



# Nottingham and Nottinghamshire

## **Joint Policy and Procedure on the Mental Capacity Act (2005)**

Second Edition: June 2010





*Positive about mental health and learning disability*



**This Policy and Procedure was reviewed for the second edition by** representatives of the Nottinghamshire Mental Capacity Act Local Information Network. This followed widespread consultation and involvement with health and social care agencies in Nottinghamshire.

June 2010

## CONTENTS

		Page Number
<b>1)</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
	1.1. Equality Impact Assessment	6
	1.2. Defining Lack of Capacity	7
	1.3. Key Principles of the Act	8
<b>2)</b>	<b>Assessment of Capacity</b>	<b>8</b>
	2.1 Who Makes Assessments	9
	2.2 Test of Capacity	9
	2.3 Guidelines for Assessment of Capacity	10
<b>3)</b>	<b>Best Interests</b>	<b>11</b>
	3.1 Best Interests Check List	11
<b>4)</b>	<b>Referral to the IMCA (Independent Mental Capacity Advocate) Service</b>	<b>11</b>
	4.1 Referral Criteria for IMCAs	12
	4.2 Decisions Where a Person Must be Referred	12
	4.3 Optional Decisions	13
	4.4 Safeguarding	14
	4.5 Access to Records	15
	4.6 IMCAs and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards	15
<b>5)</b>	<b>Confidentiality, Disclosure and Consultation</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6)</b>	<b>Liability, Conveyance and Staff Protection for Acts Done under Sec 5 MCA</b>	<b>16</b>
	6.1 Liability	16
	6.2 Change of Residence	16
	6.3 Restraint	17
	6.4 Transport	18
	6.5 Urgency	19

<b>7)</b>	<b>Advance Planning</b>	<b>19</b>
		Page Number
	7.1 Advance Decisions to Refuse Treatment	19
	7.2 Statements of Wishes & Feelings	20
	7.3 Lasting Power of Attorney	20
<b>8)</b>	<b>Disputes</b>	<b>21</b>
	8.1 Notification	21
<b>9)</b>	<b>Finance</b>	<b>21</b>
	9.1 Appointees	21
	9.2 Personal Budgets and Direct Payments	22
	9.3 Paying for Goods and Services	23
	9.4 Access to a Person's Assets. Power of Attorney.	23
<b>10)</b>	<b>Public Guardian, Court of Protection</b>	<b>24</b>
	10.1 Court of Protection	24
	10.2 Office of the Public Guardian	24
<b>11)</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>25</b>
	11.1 The MCA and Children under 16	25
	11.2 The MCA and Young People of 16 and 17	25
	11.3 Young People Who will need an Independent MC Advocate	25
	11.4 Young People Who Already Use an Advocacy Service	26
	11.5 Transitions	26
	11.6 Working with Parents Who May Lack Capacity	26
<b>12)</b>	<b>Interface with Mental Health Act</b>	<b>26</b>
	12.1 General	26
	12.2 Guardianship	27
	12.3 Detained Persons	27
	12.4 Non-detained Persons	
	12.5 Persons on a Community Treatment Order	28
<b>13)</b>	<b>Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS)</b>	<b>28</b>
	13.1 DOL Safeguards & a Separate Policy	28

	Page Number
<b>14) Recording</b>	<b>29</b>
14.1 Recording	29
<b>15) Criminal Offence</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>16) Research</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>17) Appendices</b>	<b>31</b>
Appendix 1: Test for Capacity	31
Appendix 2: Test for Capacity	34
Appendix 3: Best Interests Checklist	36
Appendix 4: Shorter Best Interests Checklist	40
Appendix 5: Guidance to the Mental Capacity Act and Care Planning	43
Appendix 6: Guidance from the Care Quality Commission	45
Appendix 7: IMCA Service 2010	46

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes guidance for health and social care staff in Nottingham City and in Nottinghamshire where the relevant agency - whether statutory, independent voluntary, or private sector - has ratified this document for use in their organisation.

References throughout this document refer to the *Mental Capacity Act Code of Practice* (MCA Code), the *Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Code of Practice to supplement the main Mental Capacity Act 2005 Code of Practice* (DOL Code), and the *Code of Practice, Mental Health Act 1983* (MHA Code).

This document should also be read in conjunction with the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Multi Agency Policy and Procedure on the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

The purpose of this guidance is to inform health and social care staff about the local procedural arrangements for working with patients/service users with impaired mental capacity. This policy and procedure applies to all health and social care staff and wider support agencies involved in the care, treatment and support of people mainly but not exclusively over the age of 16 who are unable to make all or some decisions for themselves – but please note that some sections only apply to those over 18.

The basic principles of the Act are described in this document. It is not intended to replace the Code of Practice. For a detailed wider commentary on the practice implications of the Act, staff must consult the Act itself and the Code of Practice, as well as case law commentary as it emerges. Staff are reminded that they must have regard to the Code of Practice and will need to take active responsibility for equipping themselves to practice within the law and they should be able to explain how they have regard to the Act and the Code when acting or making decisions on behalf of people who lack capacity to make decisions for themselves.

***Health and Social Care Services that have not signed up to this Policy may wish to use this as a basis for writing their own. Responsibility for the accuracy of any amended versions rests with those services.***

### 1.1 Equality Impact Assessment

Each agency that uses this Policy and Procedure should take responsibility for conducting their own impact assessment in keeping with agency guidelines for this process. The Equality Impact Assessment on the Mental Capacity Act (30<sup>th</sup> May 2007) states “the aim of the Act is to provide an appropriate balance between an individual’s’ right to autonomy and self determination with the right to safeguards and protection from harm”.

In meeting this balance, the impact of the Act is expected to be positive for all groups assessed in the Equality Impact Assessment. However, agencies have to ensure that they meet this aim by using the Code of Practice and agency procedures such as this to support staff in how they implement the Act.

## 1.2 Defining Lack of Capacity

The Mental Capacity Act provides a statutory framework to empower and protect vulnerable people who may not be able to make their own decisions. The Act defines 'lack of capacity' as an inability to make a particular decision at a particular time due to "*an impairment of or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain*". The Act contains the following key elements in regard to capacity:-

- **Time specific** – the issue is whether a person can make a decision at the relevant particular time
- **Decision specific**- capacity relates to a specific decision not a general ability to make decisions
- **Diagnostic threshold** – must have permanent or temporary impairment of or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain
- **Not based on appearance and behaviour** – e.g. not assuming someone lacks capacity just because they have a learning disability
- **Balance of probabilities** – lack of capacity must be decided on the balance of probabilities of what is more likely than not.

1.2.1 The Act states that a person cannot make a decision if they cannot do any of the following four things:-

- Understand information given to them relevant to the decision.
- Retain that information long enough to be able to make the decision.
- Use or weigh up the information available to make the decision as part of the decision – making process.
- Communicate their decision in any way.

1.2.2 Lack of capacity can be due to for example:-

- A stroke or brain injury
- A mental health problem
- Dementia
- A significant learning disability
- Confusion, drowsiness or unconsciousness because of an illness or the treatment of it
- A neurological disorder
- Substance misuse

1.2.3 The law further emphasises that the disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain can be permanent or temporary. It says that no-one can be labelled 'incapable' by reference simply to a particular diagnosis or mental condition nor by reference to a person's age or appearance or aspect of their behaviour that might lead to an unjustified assumption about their lack of capacity.

If an individual has capacity in relation to a decision, then a decision cannot be made on their behalf under this Act although it does not preclude decisions being made in relation to treatment for a mental disorder if the patient is detained under the Mental Health Act.

### 1.3 Key Principles of the Act (MCA Code Chapter 2)

Staff will need to keep the following Five Key Principles in mind when working with people who may lack capacity to make decisions and statutory organisations need to demonstrate that they are working to these principles:-

- **Presumption of Capacity**  
A person must be assumed to have capacity unless it is clear that she/he lacks capacity to make a decision.
- **Maximising decision-making**  
A person is not to be treated as unable to make a decision unless all practical efforts to help them have been made without success.
- **Unwise decisions**  
A person is not to be treated as unable to make a decision because he/she makes an unwise decision. The Code of Practice distinguishes between unwise decisions where a person has capacity to make them and repeated unwise decisions that cause concern and unwise decisions that require investigation
- **Best interests**  
An act done or decision made under the Mental Capacity Act for or on behalf of a person who lacks capacity must be done or made in his/her best interests. (see Section 4 of the Act – and Appendices 3 and 4 **Best Interests Checklists**).
- **Least restrictive option**  
Before an act is done or a decision is made on behalf of a person lacking capacity it should be considered whether these purposes can be achieved in a way that is less restrictive of that person's rights and freedom of action.

## 2. ASSESSMENT OF CAPACITY

The Act sets out a two stage test of diagnostic and functional elements for assessing whether a person lacks capacity to take a particular decision at the relevant time, based on the principles outlined above. If, for example, a person has a diagnosis of “dementia” or “learning disability” this does not imply or determine that they lack capacity. The Act simplifies assessment of capacity and encourages this to be undertaken by a wide range of health and social care staff on a regular basis.

There should be evidence of a capacity assessment - where capacity is in doubt - when the particular care plan has been developed. This means that it is not then always necessary for care staff to assess capacity if this has been assessed as part of the care plan - for example where a care worker helps a person to get dressed. The care plan should take account of the possibility that capacity can fluctuate and even though the assessment in the care plan indicates that the person lacks capacity, that person may actually have capacity at the time the decision needs to be made. Likewise where the situation is urgent such as when a person runs into the road and may need restraint in order to protect them from harm there is no expectation that a detailed capacity assessment has taken place. Reasonable belief that the person lacks capacity to make the decision will be enough. Decision makers must be



prepared to justify their decision. A more detailed capacity assessment should be carried out if a more serious decision has to be made and capacity is in doubt (MCA Code 4.34).

## 2.1 Who Makes Assessments under the Act?

All health and social care staff are likely to have to assess capacity at some stage. Who assesses capacity depends on the nature of the decision that needs to be made. For day-to-day domestic decisions a carer can make decisions about capacity and take decisions on behalf of the person cared for, provided that they reasonably believe that the person lacks capacity to make the decisions and then act in the person's best interests. However, more experienced decision makers will become involved in assessing capacity when:-

- When a decision needs to be made that is serious or has serious consequences
- There is a dispute about capacity by the person or by carers or other decision makers
- A person is expressing different views to different people, perhaps in an attempt to tell them what they think they want to hear
- A challenge to a person's capacity to make a decision is likely
- There are legal consequences to a finding of capacity
- A person is repeatedly making decisions that put them or others at risk of harm
- Capacity is at issue in a case of adult safeguarding (MCA Code 4.53)

The Act requires a nominated decision maker for a decision on behalf of a person lacking capacity to decide for him or herself. The Act does not specify who should undertake the assessment of capacity but gives guidance in Paragraph 4.38 – 4.43 of the Code of Practice. Primarily it is the person who is to undertake an act in connection with care or treatment who is responsible for the assessment.

Carers and all levels of health and social care staff will make day-to-day assessments based on best interests and the principles of the Act on a regular basis for the more minor decisions on behalf of people who lack capacity. More serious decisions will require more senior/ appropriately qualified decision makers/practitioners. The Code of Practice discusses decision making in more detail. (MCA Code 4.51)

## 2.2 The Test of Capacity

Firstly, the person must have an impairment of or disturbance in functioning of the mind or brain. A lack of capacity must not be established merely by reference to a person's age or appearance or a condition that they might have or aspect of their behaviour which might lead another to an unjustified assumption about that person's capacity. Capacity is to be assessed in relation to a particular decision at the relevant time that the decision needs to be made.

If a person does not have an impairment of or disturbance in functioning of the mind or brain, then they cannot lack capacity.

Secondly, the impairment or disturbance must mean that they cannot understand, retain weigh up or communicate their decision in any way.

This guidance offers documentation for recording the **Two Stage Test for Capacity (Appendix 1 and 2)**.

## **2.3 Guidelines for completion of the Two Stage Test (MCA Code Chapter 4)**

### **Stage 1: The diagnostic threshold**

The Act and Code of Practice acknowledge that if there is an established diagnosis of mental illness, learning disability or some other condition then this is sufficient to confirm “impairment of or disturbance in functioning of the mind or brain”. However, some may not have a formal diagnosis of this kind, but assessors need to take all reasonable steps to satisfy themselves that there is a temporary or permanent impairment or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain. The diagnostic descriptor “Other” is to be used for conditions/diagnoses that do not readily fit the main categories mentioned above.

#### **Nature of decision**

Assessors should record the nature of the decision facing their client/patient.

### **Stage 2: The functional threshold**

#### **a) Understanding the information**

This test requires the assessor to help the person understand the information relevant to the decision. The Code of Practice provides examples (MCA Code 4.18). Information should be presented in a clear and simple way or with the use of visual aids. Cultural/linguistic considerations should be included and family, friends and carers of the person being assessed should be used to assist the process. In order to demonstrate “understanding” a person needs to understand the nature of the decision, the reason why it is needed and to have an element of foresight about the likely effects of making or not making the decision.

#### **b) Retain the information**

Information need only be held in the mind of the person long enough to make the decision. The Code of Practice gives examples of how to help people retain information for longer (MCA Code 4.20).

#### **c) Use or weigh the information**

Some people can retain and understand the information but an impairment or disturbance in functioning - such as psychosis - stops them from using it. The inability to use the information has to be the result of the disorder not a lack of agreement with or trust in the decision makers. The person must be able to consider and balance the arguments for and against a proposed action and weigh up the likely consequences before making a decision.

#### **d) Communicate the decision in any way**

The Code of Practice gives examples of how people should be helped to communicate “in any way” (MCA Code 4.24). Assessors should consider using specialist workers to assist in communication i.e. for people with sensory impairment.

## General Notes

- The answer NO to any of the questions in part 2 of the test indicates that the person lacks capacity in relation to that decision.
- The Act requires “reasonable belief” of the assessor that a person lacks capacity in relation to a decision.
- Decision makers/practitioners need to be able to identify objective reasons why a person lacks capacity based on the above test.
- Decision makers/practitioners should take care to sign and date the assessment and record the time by the 24 hour clock.

## 3. BEST INTERESTS

Once a person is assessed as lacking capacity to make a decision the Act requires the decision maker to make a “best interests decision” on their behalf. The decision maker is the person who would undertake the act in connection with care or treatment. This could be a different person in relation to each decision (see MCA Code 5.8 – 5.12). The Act provides detailed rules on determining Best Interests and there is commentary in the Code of Practice (Chapter 5). This Policy and Procedure provides specimen Best Interests checklists for use by “decision makers”, to guide them through the key statutory criteria and to act as a record that employees are reasonably acting in the best interests of vulnerable people.

### 3.1 Best Interests Check List

See Appendix 3 and 4 for specimen checklists. A checklist should be used as a guide to the statutory best interests indicators. It should be used to guide best interests discussions and evidence of those discussions should be recorded in patient/ service user notes. As a minimum there should be evidence of the following:

How the decision was reached.

What the reasons for that decision were.

Who was consulted in relation to the decision?

What particular factors were taken into account? (See MCA Code 5.15).

## 4. REFERRAL TO IMCA (INDEPENDENT MENTAL CAPACITY ADVOCATE) SERVICE

The Act places a legal duty on local authorities and the NHS to refer a person to an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate Service in certain circumstances in order to support vulnerable people who lack capacity to make important decisions. IMCAS must be involved when a person has been evidenced as lacking capacity in relation to important decisions about treatment and about longer periods of accommodation in a hospital or care home. IMCAs may also be involved in some other cases where decisions with serious implications need to be made and when they have no family, friends or carers.

There will be an initial screening and signposting service if the referral is accepted. The IMCA service will issue a referral form. This will usually be sent electronically. There may be further screening and signposting of ineligible referrals at the initial assessment stage.

#### 4.1 Referral Criteria for Nottingham City & Nottinghamshire IMCAs

- Referral is to be made only by relevant “decision maker” i.e. a qualified member of local authority-employed health and social care staff or by allied healthcare decision makers employed by an NHS body.
- The person must lack capacity for the required decision as evidenced by use of the Two Stage Capacity Test. The IMCA service may ask for a copy of this.
- The person should be ordinarily resident in Nottingham City or Nottinghamshire County or be living in a residential unit or be an in-patient in an NHS hospital situated in that area.
- The proposed serious decision about treatment is not psychiatric treatment for a person currently detained under The Mental Health Act (1983) or accommodation arranged under the MHA Section 7.
- An IMCA should be involved in a decision about ECT in a non – detained patient who may lack capacity and is where there is no one appropriate to consult.
- That person has no relative, friend or carer (someone not paid to care), Lasting Power of Attorney (Section 40 of the MCA allows for an IMCA to be involved in decisions about any matters that may not be covered by LPAs with specific remits), Enduring Power of Attorney, Deputy or individual nominated by the person lacking capacity who is appropriate to consult in determining the person’s best interests. (note relatives and carers considered by decision makers as not appropriate to consult might include: relatives permanently living abroad and cases where adult protection issues have been raised. If family and friends disagree with the decision maker, that does not automatically mean they are “not appropriate to consult”. Decision maker judgement is the arbiter of “appropriateness”).
- Person must be facing one of the decisions described in 4.2 below.

#### 4.2 Decisions where a Person must be referred to an IMCA

- Where an NHS body is proposing serious medical treatment or proposing stopping or withholding serious medical treatment.
- Where an NHS body proposes to provide accommodation in hospital for a period of more than 28 days or in a care home for more than 8 weeks.
- Where an NHS body proposes to change a person’s accommodation to another hospital or care home for a period of more than 28 days in hospital or 8 weeks in a care home.
- Where a local authority proposes to provide or to change residential accommodation for more than 8 weeks continuously.

**NB:** If there is a need for **urgent** treatment then an IMCA need not be consulted beforehand. However if further serious treatment follows on from the original urgent treatment then an IMCA must be involved in this further treatment decision making process (MCA Code 10.46).

If a person has to be moved to statutory accommodation as a matter of urgency (such as in cases of possible homelessness), the move need not be delayed in order to commission an IMCA (MCA Code 10.57).

### **4.3 Optional Decisions where the Local Authority and the NHS have powers to involve an IMCA which should be considered on a case by case basis**

In the Local Authority, a person at team manager level would authorise these referrals. Staff at ward manager/community team manager level would authorise these referrals in the health sector. Decision makers should consider individual cases, but referrals should be made in exceptional cases.

#### **4.3.1 Care Reviews in Care Homes or Hospitals**

##### **a) Eligibility:-**

- Person must lack capacity in relation to serious decision
- Must be over 16
- Must have no family or carers to represent them
- Local Authority or the NHS must “have arranged the original accommodation”. This means for the purposes of this local policy and procedure that for those in care homes and other residential facilities that the person had been referred to social care services and have received a formal social care assessment at the outset of their episode of care at the care home. Inpatients in hospitals and NHS residential facilities will have been admitted following a healthcare assessment.
- An IMCA would not normally be appropriate for a routine care review or annual review of care of a settled resident with no contentious issues or decisions facing them.

##### **b) Types of Care Review Decisions where an IMCA should be involved:-**

- A care review or home placement review where there are serious decisions to be made with high potential impact on the person or which are particularly contentious or which are challenged by another person/authority. Serious decisions would include: risk of death, of serious deterioration in physical or mental health, risk of serious physical illness or injury, serious emotional distress or where a life changing decision is involved.

#### **4.4 Safeguarding (Adults who lack capacity)**

Eligibility:-

- Person alleged to be at risk of abuse or neglect must formally lack capacity in relation to serious decisions about their own well being and safety; OR  
The potential/alleged perpetrator of abuse or neglect lacks capacity in relation to serious decisions about their behaviour, and where serious harm has been alleged.
- Where formal safeguarding measures are being put in place in relation to the protection of vulnerable adults from abuse.
- Where there is a serious exposure to risk
  - Risk of death
  - Risk of serious injury or illness
  - Risk of serious deterioration in physical and mental health
  - Risk of serious emotional distress

In addition the individual lacking capacity must be over 18. Safeguarding situations are the only circumstances where an IMCA may be involved even if the individual has family and friends representing his/her interests. If there is an LPA in place and there is a reasonable belief that the LPA is not acting in the best interests of the person then an application to the Court of Protection should be made for a best interests decision or for displacement of the LPA before an IMCA is instructed.

##### **4.4.1 At what point should an IMCA become involved In Safeguarding Adults Decisions?**

- Where the early indications of the case point to life-changing implications or serious exposure of risk and where consultation with family is compromised by the reasonable belief that they would not have the person's best interest at heart.
- Where there is a challenge to the protection plan or conflict of interest between the responsible authority and the person or conflict of interest or views between the decision makers about the best interests of the person.

Consideration should be given as to the most appropriate time to instruct an IMCA. In some cases it would be appropriate to involve them at the strategy/discussion/meeting stage. This would need to happen for cases when the individual's wishes would have a significant impact on the investigative process or where immediate actions needed to be taken to safeguard the individual. In other cases it may be more appropriate for an IMCA to become involved at The Adults Safeguarding Meetings and subsequent reviews so that they can input into the safeguarding plan. Involvement of an IMCA should be reviewed once the specific decisions that prompted their original referral have been resolved.

Further information on local Safeguarding Adults policies can be found on [www.nottsadultprotection.org](http://www.nottsadultprotection.org)

There is a serious review process available through the Adult Safeguarding Boards for cases that require oversight.

## 4.5 Access to Records

All Health and Social Care staff need to be aware that IMCAs have statutory right of access to and copying of records that the record holder believes to be relevant to the decision. Decision makers and practitioners should be prepared to give access to files and notes but only to relevant information to the decision. Those responsible for patient / user records should ensure that third party information and other sensitive information not relevant to the decision at hand remains confidential.

Following referral and IMCA involvement and IMCA report, the referrer (both NHS and Local authority), will be expected to communicate the outcome of the case to the IMCA service.

## 4.6 IMCAs and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (Mental Capacity Act 2005)

There is a separate role for IMCAs in regard to the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. Refer to the Nottinghamshire Multi – Agency Policy & Procedure on the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards for details.

## 5. CONFIDENTIALITY, DISCLOSURE AND CONSULTATION

- Health and social care staff are expected to work within the five principles of the Act to maximise people's ability to consent to disclose information.
- Health and social care staff may only disclose information about somebody who lacks capacity to consent to disclose when it is in their best interests to do so (MCA Code 5.56 and Chapter 16) or when there are other lawful reasons to do so. The Data Protection Act 1998 and the common law duty of confidentiality principles are relevant. Each agency must abide by their confidentiality policies and procedures.
- LPAs and court deputies can ask to see information concerning the person so long as the information applies to the decisions for which the attorney or deputy has legal authority. The Code gives guidance about requests for limited information not requiring formal processes but they must also respect confidentiality. Any more detailed requests should be in writing (paragraphs 16.9 -16.18).
- The Public Guardian or Court of Protection visitor is allowed to examine and take copies of all relevant health, local authority social care, or care records.
- IMCAs are allowed to examine and take copies of health, local authority social service or care records that the record holder thinks may be relevant to the IMCAs involvement – and the specific decision.
- People who lack capacity for certain decisions may have the capacity to agree to someone seeing their own personal information or indeed see their own information. Even if they do lack capacity to give such consent, a deputy or attorney could see their personal information if it is in their best interests and relates to their legal authority.

## **6. LIABILITY, CONVEYANCE, AND STAFF PROTECTION FOR ACTS DONE UNDER SECTION 5 MCA**

### **6.1 Liability**

Section 5 of the Act (Acts in Connection with Care and Treatment) indicates that decision makers i.e. staff and carers must:

- Act within the Five Principles of the Mental Capacity Act (see 1.4 above).
- Take “reasonable steps” to ascertain whether a person lacks capacity to consent to the act.
- Have a reasonable belief that the person lacks capacity to make the specific decision.
- Ensure that the proposed act does not contravene the authority of a registered LPA or deputy who has the appropriate decision making authority, or a valid and applicable advance decision to refuse treatment.
- Act in the best interests of that person.

This protection is for undertaking acts without the consent of a person who lacks capacity in relation to that act and does not protect against the consequences of civil liability for loss or damage or negligence - either in carrying out a particular act or by failing to act where necessary.

Most decisions or acts will not require extensive paperwork to be completed – so long as carers and decision makers:-

- a) can give clear, objective reasons why they had a reasonable belief that someone may lack capacity and
- b) how they considered all the relevant circumstances that led them to have reasonable grounds to believe they acted in the person’s Best Interests.

Care plans should provide evidence of use of the two stage test and best interests checklist in order to allow other staff to carry out day to day acts of care or treatment under reasonable belief that the person lacks capacity. The Care Plans should include running records that are up to date. This is to evidence an audit trail of decision making.

### **6.2 Change of Residence**

Chapter 6 of the Code of Practice (6.8 – 6.14), gives detailed guidance. Health and Social Care staff must follow the Act’s principles, complete the Two Stage Capacity Test and Best Interests checklist, and record these according to their agency requirements. A referral to an IMCA must take place if the referral criteria are satisfied.

The Mental Capacity Act (Section 6) provides clear limits to the use of force or restraint, for example when helping someone move. If the process of transportation to a care home or hospital may amount to deprivation of liberty, further authorisation may be required (Refer to Multi – Agency Deprivation of Liberty Policy and Procedure for guidance).

If there is a serious disagreement in a complex situation and all avenues such as an IMCA referral and case meetings have been tried, a referral to the Court of Protection for a Best Interests decision may be necessary.



### 6.3 Restraint

The Act defines restraint as a situation when a person “uses, or threatens to use, force to do an act which the person resists “or when a person “restricts the liberty of movement of someone who lacks capacity whether or not the person resists”. Restraint could take the form of:

**Physical intervention:** one or more members of staff holding or moving someone, or blocking their movement to stop them from leaving.

**Physical restraint:** stopping an individual’s movements by the use of equipment (e.g. bed rails, belts and tables).

**Denial of practical or staff resources to manage daily living:** such as not taking people to the toilet, removing or not answering the call bell.

**Environmental restraint:** managing the environment to restrict free movement, e.g. by locks or complicated keypads.

**Chemical restraint:** the use of medication to restrain; this could be regularly prescribed medication, medication prescribed to be used ‘as required’, over-the-counter medication, or illegal drugs.

**Electronic surveillance:** close circuit television, electronic tagging, pressure pads and door alarms may be used to monitor and subsequently control people’s behaviour.

**Medical restraint:** fixing medical interventions, such as drips, so that the individual cannot remove them.

**Forced care:** restraining a resident so that personal care may be carried out, forced feeding or making people take medications.

*Taken from: CSCI Report: ‘Rights, risks and restraints: an exploration into the use of restraint in the care of older people’.* <http://www.csci.org.uk/PDF/restraint.pdf>

Section 6 (1) of the Act does not permit restraint unless there is reasonable belief that it is necessary to prevent harm and that the restraint used is proportionate to the likelihood and seriousness of harm *to the person who lacks capacity*. The Code of Practice (6.11, 6.39 - 6.48), gives examples and further guidance. The emphasis of the guidance falls on the person carrying out the restraint (or authorising it) to identify the reasons to justify it, i.e. if the person would suffer harm unless they were restrained in some way. The Act does not authorise restraint to prevent harm coming to other people who might be injured by the person without capacity, but staff may still have a duty of care to these others. Restraint under the common law may be justified in these circumstances.

Appropriate use of restraint falls short of deprivation of liberty. However, where the restriction or restraint is ***frequent, cumulative and ongoing***, then care providers should consider whether this has gone beyond permissible restraint. Restriction of liberty even though it has been agreed to be in the person’s best interests may still amount to deprivation of liberty. If this is unavoidable, further authorisation must be obtained.

Deprivation of Liberty under the Mental Capacity Act can only occur if:

- The Court of Protection authorises it (s 16) or

- Authorisation has been granted by a Supervisory Body under the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards procedures (or urgent self authorisation granted by the managing authority pending assessment by the Supervisory Body) (Schedule A1) *or*
- The deprivation of liberty is necessary to provide *emergency* medical treatment AND an order is being sought from the Court of Protection (s 4B).

Refer to the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Code of Practice and the Multi – Agency Deprivation of Liberty Policy and Procedure for detailed guidance.

## 6.4 Transport

- Informal Carers can convey a person as long as they have taken reasonable steps to ascertain that the person lacks capacity to agree to be conveyed and that it is in their best interests to be conveyed.
- Health and social care decision makers, police and ambulance personnel need to have evidenced that they have taken reasonable steps to ascertain capacity to consent to conveyance and best interests to do so unless in cases of urgent necessity. In general there is no impediment in law to conveying people who lack capacity as long as it is done to prevent harm and that it is proportionate to the seriousness of harm.
- People cannot be transported for treatment if they have made a valid and applicable advance decision to refuse that treatment.
- Health and safety considerations, lone working, insurance provision and appropriate risk assessments continue to have primacy when transporting vulnerable people. The following considerations should be included:-

Individual agency policy about conveying vulnerable people in workers own cars should be followed. In general an incompliant person not capable of consenting to be conveyed should not be moved in a workers own car without a strong rationale to do so, and not without an accompanying robust risk management plan. Other workers may also need to travel in the car to provide additional safeguards. This especially applies to moving vulnerable people into care homes or hospitals. Moving someone to view a care facility or visit a day centre for example may require a less stringent series of safeguards as the implications of the decision are less serious.
- Local Authority and NHS transport providers should request evidence of a capacity assessment and best interests checklist as part of their referral information for conveying vulnerable people, especially between residential homes and between hospitals for example.
- Police or ambulance staff moving a person lacking capacity to consent may do so if they have a “reasonable belief” that the person lacks capacity and should be moved in their best interests.
- Guidance on authority to convey the person to the place at which they are authorised to be deprived of their liberty can be found in the Multi Agency DOLS Policy.

## 6.5 Urgency

In the case of urgent medical treatment, decision makers should act in the person's best interests unless they are aware of clear reasons why the treatment or care should not be given in those circumstances (such as a valid and applicable advance decision to refuse treatment see MCA Code 6.35, 6.37). If there is doubt as to whether a valid and applicable advance decision exists, treatment may be given whilst awaiting a ruling from the Court.

## 7. ADVANCE PLANNING

### 7.1 Advance Decision to Refuse Treatment (ADRT) (MCA Code Chapter 9)

A person who is over 18 years of age and who has capacity to make the decision can specify what medical treatments they would refuse in the future should they lack capacity. The person must specify the treatment that is to be refused and the circumstances of that refusal.

Advance Decisions relate to refusal of medical treatment rather than social care. They are not demands for treatment nor can they be used to refuse 'basic care' such as being kept clean or free from pressure sores.

There are distinctions between advance decisions to refuse treatment (which could be made verbally) and advance decisions to refuse *life-sustaining* treatment (which are subject to strict requirements).

If the advance decision is in relation to *life sustaining* treatment:

- It must be in writing - it must be signed by the maker (or another in the maker's presence and that signature witnessed).
- It must be witnessed.
- It must contain a statement confirming that the decision is to apply to that treatment 'even if life is at risk'.

There is no statutory format for an advance decision – it is the *content* that is vital – not the appearance – but Nottinghamshire health and social care staff can access a blank ADRT form on [www.adrtnhs.co.uk](http://www.adrtnhs.co.uk)

Advance decisions to refuse treatment must be recorded in Health and Social Care records when they are received by health and social care decision makers. An advance decision can be withdrawn or altered at any time whilst the person has capacity.

A valid and applicable advance decision to refuse treatment will be binding on decision makers and treatment cannot be given (Note: exceptions when the treatment is for a mental disorder and the patient is detained under the Mental Health Act 1983 – see below).

The East Midlands Ambulance Service has agreed a 'Registration of End of Life Care Decision' protocol with an accompanying 'Clinical Guidance Bulletin'. See their website [www.emas.nhs.uk](http://www.emas.nhs.uk) for more details.

## **7.2 Statements of wishes & feelings (MCA Code 5.40 – 5.45)**

The Act requires decisions to be taken in a person's best interests. This includes taking into account any relevant written statement that the person may have made when they had capacity.

These can cover a wide range of preferred treatments or ways in which people would prefer to be cared for if they lose capacity. They enable views and preferences on a range of healthcare, treatment, social care and personal issues to be recorded and taken into account when subsequent decisions are being made on behalf of that person should they lose capacity to make these decisions for themselves.

Staff should consider adding a "planning ahead" element to user/patient reviews e.g. Care Programme Approach reviews. A person's capacity at the time to make the decision must be supported and aided as much as possible.

Evidence of statements of wishes and feelings (verbal or written) must be recorded in Health and Social Care records when they are made by the patient or service user.

Although these general wishes must be taken into account by those providing care and treatment in the future when working out best interests, they are not legally binding. If a person has made a written statement and the decision maker has not been able to follow it, the decision maker must record the reasons why (MCA Code 5.43).

## **7.3 Lasting Power of Attorney (MCA Code Chapter 7)**

An individual over 18 years old who has capacity (the donor), can appoint someone else (the donee) to make decisions on their behalf.

A Personal Welfare Lasting Power of Attorney enables decisions to be made regarding health and welfare such as personal care and medical care.

A Property and Affairs Lasting Power of Attorney enables decisions to be made regarding finance and property.

A donor can appoint one or more person to have Lasting Power of Attorney,

The donee of the LPA must be consulted by decision makers as part of best interests decision making (MCA Code 7.25). *Nevertheless, it is very important to recognise that the donee may have the decision making power in relation to the issue. Personal Welfare Attorneys may only make decisions when the donor lacks capacity to make the decision.* The donee of a Personal Welfare LPA may have authority to refuse life sustaining treatment if that has been specified explicitly within the LPA document. All Lasting Powers of Attorney MUST be registered with the Office of the Public Guardian in order for the donee to have any authority to act on behalf of the person. It is important to have sight of the original document (copies are not acceptable) or to confirm with the Office of the Public Guardian to establish the extent of the donee's decision making ability.

Individual agencies should make reasonable efforts to ascertain whether an LPA is in place for patient/users to whom they are offering a service and whether a statement of wishes & feelings or valid and applicable ADRT is in place. The Office of the Public Guardian can be contacted on 0300 456 0300 by decision makers who need to check that an LPA is registered. The individual organisation's safeguarding lead or equivalent should also be contacted in the event that decision makers have legitimate concerns about the conduct of (not merely disagreement with) the person acting as the LPA.

Individual agencies should have a policy to clarify whether their staff can be certificate providers or witnesses to Lasting Power of Attorney documents.

## **8. DISPUTES**

The Code of Practice (Chapter 15) gives general guidance on how to resolve disputes and conflicts about issues of capacity. The Court of Protection is the final arbiter on matters of capacity but Local Authority and NHS staff should seek local resolution of disputes/concerns/challenges rather than risking expensive legal processes. In the first instance the relevant line-manager should provide an overview and support to resolve disputes. If this is unsuccessful then the relevant Local Authority or NHS Service Head/Service Manager will convene a case review and reconciliation process with help from the respective legal section. Differing agencies should have regard to their own dispute and reconciliation procedures.

### **8.1 Notification**

Disputes and challenges about IMCAs will go first to the relevant advocacy organisation internal reconciliation process then if unresolved to the individual agencies complaints and legal processes. The Nottinghamshire IMCA steering group should be notified of any such disputes. For Nottingham City residents this would be the Commissioning Officer, Nottingham City Council (Older Persons). For Nottinghamshire County residents, the Service Manager Mental Health, County Hall.

## **9. FINANCE**

### **9.1 Appointees**

The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) can appoint someone (an appointee) to claim and spend benefits on a person's behalf if that person:

- gets social security benefits or pensions
- lacks the capacity to act for themselves
- has not made a property and affairs LPA or an EPA, and
- the court has not appointed a property and affairs deputy.

The DWP checks that an appointee is trustworthy. It also investigates any allegations that an appointee is not acting appropriately or in the person's interests. It can remove an appointee who abuses their position. Concerns about appointees should be raised with the relevant DWP agency. (MCA Code 14.36).

### **Appointees for those in Residential Care**

Where the only assets of a service user are their benefits, and when they are in residential care and lack capacity to manage their affairs, then the current Local Authority system by

which the Strategic Director/Corporate Director is identified as their “appointee”, with all transactions made in their name by the respective Adult Care Finance Team will remain in place.

Where there is someone known to the service user who can act as their appointee, that person should be identified in the residential referral so that their status can be confirmed as part of the financial assessment process.

The relevant Receivership and Finance teams will have their own more detailed procedural guidance.

Referring social workers will need to bear in mind that clients who may lack capacity to understand the significance of finance and care documentation should not be required to sign them.

## 9.2 Personal Budgets and Direct Payments

### Self Directed Support/Personalised Plans and people who lack capacity

Both Self Directed Support and Person Centred Planning have values that link closely with the MCA, around communication, enabling decision making and promoting choice. The person centred thinking tools can be helpful in ensuring that the person is as involved as possible with decisions surrounding personal budgets and self directed support, particularly when the person does not have capacity to make decisions in specific areas.

The Mental Capacity Act states that involvement should continue even if the person does not have the capacity to make the decision. This means that although they may not be able to make the overall decision, they may be able to make smaller decisions that are part of the overall decision. For instance, someone may not have capacity to make a decision about what support provider they want but they may be able to tell you (through their words or behaviour) that they prefer female staff to male staff. This information must *always* be taken into account when supporting someone to develop their support plan and arrange support. Tools such as **Good Day Bad Day** and **Important to and for** can be used to gather more information. It is important also that any statement that the person has made should be used to support best interest’s decision making where a person lacks capacity.

### The Self Directed Support/Personal Budget process for people who lack capacity:

Initial assessment should identify at an early stage where capacity is in doubt and this should be further explored as part of the Self Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ). The SDSA includes a section which identifies how capacity issues were managed during the assessment, for example what steps were taken to try to enable the service user to make decisions. It also identifies the sections of the assessment where “best interest” decisions have been taken on behalf of the service user who lacks capacity.

The above information should be explored as part of the Self Assessment Questionnaire and recorded in the outcomes boxes and the support plan should evidence how we are taking into account the views of the person when they lack capacity.

If a person has fluctuating capacity, a **Decision Making Profile** may enable us to explore how best to support the person in decision making. This information should then be used to inform when and how we support the person with the SAQ and support plan.

It is particularly important for people who lack capacity that we continue to learn about what is important to them on an ongoing basis after the implementation of support services. This information can then be used to inform reviews and update support plans. **Learning Logs** are

a useful tool to promote ongoing learning and may be a useful tool to ask support providers to complete when they are supporting someone who has a personal budget.

### **Direct Payments:**

Someone who has eligible needs but who lacks capacity to consent to direct payments can still receive them. An assessment of capacity should be undertaken to establish this. Local Authorities can then make direct payments to a person who lacks capacity but via an appropriate and willing 'suitable person' who can receive it on their behalf.

Further advice and Guidance is available in the Department of Health Document

"Guidance on direct payments - For community care, services for carers and children's services". Published in September 2009 or go to:

[http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_104840](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_104840)

### **9.3 Paying for goods and services:**

Paid care staff and other carers may have to make decisions about the person's money in some circumstances e.g. pay for a hairdresser or house repairs. This kind of payment for necessary goods and services on behalf of a person who lacks capacity is permissible under sections 5 and 8 of the Mental Capacity Act.

- Decisions that need to be made about financial issues need to follow the best interests principle.
- It is important to consider what are 'necessary' goods and services to the person; suitable for the person and their requirements (6.58).
- The carer must take reasonable steps to check whether the person can make the payment themselves or has capacity to consent to the carer to doing it for them (6.61)
- Bills, receipts and proof of payments should be kept. This is particularly true for those who are in care homes or who receive domiciliary care.

However, this does not give access to a person's income, assets or allow the sale of property. This is only possible through **formal legal authority**; a court order, a Lasting Power of Attorney responsible for the person financial affairs or a deputy appointed by the Court of Protection (MCA Code 6.56 – 6.66).

### **9.4 Access to a person's assets**

#### **9.4.1. Property and Affairs LPAs (MCA Code Chapter 7)**

Once an LPA is registered with the Office of the Public Guardian, the Attorney may make any decisions authorised in the instrument about the person's financial affairs even where the person still has capacity but has agreed for this to happen. This is different to the Personal Welfare LPA where the LPA can only make a decision on behalf of a person who lacks capacity and where they have that decision making ability.

Following registration the attorney can then manage the donor's financial affairs in line with the powers given in the LPA. There may be restrictions or conditions on the way the LPA can

manage an account as attorney, For example more than one attorney may be needed to sell property but either could manage a bank account.

#### **9.4.2. Enduring Power of Attorney (EPA)**

An EPA will have been created prior to October 2007 but is similar to an LPA in that the Attorney may make any agreed decision about the person's financial affairs even where the person still has capacity but has agreed for this to happen. When the person "is or is becoming incapable of managing [...] their affairs" the Attorney must register it with the Office of the Public Guardian (MCA Code 7.5). There are different rules that apply to LPAs and EPAs. Whilst existing EPAs are still valid, only LPAs can be made following the introduction of the Mental Capacity Act.

#### **9.4. 3. Property and Affairs Deputies**

The Court may appoint a deputy to manage a person's financial affairs if the person lacks capacity to make decisions about their property or finances and they have not made an EPA or LPA.

Applications to the Court are necessary for this to happen (see below). If appropriate, an applicant may be nominated by the Local Authority Corporate Director (Court Deputy) or NHS equivalent to be appointed by the Court of Protection as a Deputy (MCA Code 8.35 – 8.37).

### **10. THE COURT OF PROTECTION and OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC GUARDIAN (MCA Code Chapter 8)**

#### **10.1**

The Court of Protection is based in London but may hear cases in regional courts. The Court may appoint Deputies who will make decisions on finance matters for persons lacking capacity. In exceptional cases they may appoint deputies for health and welfare matters to make decisions about ongoing complex care decisions. These would usually be family members or could be Local Authority employees or the existing Deputy.

The Court of Protection has a dedicated customer enquiry service. For any queries relating to applications to the Court of Protection or to request Court of Protection forms, call 0300 456 4600 or email [courtofprotectionenquiries@hmcourts-service.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:courtofprotectionenquiries@hmcourts-service.gsi.gov.uk)

#### **10.2**

The Office of the Public Guardian regulates Deputies and Lasting Powers of Attorney.

The OPG can be contacted on 0300 456 0300 or email at:

[customerservices@publicguardian.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:customerservices@publicguardian.gsi.gov.uk)



## 11. CHILDREN (MCA Code Chapter 12)

Note: The term “children” is used for people under the age of 16, and “young people” for those aged 16 and 17.

### 11.1 The MCA and children under 16

In most situations the care and welfare of children under 16 continues to be dealt with under the Children Act 1989.

There are two parts of the MCA that apply to children under 16:-

- The Court of Protection’s powers to make decisions concerning the property and affairs of a child under the age of 16. The Court can make these decisions where it considers it likely that the child will lack capacity to make decisions about their property and affairs even when they are 18. This could be useful as it means there will be no need for new proceedings once the young person reaches adulthood: the arrangements made for them as a child can continue smoothly past the age of 18.
- The criminal offence of ill treatment or neglect also applies to children under 16 who lack capacity because of any impairment or disturbance in functioning in the mind or brain as no lower age limit is specified for the victim. It remains to be seen whether there will be any advantages in prosecuting someone under this law rather than under existing laws used to protect children.
- Care and treatment of children under 16 is governed by common law principles (known as *Gillick* competence or Fraser Guidelines), the Children Act 1989, and where appropriate, the Mental Health Act 1983 (as amended).

### 11.2 The MCA and young people of 16 and 17

Most of the provisions of the MCA apply to young people once they are 16.

There are exceptions and the following parts of the MCA **do not apply to 16 and 17 year olds**, but only to people who are 18 and over:-

- Making a Lasting Power of Attorney
- Making an advance decision to refuse treatment
- Making a will. The law generally does not allow people under 18 to make a will and the MCA confirms that the Court of Protection has no power to make a will on behalf of anyone under 18.
- The Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards procedures apply only to those over 18.

The Code of Practice provides guidance on acts of care and treatment for young people who lack capacity to consent as well as background guidance about care and treatment for competent young people.

### 11.3 Young People who will need an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA)

Young people, aged 16 and 17 **must** be referred to the IMCA service if they:-

- lack capacity in relation to a decision
- are facing major or life changing decisions as defined in the IMCA guidance in this policy and
- have no family member, friend or existing advocate who can support them in making a decision in their best interests

#### **11.4 Young people who already use an Advocacy Service**

Some young people, who lack capacity, and who have no family or friends able to support them appropriately, will often already be using an advocacy service. Many of these young people either will be Children in Need or will be Looked After.

Local Authorities have a duty to provide an advocacy service for all children and young people looked after, in need and in receipt of After Care (Adoption Act 2002 amendment to Children Act 1989). In addition, all children looked after who do not have regular contact with their parents will have an independent visitor. It will remain within the judgement of the decision maker, to decide on a case by case basis, whether the connection with these advocates is sufficiently robust to constitute an appropriate support or an otherwise unsupported young person facing the sort of decisions that might require an IMCA.

Should an IMCA be required then the IMCA will be provided by the local authority approved IMCA service.

#### **11.5 Transitions**

Transitions staff should act with regard to the five principles of the Act and Chapter Twelve of the Code of Practice when helping young people to prepare for transition into adult services and plan for their future.

#### **11.6 Working with parents who may lack capacity**

Health and social care staff working with children and young people whose parents may lack capacity in relation to important decisions will need to be aware of the principles of the Act and the Code of Practice. They may consider that the parents will need additional help to make decisions or have decisions made for them in their best interests.

### **12. INTERFACE WITH THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT 1983 (as amended).**

#### **12.1 General**

In general, treatment of detained people under Part 4 of the Mental Health Act 1983 takes precedence over the Mental Capacity Act. However if a person is subject to the Mental Health Act, there should be no assumption that they lack capacity and those who do lack capacity do not stop being under the protection of the Mental Capacity Act. An example would be that if the person required treatment for a physical condition not related to their mental health such as diabetes, then the principles, sections and guidance of the Mental Capacity Act should be followed.

## 12.2 Guardianship

If a person lacks capacity to make a decision, in general a decision maker can use the Mental Capacity Act and in particular the protection from liability provided by section 5 so long as all relevant safeguards are followed. In some circumstances the person may respond to the authority of the Guardian under the Mental Health Act and therefore be more willing to comply with any necessary care or treatment or Guardianship may confer greater safeguards of independent review for the person.

Generally, decisions about residential care where the person lacks capacity can be also carried out on the basis of section 5, or the decision of an attorney or deputy. Guardianship may be more appropriate where:-

- a) it is thought necessary in the interests of the welfare of the patient or for the protection of others to reside in a named place.
- b) and particularly when decisions are best placed in the hands of one person or authority.

If the decision is very complex and there are different and closely balanced views, a best interests decision from the Court of Protection may be preferable.

**Note** – Guardianship does not confer any power to deprive a person of their liberty. If Deprivation of Liberty is an issue for a person who lacks capacity and is subject to Guardianship, then appropriate authorisation must be obtained using the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards procedures.

## 12.3 Detained Persons

- The treatment provisions of Part 4 of the Mental Health Act take precedence over the MCA in relation to treatment for mental disorder. (This applies where the patient is detained under the longer term sections such as s 2 and s 3). Part 4 does not apply to the short term sections (or to s.35). The Mental Capacity Act could be used to treat a person who lacks capacity in their best interests who is detained under the shorter term sections of the MHA (Section 4, 5(2), 5(4), s7, s 135, and s 136) or s.35.
- Advance Decisions to Refuse Treatment that are applicable & valid still apply unless they relate to medical treatment for *mental disorder* following detention under the MHA when the MHA takes precedence. Note that the Mental Health Act has been amended to enable refusal of Electro Convulsive Therapy by a detained patient who has capacity. A patient who now lacks capacity may have made a valid and applicable advance decision when they did have capacity to refuse ECT. The provisions of Section 58A of the Mental Health Act are applicable.
- Second Opinion Appointed Doctor provisions apply under the MHA. A SOAD will consider the validity and applicability of any advance decision to refuse treatment relating to ECT.
- For detailed guidance on all of the treatment provisions relating to mental health patients see the Mental Health Act Code of Practice Chapters 23 and 24
- An IMCA is not required for formal admissions to hospital under the MHA or to a care home under Guardianship or Section 17 leave including Community Treatment Orders. An IMCA can be instructed in relation to a detained patient if that detained patient lacks

capacity and the decision is in relation to serious medical treatment for a physical condition or a change of accommodation in relation to s117 aftercare.

- 'Nearest Relative' powers remain and are distinct from LPA or Deputy authority.
- A person who is a Personal Welfare Attorney may apply to a manager's panel or tribunal on behalf of a detained patient, and may refuse Electro Convulsive therapy on that patient's behalf.

#### **12.4 Non-detained people in mental health hospital wards**

- The MCA applies to the care of a patient who lacks capacity in this setting. Care cannot conflict with the valid authority of an appropriately authorised LPA or Deputy or a valid and applicable ADRT.
- IMCA provision may apply.
- A person lacking capacity who is not objecting and who is or may be deprived of their liberty can only be deprived of their liberty without recourse to the Mental Health Act if prior authorisation from the Court of Protection is received, in an emergency to give life sustaining treatment while awaiting a ruling from the Court of Protection, or by using the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards procedures. This may require either urgent self authorisation by the Managing Authority together with a request to the relevant Supervisory Body for authorisation.
- The MCA cannot be used as an alternative mode of admission where the criteria for the MHA apply i.e. when the patient objects or where, from knowledge of the patient, it is likely that the person would object if they had capacity.

#### **12.5 Persons under a Community Treatment Order:**

- A person who is subject to a Community Treatment Order who is recalled to hospital comes under the provisions of Part 4 of the Mental Health Act (as above).
- A person who has not been recalled but lacks capacity to consent to treatment may be treated under part 4A of the Mental Health Act. This is the case unless treatment would conflict with an advance decision made by the patient, or the views of an Attorney with appropriate authority, Deputy, or the Court of Protection.
- For detailed guidance on all of the treatment provisions relating to mental health patients see the Mental Health Act Code of Practice Chapters 23 and 24.

### **13. DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY SAFEGUARDS (DOLS)**

#### **13.1**

The DOL Safeguards, which relate to people who lack capacity and who are being or may be deprived of their liberty came into effect in April 2009. There is a DOL Safeguards Code of Practice which covers this complex area. There is also a separate Nottinghamshire Multi –

Agency Policy & Procedure relating to the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards which should be read in conjunction with this Policy and Procedure.

## 14. RECORDING

14.1 When staff undertake an assessment of capacity, the outcome and evidence should be recorded. Any staff who need to make a decision in a person's best interests should consult the best interests checklist and record as a minimum:

- How the decision was reached.
- What the reasons for reaching the decision were.
- Who was consulted?
- What particular factors were taken into account?

(MCA Code 4.61, 5.13, 5.15)

This Policy & Procedure offers two templates for recording (See Appendices below). Use of these templates is not mandatory, but use of them would demonstrate that the requirements of the Act are being met.

Some organisations may have electronic systems for recording capacity assessments and best interests decision making. Where these exist, use should be made of these systems in line with organisational policy.

14.2 General statements of wishes and feelings must be recorded in the person's records and practice notes during all decision maker contacts with people across all fields in health and social care.

Where it is known the a patient has made an advance decision to refuse treatment, this must be recorded in the person's notes together with evidence of a clear and up to date care plan of action relating to that advance decision.

14.3

Consultation with LPA and deputies must be recorded.

Consultations and efforts to engage people in decisions should be adequately documented.

14.4 Access to documents

IMCAS and those authorised by the Court of Protection must have access to all relevant documents.

## **15. Criminal Offence**

The Act contains measures creating the criminal offences of wilful neglect or ill treatment of a person lacking capacity (section 44) which apply to anyone responsible for a person's care, donees of LPAs or EPAs, or deputies appointed by the Court who are caring for a person who lacks capacity. On conviction the offender is liable to imprisonment (maximum sentence 5 years) and/or fine. Concerns relating to these offences should be referred under the local Safeguarding policy.

[www.safeguardingadultsnotts.org](http://www.safeguardingadultsnotts.org)

## **16. Research (MCA Code Chapter 11)**

This Policy & Procedure requires all Local Authority and NHS staff to abide by the guidelines on research identified in the Act and the Code of Practice.

## 17. APPENDICES 1 to 7

### Appendix 1: Test For Capacity

**MENTAL CAPACITY ACT**

**TWO STAGE TEST FOR CAPACITY**

**NATURE OF DECISION:**

**A separate Test is required for each decision.**

**TEST – STAGE 1**

This test is designed for use by qualified clinicians and practitioners and must be included in the patient/service user’s record. Please read the accompanying guidance for each test section before completion.

**DIAGNOSTIC THRESHOLD**

The Act requires the assessor to have “reasonable belief” that a person lacks capacity in relation to a decision. The Act and Code of Practice acknowledge that if there is an established diagnosis of mental illness, learning disability or some other condition then this is sufficient to confirm “impairment or disturbance of the mind”. Social care practitioners need to take all reasonable steps to satisfy themselves that there is a temporary or permanent impairment or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain and healthcare staff will usually ascertain this from the diagnostic information available.

Does the patient/service user have an impairment of or disturbance in the functioning of the brain or mind? If the answer is NO then capacity is not an issue. Yes  No

If YES then record nature of disturbance

- |                           |                          |                     |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Neurological Disorder     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Learning Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mental Disorder           | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dementia            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stroke                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | Head Injury         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Delirium, Unconsciousness | <input type="checkbox"/> | Substance use       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify)    |                          |                     |                          |

**Practical steps** - Record steps taken to encourage and aid decision making, i.e. use of alternative communication, time of day chosen, whether the use of additional practitioners or family support was used.

Record evidence-

**TEST – STAGE 2**

**1. Understanding**

Does the person understand the information relevant to the decision?

Yes  No

Please evidence

**2. Retain**

Can the person retain relevant information for long enough for the decision to be made?

Yes  No

Please evidence

**3. Use / Weigh**

Can the person use or weigh the information to make a decision?

Yes  No

Please evidence

**4. Communication**

Can the person communicate a decision?

Yes  No

Please evidence

The answer NO in any part of the test indicates that the person lacks capacity in relation to that decision.

The Act requires “reasonable belief” of the assessor that a person lacks capacity in relation to a decision.

Clinicians/practitioners need to be able to identify objective reasons why a person lacks capacity based on the above test.

Please indicate where any further evidence is recorded if appropriate to support your answers above (for example in ‘case notes’ or accompanying reports etc).

**Location of further evidence**

**Assessment completed by:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date and time completed:**

\_\_\_\_\_



## Guidelines to the Test for Capacity

This is designed as a functional test for qualified decision makers and practitioners and for inclusion in the patient/service user record.

### Diagnostic Threshold

The Act and Code of Practice acknowledge that if there is an established diagnosis of mental illness, learning disability or some other condition then this is sufficient to confirm “impairment or disturbance of the mind”. Social care practitioners need to take all reasonable steps to satisfy themselves that there is a temporary or permanent impairment or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain and healthcare staff will usually ascertain this from the diagnostic information available. The diagnostic descriptor “Other” is to be used for unusual conditions/diagnoses that do not readily fit the main categories mentioned above.

### Nature of decision

Assessors should record the key decisions facing their clients/patients and seek to avoid duplicating the process by use of multiple assessments again and again.

### Functional Threshold

#### a) Understanding the information

This test requires the assessor to help the person understand the information relevant to the decision. The Code of Practice provides examples. Information should be presented in a clear and simple way or with the use of visual aids. Cultural/linguistic considerations should be included and family, friends and carers of the person being assessed should be used to assist the process. In order to demonstrate “understanding” a person needs to understand the nature of the decision, the reason why it is needed and to have an element of foresight about the likely effects of making or not making the decision.

#### b) Retain the information

Information need only be held in the mind of the person long enough to make the decision. The Code of Practice gives examples of how to help people retain information for longer.

#### c) Use or weigh the information

Some people can retain and understand the information but an impairment stops them from using it. The inability to use the information has to be the result of the disorder not a lack of agreement with or trust in the decision makers. The person must be able to consider and balance the arguments for and against a proposed action and weigh up the likely consequences before making a decision.

#### d) Communicate the decision

The Code of Practice gives examples of how people should be helped to communicate “in any way”. Assessors should consider using specialist workers to assist in communication i.e. for people with sensory impairment.

### General Notes

- The answer NO in any part for the test indicates that the person lacks capacity in relation to that decision.
- The Act requires “reasonable belief” of the assessor that a person lacks capacity in relation to a decision.
- Decision makers/practitioners need to be able to identify objective reasons why a person lacks capacity based on the above test.
- Decision makers/practitioners should take care to sign and date the assessment and record the time by the 24 hour clock.

**Appendix 2 Test for Capacity**

**MENTAL CAPACITY ACT  
TEST of CAPACITY**

**Please read the accompanying guidance for each test section before completion.**  
**This test is designed for use residential or domiciliary care services and must be included in the patient/service user's record**

Name:  Date of birth:

**NATURE OF DECISION (A separate test is required for each decision.)**

Please record - examples; personal care, eating and drinking.

**TEST – STAGE 1 - DIAGNOSTIC THRESHOLD**

Does the patient/service user have an impairment of or disturbance in the functioning of the brain or mind? **If the answer is NO then capacity is not an issue.** Yes  No

If YES then record nature of disturbance

Neurological Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>	Learning Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mental Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dementia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stroke	<input type="checkbox"/>	Head Injury	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delirium, Unconsciousness	<input type="checkbox"/>	Substance use	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify)	
------------------------	--

**TEST – STAGE 2**

**Practical steps** - Record steps taken to encourage and aid decision making, i.e. use of alternative communication, time of day chosen whether the use of additional practitioners or family support was used?

Record evidence-

- The person is unable to understand the information relevant to the decision.
- The person is unable to retain the information relevant to the decision.
- The person is unable to use/weigh information as part of the process of making the decision.
- The person is unable to communicate their decision (by talking, language or other means).

. Give your reasons for deciding that it has or has not been established that the person lacks capacity to make their own decision because of an impairment of, or a disturbance in the functioning of, the mind or brain? Making reference to the areas of understand, retain use and weigh and communication

Please evidence:

Assessor name:		Date:	
----------------	--	-------	--

**Appendix 3: Best Interests Checklist (For more complex issues)**

**MENTAL CAPACITY ACT  
BEST INTERESTS CHECKLIST**

**PERSONAL DETAILS**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of birth: \_\_\_\_\_

**DECISION**

Please record in the space below the decision for which the person lacks capacity as shown by the functional test.

**ESSENTIAL  
INFORMATION**

(Please mark with  
an X)

**1. Advance Decision**

Has an Advance Decision to refuse treatment been made above the decision in question (only in relation to medical treatment) and is it still relevant?

Yes  No

Comments:

**2. Lasting Power of Attorney**

Is a Lasting Power of Attorney (LPA) in place for the decision in question?

Yes  No

If yes, who holds this? Is it registered with the Office of the Public Guardian?

**3. Court of Protection Deputy**

Has any Deputy been appointed by the Court of Protection for the decision in question?

Yes  No

Comments:

**If the answer is yes to any of the above three questions, the checklist need not be completed. Please refer to the Code of Practice for further information on how to proceed in these circumstances.**

**4. Regaining Capacity**

a. Have you considered whether it is likely that the person may regain capacity at sometime in the future and whether a delay in decision making will allow them to make the decision themselves?

Yes  No

b. If yes, describe the plans that have been made in light of the above.

**5. Enduring Power of Attorney**

Is there an Enduring Power of Attorney (NB: for finances only)?

Yes  No

Who holds this and has it been registered?

**6. IMCA Referral**

Is there a requirement to refer to IMCA service?

Yes  No

If yes, please refer to the Mental Capacity Act policy on-line

Comments:

**SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT**

**a. Written statement**

Has any relevant written statement been made by the person when they had capacity? ( A statement relevant to *this* decision)

Yes  No

Please specify:

**b. Past and present wishes**

Have steps been taken to consider as far as is practicable the persons past and present wishes about the matter?

Yes  No

Please evidence:

**c. Involvement in decision**

Have steps been taken to encourage and involve as far as possible the person's involvement in the decision and actions being considered on their behalf?

Yes  No

Please evidence:

**d. Beliefs and values**

Have you considered the beliefs and values likely to influence the person's attitude to the decision, i.e. religious, cultural, lifestyle choices?

Yes  No

Please evidence:

**e. Other factors**

Have you taken into account other factors that the person would like to have considered in relation to the decision, i.e. emotional bonds, family obligations, where to reside and how to spend money?

Yes  No

Please evidence:

**CONSULTATION**

The Act places a duty on the decision maker to consult anyone with an interest in the care of the person who lacks capacity

**a. Views of previously named people**

Have the views of anyone previously named by the person as someone to be consulted been sought? This would be a person named by the service user at a time they had capacity as someone they wished to be consulted.

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

**b. Views of professionals**

Have the views of people engaged in caring for the person (e.g. carers, GP, dentist, nurse, key worker, social worker) been sought – where appropriate to the decision? The views of all interested parties must be recorded.

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

**c. Views of family and friends**

Have the views of family and friends been sought – where appropriate? The views of all interested parties must be recorded.

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

**d. Views of other interested parties**

Have the views of other people with an interest in the persons welfare (e.g. advocate, voluntary worker, IMCA) been sought – where appropriate? The views of all interested parties must be recorded.

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

**OTHER INFORMATION**

Identify all relevant circumstances

Have all least restrictive options been explored?

Any other relevant factors to be considered.

**ACTIONS**

a. Best Interest action, if any, to be undertaken.

b. What were the reasons for reaching this decision? Include any important factors taken into account

**c. Conflict**

Are there any disagreements or conflicts regarding the process or outcome?

Yes  No

If yes, what steps have been taken to work with or to overcome these conflicts?

**Completed by:**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Designation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date completed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 4 Shorter Best Interests Checklist (day to day decision making)**

**MENTAL CAPACITY ACT  
BEST INTERESTS CHECKLIST**

Name:  Date of birth:

**DECISION -**

Please record the decision for which the person lacks capacity as shown by the 2 stage test.

**ESSENTIAL INFORMATION**

Is a Lasting Power of Attorney (LPA) in place for the decision in question? Yes  No

If yes, who holds this and is it registered with the court of protection?

Has a deputy been appointed by the Court of Protection for decision in question? Yes  No

**If the answer is yes to any of the above questions, the checklist need not be completed. Please refer to the Code of Practice for further information on how to proceed in these circumstances.**

Have you considered whether it is likely that the person may regain capacity at sometime in the future and whether a delay in decision making will allow them to make the decision themselves? Yes  No

If yes, describe the plans that have been made in light of the above.

**SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT**

Has any relevant written statement been made by the person when they had capacity? Yes  No

Please specify:

- Have steps been taken to consider the persons past and present wishes about the matter? Yes  No
- Has the person been involved in the decision? Yes  No
- Have you considered the beliefs and values likely to influence the person's attitude to the decision? Yes  No
- Have you taken into account factors that the person would like to have considered in relation to the decision, i.e. emotional bonds, family obligations, where to reside and how to spend money? Yes  No



Please evidence:

**CONSULTATION** - The Act places a duty on the decision maker to consult anyone with an interest in the care of the person who lacks capacity

- Have the views of anyone previously named by the person as someone to be consulted been sought? (This would be a person named by the service user at a time they had capacity as someone they wished to be consulted.) Yes  No
- Have the views of people engaged in caring for the person (e.g. carers, GP, dentist, nurse, key worker, social worker) been sought? The views of all interested parties must be recorded. Yes  No
- Have the views of family and friends been sought? The views of all interested parties must be recorded. Yes  No
- Have the views of other people with an interest in the persons welfare (e.g. advocate, voluntary worker, IMCA) been sought? The views of all interested parties must be recorded. Yes  No

Record the individual names and views of those consulted

**OTHER INFORMATION ( see guidance)**

Have all least restrictive options been explored?

Relevant factors to be considered. - . Risk assessments, urgency of situation. resources

**ACTIONS/ Summary**

- a. Best Interest action, if any, to be undertaken. Include the reasons for reaching this decision and any important factors taken into account.
- b. Also record any conflict and steps taken to overcome these – and consider any Deprivation of liberty issues where conflict or disagreements exist

Name:

--

Designation:

--

Date completed:

--

## **Appendix 5**

### Guidance on the Mental Capacity Act and Care Planning

Use the **MCA Code of Practice to guide you!**

#### **Assume Capacity**

The first principle of the Act requires staff to assume capacity. This means that capacity assessments may not need to be carried out with some services users, since their decision making skills have not been called into question. However, where there is disagreement and/or challenge around a person capacity, the two stage test should be used to clarify that person's capacity status.

#### **Unwise decisions**

The two stage test can therefore be used to empower a service user when their capacity is questioned by family or other professionals and can provide protection from liability where the service user is thought to be making unwise decisions. i.e. the two stage test evidences the person ability to make the decision and their insight into the risks and consequences; therefore there can be no breach of duty of care for service users who may make what others may consider to be unwise decisions.

**Decision Specific** – A capacity assessment needs to be considered for **each area of care provided** where the persons capacity is in doubt (e.g. continence care, personal care, finances, medication, mobility, activities, etc). Use the two stage test for each area of care and a best interest's checklist if they lack capacity for that decision. For example, it may be clear that a person may be able to make decisions about their personal care but there may be a doubt around their ability over finances. Therefore they would just require a two stage test to be carried out for finances.

Where a number of tasks are required within that area of care, several capacity assessments may be required if the person has some capacity for some elements of that area of care e.g. within the area 'personal care', there are several elements including bathing/showering/washing, shaving, teeth care, dressing, nail care, etc; where a person may be able to make some decisions but not others. Capacity assessments will be required for each element, where capacity is in question. However, where a person can be evidenced to lack capacity over all elements within an area of care, this can be recorded as one two stage test for that area of care.

*Example of how you might reflect this in your documentation:*

Area of care	Elements	Two stage test evidence
Personal care	Bathing/showering/washing	Lacks capacity – see separate written evidence
	shaving	Has capacity
	Teeth care	Has capacity
	dressing	Lacks capacity - see separate written evidence
	Nail care	Lacks capacity - see separate written evidence

#### **Recording**

##### Test

Where you have used the two stage test – record it. Evidence of how part 1 and 2 were applied and determined should be included and the outcome e.g. whether the person has capacity or not.

The Code of Practice states that the assessor should be able to

*“Give reasons why they believe the person lacks capacity to make the decision and provide objective evidence to support that belief”*

Code of Practice 4.63

**Best interests**

If the person lacks capacity over the decision, the best interest's checklist should be used and evidence of the following should be recorded:

- **How** the decision about the persons best interests was reached
- **What the reasons** for reaching the decision were
- **Who was consulted** to work out best interests
- **What particular factors** were taken into account?

Code of Practice 5.15

There are no prescribed forms or documentation. However, there are templates available that meet recording requirements and can be adapted and amended to meet the needs of a service/organisation.

**Consent and signatures** – if the person has capacity, it is good practice to encourage them to sign the elements of the care plan they consent to. People who lack capacity should not be asked to sign areas of care that they lack capacity over. It is not appropriate to ask relatives to sign to say that they consent to actions in the care plan on the person behalf. However, it is appropriate to involve relatives, friends and informal carers and they can sign to say they have been consulted. If a signature is required, this should be the best interest decision maker.

However, those with a personal Welfare LPA or a deputy where they have the legal ability to make those decisions can consent on behalf of a person who lacks capacity. They are effectively the Best Interests Decision Maker. In this instance their signature would be appropriate. This is because they have the legal right to consent to or refuse treatment or care on behalf of the person.

Capacity	Lacks Capacity	Fluctuating Capacity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A service user with capacity should decide the content of their care plan.</li> <li>▪ Should be written in the first person.</li> <li>▪ Person should sign to indicate consent to actions and involvement.</li> <li>▪ Two stage tests <b>may</b> be used and evidenced where a person's capacity was in question/in doubt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Written in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person; only indicators of 'preference' can be written in the first person e.g. the person may not be able to make the decision about their personal care but may be able to state a preference about products to be used, such as particular shampoo.</li> <li>▪ Evidence of use of the two stage test.</li> <li>▪ Their signature is not appropriate and recording should indicate they lack capacity to consent.</li> <li>▪ Relatives can sign to say they have been <b>consulted</b> but cannot consent unless they have the legal power to do so.</li> <li>▪ The decision maker should record their name, date completed and their signature to verify their belief that the care proposed is the person's best interests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discuss with the person at the times when they have capacity in order to help plan and prepare best interests decision making at the times they lack capacity.</li> <li>▪ Encourage involvement of the person in constructing a care plan that reflects actions that are consented to (when they have capacity) and indications of preferences and wishes (for when they haven't). This will inform best interest's decision making when they lack capacity.</li> <li>▪ Always consider whether the decision can wait until the person is able to make the decision themselves.</li> </ul>

## **Appendix 6**

### **Guidance from the Care Quality Commission**

The Care Quality Commission has provided guidance relating to the Mental Capacity Act and including the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. As well as providing a useful summary of the Act, the guidance sets out what the CQC will be looking for when they visit care providers and hospitals.

MCA Guidance:

[http://www.cqc.org.uk/db/documents/20090526\\_CQC\\_MCA\\_guidance\\_v\\_2\\_00\\_072-09.doc](http://www.cqc.org.uk/db/documents/20090526_CQC_MCA_guidance_v_2_00_072-09.doc)

DOLS Guidance:

[http://www.cqc.org.uk/db/documents/20090526\\_CQC\\_MCA\\_DOLS\\_guidance\\_v\\_1\\_00\\_074-09.doc](http://www.cqc.org.uk/db/documents/20090526_CQC_MCA_DOLS_guidance_v_1_00_074-09.doc)

## **Appendix 7**

### **IMCA Service 2010**

The IMCA service in Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire is delivered by an independent advocacy service. This service is subject to tender. The current service provider is: *Advocacy Partners Speaking Up*.

*Advocacy Partners **Speaking Up*** is based at:-

3a First Avenue  
Nottingham NG7 6JL

**Tel: 0115 9628270**

***Speaking Up* has provided a national IMCA referral line for information and referrals: -  
0845 650 0081**