

Glasgow City Council Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership

- 1) The people who are eligible to apply to the scheme.

We agree that those eligible are covered by the definition in the Bill.

Eligibility should relate to the experience/ impact of abuse by the care giver (i.e. those discharging parental responsibilities).

- 2) The Bill's definition of abuse.

The definition of abuse ("sexual abuse, physical abuse, emotional abuse, and abuse which takes the form of neglect") appears commensurate with child protection policy and procedures (taking into account the prevailing laws on the use of corporal punishment during the period covered by the Scheme).

- 3) The dates used in the Bill to define 'historical abuse'.

The changes made in child protection legislation, policy and practice in 2004 provide a cut off point for access to the Redress Scheme, as well as noting the timing of the public apology by the First Minister at that time.

- 4) The Bill's definition of 'in care' and the places in which that care took place.

The care settings (foster placements, children's home, penal institution, residential care facility, school-related accommodation and secure accommodation) appear to reflect the full range of settings which should be included, as arranged by the local authority or by a voluntary organisation on behalf of the local authority.

- 5) The process of applying for redress and what advice and support applicants might need, particularly in relation to the waiver scheme.

Glasgow HSCP supports the development of the Redress Scheme, as an alternative to the Court process, and underpinned by a trauma-informed approach. Given the fundamental importance of the 'trauma informed' process and function of the Redress Scheme, it may be beneficial to define the meaning of 'trauma informed' in this specific context. Moreover, to operationally define this for all involved in supporting the delivery of the Scheme and to ensure that applying to the Redress Scheme does not compound the impact of the abuse already experienced by survivors.

In response to some public claims relating to the injustice of the Scheme, it may be necessary to strongly emphasise the *choice* of survivors to claim through the Scheme, or to pursue legal action. Given the possibility of cross-examination in Court, we support this level of choice, and would challenge the notion that the experience of Court is as suggested cathartic, although we acknowledge that pursuing Court action will be the most appropriate course of action for some survivors and that the choice is of key importance in this regard. As acknowledged, it will be necessary to fully inform survivors of their choices, and the implications of each, in order that they can make an informed choice on the most appropriate course of action.

- 6) The level of payments offered to survivors.

Glasgow City Council strongly supports the principle that the financial redress will be directed solely to survivors accessing the Scheme, who will not be required to pay legal costs. It is anticipated that most survivors will opt for an individual assessment, and this is also supported by Glasgow City Council.

- 7) What you believe to be a 'fair and meaningful' contribution to the scheme from organisations responsible for abuse.

This will need to relate to the number of claims, and the extent/ impact of the abuse on each applicant. Glasgow city council would welcome further guidance and information on how these financial claims will be assessed and indeed how contributions from local Authorities will be calculated and determined.

- 8) The process for dealing with applications to the scheme from people who have serious convictions.

Given the Scheme is operationalising a trauma-informed approach, this should arguably not affect the eligibility/ process for making an application to the Redress Scheme, except possibly in relation to serious convictions for fraud. Circumstances relating to criminal convictions should be assessed individually, using a trauma-informed framework, and taking into account the added stress across the life course, and the potential impact of redress on the survivor (through, for example, addressing poverty).

- 9) The process for family members to make an application on behalf of a survivor who has since died.

The four week period for notification of a review of the panel decision may be difficult for next of kin dealing with a recent bereavement. Consequently, Glasgow city council would suggest a further reflection and review to consider again the period of notification.

- 10) How to ensure that non-financial redress (e.g. an apology) meets the needs of survivors.

An acknowledgement of system failures, and the impact on individual children, is as important as financial redress. This needs to strongly acknowledge the impact of the abuse on survivors throughout their lives, and build on the research literature relating to the impact of trauma. Mental health support will be an important element of the Scheme, and should be procured from organisations working applying a trauma-informed approach, so that all aspects of the Scheme are working in close alignment, and that survivor's experience consistently high quality, trauma-informed support from all individuals supporting the implementation of the Scheme.