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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) where practitioners were observed using the GCP
## GCP as an assessment tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioner Views of GCP</th>
<th>Good (%)</th>
<th>Acceptable (%)</th>
<th>Poor (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use in assessing neglect (20 responses)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18/20)</td>
<td>(2/20)</td>
<td>(0/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool for assisting multi-professional assessment</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 responses)</td>
<td>(13/18)</td>
<td>(5/18)</td>
<td>(0/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP as tool for engaging parents</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21 responses)</td>
<td>(10/21)</td>
<td>(7/21)</td>
<td>(4/21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Lacosse, any trainers we’ve got is Lacosse 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