenced meeting 23.10.20**

**Present:** Jill Stavert (chair), Simon Bradstreet, Arun Chopra, Joanne Dymock, Pearce McCusker, Paul Hutton, Jan Killeen, Marianne Morritt

**In attendance:** Sandra McDonald, Sophie Ryder

**Apologies:** John Scott, Becky Leach, Ronnie Franks

### **Meeting Focus**

The full discussion of the meeting is recorded and this note serves only to summarise main points. The focus for this meeting was for the larger workstream to review, comment on and develop the work of the subgroup on Capacity and Human Rights Assessments from its more detailed consideration of capacity and human rights assessing.

### **Discussion**

The workstream had posed some questions, which flowed from the work of the subgroup – repeated here for ease of review.

1. Can we agree a 'first cut' of what the outcomes / principles of the assessment should be [whatever assessment] – so that we have a list to put to full workstream for discussion.
2. What do the Group feel about a blank page. What would they wish to see included in a new assessment?
3. What is the Groups' view on a HR assessment?
4. What is the Groups' view on the role of should 'insight' in a capacity assessment?
5. Are we any closer to deciding if there is a role for both SIDMA and capacity assessments, or if one can / should be subsumed within the other? or
6. Depending on the direction for assessment – how do these / does this apply, if at all, for non-consensual interventions?

There was detailed discussion which worked towards an outcome on these.

### **Essence of the discussion**

The essence of this discussion centred around the principles of the assessment and how should they be embedded, the implementation of Human Rights, balancing the right to autonomy and the weighting of economic, social and cultural rights.

### **Supported Decision-Making (SDM)**

The group discussed the issue of SDM including what it is and whether it is more than just supporting a decision? When should it be done? It was agreed that there should be a firmer legal basis requiring professionals to engage in supported decision-making. The inextricable linkage between capacity/Human Rights assessments and SDM was very apparent.

The group agreed that a subgroup on SDM was necessary.

### **Others' Views**

Agreed that there are a range of other people who have views we need to hear and names of people who it would be useful to hear from were mentioned.

Action All: to think of other groups / contacts who have had exposure to designing SDM/capacity/Human Rights assessments frameworks that we may wish to invite to 'meet' with us.

### **Interim Report**

Noted that the Review's second interim report is due in December so we need to consider how best to report the progress of this workstream.

### **Next Steps**

1. SDM subgroup to be established to inform the work of the Capacity and Human Rights Assessment subgroup.
2. **Action:** Jill to produce 'a blank page paper' which endeavours to capture thoughts about what a new/revised process may look like – to create a starting point for focused discussion in next workstream advisory group meeting on 10 November.
3. Agree who else we may wish to speak to – arrange these 'meetings'.