

Appendix 7: Assessing quality by identifying the difference the IMCA service has made

The IMCA provider will collect information about the difference the IMCA service has made. This would include any differences for the person, but also wider changes in health and social care services.

The key areas in which IMCAs can make a difference are in relation to:

- how the person was involved in the decision making process or what was known about their views or wishes
- the outcome of the decision making process for the person
- other aspects of the person's care and support
- the practice of health and social care staff.

Potential outcomes are identified for each type of IMCA instruction which can be used. Each can be marked as yes/no for efficient recording. Where significant outcome are achieved specific details should be provided (i.e. a couple of sentences explaining the difference made).

These outcomes were developed by the Norah Fry Research Centre to help assess the impact of IMCA providers. The results of this research, when published, could be used to make comparisons with local IMCA providers.

For each case the following information should be recorded:

- age
- ethnicity
- mental impairment
- whether the client died before the case closed.

All instructions: how the person was involved in the decision-making process or what was known about their views and wishes

- My involvement meant that the person got extra support to help them communicate their needs and wishes.
- As a result of my involvement, the person was able to communicate relevant needs or wishes which would have been unknown otherwise.
- I used other sources (e.g. talking to other people or looking at records) to find out about important needs and wishes which would have been unknown otherwise.
- My input meant that the person attended meetings which they would not have attended otherwise.
- As a result of my work, a capacity assessment was undertaken which showed the person could make their own decisions in this area.

- I did other things that made a difference to the way the person was involved or what was known about their views and wishes.

Accommodation instructions

- My involvement in this case meant that the person stayed where they were.
- My involvement in this case meant that the person moved instead of staying where they were.
- My involvement in this case meant that the person moved to a different place to what was proposed.
- The decision makers would not have thought about the place the person moved to if I hadn't told them about it.
- My involvement meant that the person moved quicker than would have happened otherwise.
- My involvement meant that the person's move took longer than would have happened otherwise.
- My involvement meant the person avoided going to temporary accommodation before a longer term move.
- My involvement meant the person went into temporary accommodation before a longer term move.
- My involvement meant that a care review took place sooner than would have otherwise been the case.
- My involvement meant that the person was represented by an IMCA in a subsequent care review.
- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on the accommodation decision for this person in other ways.

SMT instructions

- My involvement meant a different decision was made about the person's treatment.
- As a result of my involvement, the person received treatments that they wouldn't have had otherwise.
- My involvement meant that the person did not receive treatments that they would have otherwise been given.
- Treatment was delayed because of my involvement.
- Treatment took place quicker because of my involvement.
- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on the serious medical treatment decision in other ways.

Safeguarding adults instructions

- My involvement meant that temporary protective measures were put in place.
- As a result of my involvement no protective measure were put in place.
- My involvement meant that different or extra protective measures were put in place.
- As a result of my involvement urgent protective measures were put in place.
- My work meant that the police were involved.
- My input meant that the police took action.
- My involvement in this case meant that an application was made to the Court of Protection.
- My work as an IMCA meant that a review of the safeguarding plan was scheduled.
- As a result of my involvement, protective measures were put in place quicker.
- My involvement meant that it took longer to put protective measures in place.
- My involvement had an impact on the outcome of the safeguarding process in other ways.

39A DoLS instructions in relation to a request for a standard authorisation. Also 39C or 39D IMCA involvement in requests for further standard authorisations

- The authorisation was not granted because of my involvement.
- The authorisation was granted because of my involvement.
- I made a difference to the conditions which were set.
- I made a difference to the length of the authorisation.
- I made a difference to the choice of the relevant person's representative.
- I avoided an urgent authorisation being extended.
- My representation helped to ensure that the urgent authorisation was extended.
- The assessment was conducted more thoroughly because of my involvement.
- My involvement had an impact on the request for a standard authorisation in other ways.

39A DoLS instructions in relation to a potential unlawful deprivation of liberty

- I ensured that the restrictions were assessed as being a deprivation of liberty.
- I ensured that the restrictions were not assessed as being a deprivation of liberty.
- The assessment took longer because of my involvement.
- The assessment was quicker because of my involvement.
- My involvement had an impact on the assessment for a potential unauthorised deprivation of liberty in other ways.

39C DoLS instructions

- The person had a better understanding of what the standard authorisation meant for them and their rights.
- The managing authority had a better understanding of the standard authorisation.
- A DoLS review was undertaken.
- An application was made to the Court of Protection.
- The person accessed a solicitor.
- My representations helped to ensure a timely application for further standard authorisation.
- The relevant person's representative was appointed quicker than would have been otherwise.
- I influenced the decision on who was appointed as the relevant person's representative.
- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on the DoLS process for this person in other ways.

39D DoLS instructions

- The person had a better understanding of their rights and what the standard authorisation meant for them and their rights.
- The person's representative had a better understanding of the standard authorisation, their role and rights.
- The managing authority had a better understanding of the standard authorisation.
- A DoLS review was undertaken.
- An application was made to the Court of Protection.
- The person accessed a solicitor.
- I ensured a timely application for a further standard authorisation.

- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on the DoLS process in other ways.

All instructions: differences in the person's care and support other than those directly related to the reason for IMCA instruction. (These are the key potential outcomes for care reviews)

- My involvement meant that the care provider had a written record of the person's views and wishes to inform the support they provided (this could be a copy of an IMCA report if these were included in detail).
- My involvement meant that the person had more contact with people who were important to them.
- My input meant that the person accessed new opportunities.
- The person's staffing support changed as a result of my involvement in this case.
- As a result of my work, the person was supported to make some decisions themselves.
- My input meant there were changes to how the person's money was managed or spent.
- My involvement led to another IMCA instruction being made for the person.
- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on this person's care and support in other ways.

All instruction: differences in the knowledge or practice of health or social care staff

- At least one staff member had a better understanding of the Mental Capacity Act.
- At least one staff member had a better understanding of DoLS.
- An organisation changed some of its practice to comply with the Mental Capacity Act.
- An IMCA instruction was made for a different person.
- An application was made under the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards for a different person.
- An alert was made under Safeguarding Adults for another person.
- My involvement as an IMCA had an impact on the knowledge and practice of health and social care staff in other ways.