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Aims of the Project

- to develop **effective ways of enabling people to make supported decisions** within an appropriate safeguarding framework
- to identify, facilitate and provide the range and forms of **support that can make a difference**
- to inform the **principles for and a clear policy framework for supported decision making**
- to develop **practice guidelines** for supported decision making
- to **prioritise the voice of people living with disability** about the optimal ways to provide support with decision making
- to promote awareness and strategies to **assist agencies and service providers** to work within a supported decision making framework with people living with disability so they can exercise their legal rights and capacity.
SA Supported Decision Making Trial

- Supported Person
- Supporter
- Monitor
- Make a non statutory agreement
- 20 people alternatives to guardianship
- 20 people early intervention + further approval for 10 (Health Ethics)
Agreements

• The document itself - deliberate wording.
• Consent.
• People have specifically added what they wanted to make decisions about.
• They added what kind of support they specifically wanted and how they wanted it delivered.
• You might prompt the supported person by letting them know how participants have used their agreements to date.
Trial Exclusions

• Dementia.
• Primary diagnosis of mental health.
• Extreme conflict.
• Safety considerations.
• Degenerative conditions.
SDM Work Flow Chart

1. SDM Information & Education for Research Trial
   - Employ Facilitator
     - Create Handouts, Flyers, Newsletters, Web Page
     - Circulate through disability and community networks, media and supported work places by presentations to staff and informal chats to potential participants

2. Recruitment
   - Do they fit the Research Target Group? [Do they have any exclusion criteria?]
     - No
       - Advocacy
       - Mediation / Counselling
       - Referral to Agency
       - Voluntary Guardianship
       - No further action
     - Yes
       - Supporter Consent
       - Consent to follow-up & evaluation by Facilitator
       - Go onto Agreement
         - Participant keeps diary of all decisions. Facilitator maintains fortnightly contact
         - Put on hold; Introduced Supporter?
         - No supporter or supporter declines
         - Declined - No further action

3. Safeguards
   - Discuss during Supervision

4. Facilitator contacts all Participants' close relationships and Services so all working for common goal.
Trial governance

- Non-statutory agreements – oversight.
- Based at Office of Public Advocate.
- Project Control Group
- Development of practice guidelines.
- Future base in the non-government sector.
- Ethics committee.
Ages of Participants on Agreements

![Bar Chart]

- 18 to 19
- 20 to 29
- 30 to 39
- 40 to 49
- 50 to 59
- 60 to 69
- 70 to 79
Types of Disability

- Autism
- Autism + Motor Neurone
- Brain Injury
- Brain Injury + Deaf
- Brain Injury + Blind
- Foetal Alcohol Syndrome
- Genetic
- ID
- ID + Autism
- ID + Hydrocephalus
- ID + Motor Neurone
- ID + Physical
- Motor Neurone
Participants’ Supporter Choice

- Friend: 10
- Spouse: 0
- Parent: 1
- Sibling: 8
- Grandparent: 0
- Son/Daughter: 1
- Extended Family: 1
- Introduced: 0
- None: 0
Accommodation Before & After Agreement

- Community House
- Shared Housing
- Friends
- Residential Care
- Private Rental
- SAHT
- Family
- Aged Care
- Group

Before vs. After comparison chart.
Participants’ Health Decisions

- Medical tests
- Treatments
- Hospital
- Medication
- Weight
- Communication Technology
- Toileting
Participants’ Lifestyle Decisions

- Security: 6
- Relationships: 18
- Parenting: 4
- Work: 11
- Holiday: 9
- Funeral: 2
- Legal: 2
- Centrelink: 2
- Choosing Support: 2
These slides were part of a presentation to the International Guardianship Conference. This was then followed by presenters from the NSW Supported Decision Making Trial, who were part of a joint SA and NSW presentation.
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