Case study 1

Pauline (not her real name) was referred to the advocacy service for support with a needs assessment under section 9 of the care act, she met the criteria due to having been deemed (by the referrer) to have ‘substantial difficulty’ in being involved in the process and with no one willing or able to assist her at the time.

Her circumstances were that, following an accident at his home she had been admitted to hospital as the result of a life changing injury. At the point of discharge, it was acknowledged that she could not return to her home. This was because it was not suitable for a wheelchair user and prior to the accident it had become cluttered and was in a neglected state, needing major repairs. She was therefore discharged to a care home as an interim measure.

Advocate met with Pauline at the care home regularly over the period of 2 months. During the meetings options were explored, in terms of both care needs and housing requirements. It was clear that Pauline didn’t require any support from the care staff as she was able to meet her own care needs. However, she was unable to access the community independently. She was not able to manage her food and drink simply because she had no access to an adapted kitchen or the community to purchase groceries.

Advocate established Pauline’s wishes which were to regain some independence and leave the care home as soon as was practical. Advocate sourced a service to register her with social housing property pool (and facilitated this by taking a mobile phone into the care home). Advocate supported Pauline to explore and consider the adaptions needed to return to her own property, such as adapted bathroom, adapted doorways, adapted kitchen, through floor lift. The local authority had previously supported with clearing his property but there were also repairs outstanding.

Following a discussion with Pauline, the advocate requested the local authority commission some hours for a personal assistant (PA) to support Pauline to access the community and to explore the practicalities of returning home or selling her home and moving to a suitable property. The PA could also support Pauline to manage her property pool bids as Pauline had no access to technology in the care home. Advocate also supported Pauline to ask the local authority to make a referral to OT to consider home adaptions and wheelchair services for an electric wheelchair assessment.

Case study 2

Edgar (not real name) was in his 90s and living in his own home. He was referred to the advocacy service in relation to a section 42 enquiry under the care act. He met the criteria as he was assessed as having ‘substantial difficulty’ (by the referrer) and with no one appropriate or willing to assist him to consider the safeguarding concerns and any outcomes he wanted from the enquiry

At the time of the referral Edgar was in a respite placement, partly due to concerns around a ‘carer’ who was managing his money. There had been further concerns around the behaviour of the ‘carer’ and (her partner) raised with the local authority by members of the public in the months leading up.

Advocate met with Edgar, initially in the respite placement, but he did not acknowledge some of the concerns raised, and felt that the ‘carer’ was a ‘good person’ and said that he ‘completely trusted her’. However, during the discussions about the safeguarding concerns, he explored some events and issues that he said had worried him. He was able to say that he did not want to return home with the support of the ‘carer’ and that he wanted to spend the next part of his life in a care home, he had identified one he had seen previously, and advocate supported him to say he wanted to move there. After he moved, the advocate visited, a few weeks into his stay, he had a comfortable room overlooking a garden, and he told the advocate that he was ‘much happier’ than he had been at home. Saying ‘there is always someone to talk to and they look after you here’