

# Capricorn Citizen Advocacy

## PROCEDURE FOR ANALYSING THE DISCONTINUATION OF A MATCH

<b>Procedure number:</b>	<b>3.2.3.1</b>	<b>Approved by Management Committee:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
<b>Version:</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>Signed off by Executive:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
<b>Responsible person:</b>	<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>Scheduled Review Date:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> February 2020

### Purpose

Capricorn Citizen Advocacy always seeks to fully understand the circumstances that surround all discontinuations of matches between advocate and a protégés, in view of the fact that recruiting and establishing each match usually requires considerable time and effort.

This procedure has been developed to help the program more effectively analyse why discontinuations occur. It is related to the parent policy; [3.2.3 Policy for Analysing the Discontinuation of a Match](#). It includes a questionnaire which must be completed by the Coordinator.

### Procedure

#### 1. Overview of Discontinued Match

Details of the names and ages of the protégé and advocate, the start and finish dates of the match and the location of the match.

#### 2. Review of the Match based on its Key Elements

##### 1) *Protégé Recruitment*

- a) How was the protégé recruited?
- b) Has the protégé been matched before?
- c) What were the needs and interests of the protégé, as identified by the Citizen Advocacy office, at the time of recruitment?
- d) In retrospect, were the needs and interests of the protégé accurately identified?

##### 2) *Advocate Recruitment*

- a) How was the advocate recruited?
- b) What were the initial advocacy roles, as conceptualized by the Citizen Advocacy office?
- c) What were the characteristics and competencies of the advocate, as identified by the Citizen Advocacy office, that were considered to be relevant to the needs and interests of the protégé?
- d) In terms of characteristics and competencies, did the person recruited as the advocate fit or approximate the advocate profile?

**3) Advocate Orientation**

- a) Was the orientation appropriate in its content and duration?
- b) Was the orientation adapted in consideration of the needs of the protégé and the roles of the advocate?
- c) Were there aspects of the orientation that were overlooked or underemphasized?
- d) Were there aspects of the orientation that could have been elaborated or accentuated?

**4) Advocate/Protégé matching**

- a) Was there a congruity between the identity, needs and interests of the protégé and the identity, competencies and roles of the advocate?
- b) Were there any trade-offs between what was conceptualised and what was realised?
- c) If there were any discrepancies between the “ought” and the “is” of the matching process, what are the implications?

**5) Follow-along and support**

- a) How frequently did the office contact the advocate; according to the file?
- b) Was the nature and level of follow-along and support appropriate and responsive to the needs of the match?
- c) Did follow-along and support provide any inkling that the match was likely to discontinue?
- d) What other forms of support, which do not undermine advocate independence, could have been provided?

**6) Ongoing training**

- a) Did the advocate attend any training sessions?
- b) If the advocate did attend training sessions, were they relevant and helpful to his/her advocacy role?
- c) What other sessions, if any, could the advocate have benefited from attending?

**7) Advocate Associate Emphasis**

- a) Did the advocate avail him/herself of, and benefit from, the advice of one or more Advocate Associates?
- b) Was the Advocate in need of, but could not get access to, relevant technical advice?
- c) Are there any other ways in which the Citizen Advocacy office could have facilitated linkage of the advocate to Advocate Associates that would have been supportive?

**8) Other**

- a) Are there any other issues that the Citizen Advocacy office should have taken note of, or acted upon?

**Related Documents**

- 3.2.1 *Meeting Individual Needs Policy*
- 3.2.2 *Policy for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Each Match*
- 3.2.3 *Policy for Analysing the Discontinuation of a Match*
- 4.2.0 *Privacy Policy*

**References**

*John O'Brien and Wolf Wolfensberger, CAPE Standards for Citizen Advocacy Program Evaluation (1988)*


*Capricorn Citizen Advocacy also acknowledges the influence on formulating this document of the writing of Mitchell Peters, an experienced practitioner of citizen advocacy.*

**Ratification**

This statement was adopted by Capricorn Citizen Advocacy's Management Committee at its meeting held on:

28 / 02 / 2017.  
(Date)

SIGNED:

  
.....  
President

SIGNED:

  
.....  
Secretary

28 / 2 / 17  
.....  
(Date)

28 / 02 / 17  
.....  
(Date)

