

Grading the Graded Care Profile

Robin Sen (University of Sheffield) and
Dr Pam Green Lister (Glasgow School of Social Work)
April 17th, 2012

Acknowledgements

- ❑ Funded by BASPCAN
- ❑ Joint evaluation work with Glasgow City Council



GCP as response to neglect

- ▶ Difficulties in professional identification and response to neglect
- ▶ Co-existence with other difficulties
- ▶ Assessment of parenting is not value free

- ▶ GCP 'Objective' measure of caring using qualitative bipolar five point scale
- ▶ Breaks caring task down using into specific 'sub-areas' and 'items' of care
- ▶ Previous claims
 - ▶ Reliability
 - ▶ User-friendly for both professionals and parents
 - ▶ Quick to undertake



Data

- ▶ Baseline data gathered by local authority from practitioners: Questionnaires (22), follow up interviews (8)
 - ▶ Two focus groups with practitioners who had used the GCP
 - ▶ Individual contact with practitioners who had or were due to use the tool (56)
 - ▶ Semi-structured interviews with parents who had previously had the GCP used with them (4) and with practitioners managing these cases (4)
 - ▶ 4 Observations of how the GCP was being used with 3 sets of parents
 - ▶ Brief follow up interviews with parents (2) and practitioners (2) practitioners where practitioners were observed using the GCP
-



GCP as an assessment tool

Practitioner Views of GCP	Good	Acceptable	Poor
Use in assessing neglect (20 responses)	82% (18/20)	9% (2/20)	0% (0/20)
Tool for assisting multi- professional assessment (18 responses)	59% (13/18)	23% (5/18)	0% (0/18)
GCP as tool for engaging parents (21 responses)	45% (10/21)	32% (7/21)	18% (4/21)



-
- ▶ *Interviewer: Did you feel that the Graded Care Profile gave an accurate view of your parenting?*
 - ▶ *Mother: Oh God, aye, aye, I'm glad that I had something like this. (Case 3)*
 - ▶ *It showed me where I was going wrong and how I could build myself up. It makes you see different things. (Mother, case 5)*



But questions about its accuracy

- ▶ **Minority view, but clear theme, amongst practitioners statements about the tool:**
 - ▶ “very, very subjective” (Practitioner Interview)
 - ▶ *I am not convinced that it is hugely accurate () each of the items, the choices that they give you, they are pretty specific, so there isn't a huge amount of leeway, but there is some leeway, I suppose, in the interpretation of you going through that (SW, Case Four)*
 - ▶ Some concerns about accuracy where reliant on parents' self-reporting



Parental Engagement

- ▶ Language in the GCP a barrier to parental engagement
- ▶ **But** two of seven parents very positive experiences of its use

- ▶ Case Five: Parent very favourable experience of use of the GCP, supported by observation data
 - ▶ Relationship SW and mother – tool use to generate dialogue
 - ▶ Second time of use and progress in between times
 - ▶ SW in all but one items agreed with parents' score or suggested a better (lower) score



Where there was disagreement, scoring of the GCP could exacerbate it

Parent Case Four

- *he's ((the social worker)) not here twenty four – seven so he doesn't see it all does he?*
- *I'd have scored myself a two because I feel aye fair enough it isnae Prada and all that but it's like Nike, Adidas and Lacoste, any trainers we've got is Lacoste trainers. 30 to 40 pound a pair of trainers and Greg's ((the social worker)) saying he thinks I'm not doing my best at. Everyone's like that, what you talking about?*

SW Case Four

- *She was really up for doing it [the GCP]... I think she enjoyed doing it.*
-



Observation, case six

- ▶ F: The only reason I'm early for my ((Addictions)) appointment and all is because I take the weans to school and then I just=
- ▶ HV: =so maybe I should get you, may be I should get you (for) appointments at quarter to nine in the morning in my office=
- ▶ F: =nae bother ()=
- ▶ HV: =but I doubt you'll make it though, *I doubt you will make it though*
- ▶ F: I would, nine o'clock
- ▶ HV: I think we are taking bets on that one
- ▶ F: Nine o'clock



Going forward with the GCP

- ▶ Study illustrated some strengths to the GCP : breaking caring task down, allowing discussion about standards of care in some cases
- ▶ Need to modify language (academic, abstract)
- ▶ Does it give an objective assessment of care?
- ▶ Diagnostic/prescriptive use to grade care appears in tension with dialogical use to encourage discussion around care standards

