Capricorn Citizen Advocacy

Program Evaluation Report

October 14-17, 2002

Using the

CAPE – STANDARDS FOR CITIZEN ADVOCACY
PROGRAM EVALUATION MANUAL

Team Members:

John Armstrong (Team Leader & Report Writer)
Brian Martin
David Abela
Robyn Rooke

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1. AN OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION OF CAPRICORN CITIZEN ADVOCACY

1.1   Introduction

Evaluation is an activity that isn't easy for many people. Especially where an activity involves the *voluntary* effort of people with good hearts and well meaning, the idea of in-depth scrutiny of one's efforts and assumptions comes at a distinct price of much discomfort and potential feelings of defence. However, in the case of Capricorn Citizen Advocacy (CCA) there is a noted determination to be as effective as possible and to ensure that in the short history of the program, early signs of any (unconscious) program distortion(s) are identified and removed as soon as possible.

The evaluation team is made up of peers; people who themselves are deeply involved in the efforts of bringing Citizen Advocacy to an increasing number of people in their communities. Yet it is a community that easily distances itself and in many other ways unconsciously inflicts harm onto so many of its own citizens. In this case, Capricorn Citizen Advocacy is concerned for those citizens who live in the four Shires surrounding and within Rockhampton who are specifically in peril because they have some type of disabling condition.

Drawing out citizens who are willing and competent to advocate on behalf of people at risk of being devalued by that same community takes careful, thoughtful planning and work. This work we have referred to as the Citizen Advocacy Model, and as such this evaluation concerns itself with how well CCA is using the Citizen Advocacy Model to build strong, effective and enduring relationships – that we commonly refer to as 'Good Matches'. Good matches consist of many things, but typically involve a keen perspective of the protégé's situation, a capacity to endure hardship and cost, an underlying commitment to the protégé, an uncompromised loyalty, and a capacity to act. In the words of Martin Luther King Jr, many good matches take a *right* path.

> *Cowardice asks the question, "Is it safe?" Expediency asks the question, "Is it politic?" Vanity asks the question, "Is it popular?" But conscience asks the question, "Is it right?" And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because one's conscience tells one that it is right.*

CAPE is seen as one of the major safeguards to the quality and continuity of a CA program – but only if it is implemented. Having the CAPE isn't the safeguard – only acting on it does that.

The team hopes that the program will find the verbal assessment summary and this written report instructive, constructive, and affirming.

1.2 The Concept and Need for Citizen Advocacy

Citizen Advocacy was egitimisation and evolved by Dr Wolf Wolfensberger in the 1960s. Citizen Advocacy was developed for at least 3 reasons: namely, that many people with developmental disabilities:

i) need assistance with the practical affairs of everyday life;
ii) require protection and advocacy because they are held in low esteem by society, and are likely to encounter "wounding" life experiences including rejection, exploitation, abuse etc.;
iii) do not have freely-given personal relationships.

Though there have been various definitions of the concept of Citizen Advocacy, the most recent formulation (October 1990) by the International Citizen Advocacy Safeguards Group is probably the best elaborated and clearly explicated statement of the function of Citizen Advocacy:

> *Citizen advocacy is a means to promote, protect and defend the welfare and interests of, and justice for, persons who are impaired in competence, or diminished in status, or seriously physically or socially isolated, through one-to-one (or near one-to-one) unpaid voluntary commitments made to them by people of relevant competencies.*
>
> *Citizen Advocates strive to represent the interests of a person as if they were the advocate's own; therefore, the advocates are supported, and usually recruited, by a Citizen Advocacy office with paid staff that is so funded and governed as to be essentially free from conflicts of interest.*
>
> *In consultation with the Citizen advocacy office, advocates choose from a wide range of functions and roles. Some of these commitments may last for life.*

1.3 The Capricorn Citizen Advocacy Program

Capricorn Citizen Advocacy commenced operation in August 2000. The program is located within the city of Rockhampton in Central Queensland and operates across the four shires of Livingston, Mt Morgan, Rockhampton and Fitzroy South. Rockhampton has the largest population of around 60,000.

Rockhampton supplies needs of a vast surrounding region of cattle and other primary producers, situated some 50 kilometres from the coast. The town has many long-term residents, but also has quite a number of itinerant workers and people who settle for various lengths of time. 'Rocky' has a distinctly rural and cattle business flavour – for which it is well known. It sits on the Tropic of Capricorn, which gives many activities – including this program – its distinctive name. The city has many modern amenities and a rich history. The newer coastal communities of Yeppoon and Emu Park lie to the east, and the older and poorer ex-mining township of Mount Morgan lies to the west – each taking just under 45 minutes to reach.

The Program receives the majority of its funding from the State Government of Queensland, through Disability Services Queensland (DSQ). There are no particular contract requirements to these recurrent funds, though the program does provide detailed updates of its efforts on an annual basis to DSQ. CCA is unusual in that it is *the only* Citizen Advocacy Program funded by the Queensland State Government – and indeed *any* State Government.[4]

DSQ also funds another program across Queensland that matches ordinary citizens to people with an intellectual disability – for friendship. Some in the department believe that this 'Volunteer Friends' program is equivalent or even superior to Citizen Advocacy, even though recent reports provide alternative data. There is a Volunteer Friends program in Rockhampton but there is no contact between the two (nor should there be), and there appears to be no adverse effects for CCA.

There is a management Committee consisting of seven members from varied human service, business, professional, and parent backgrounds who oversee the Program. They meet monthly and attend to the various items of business – though the primary and greater weight of the meetings is spent considering the Coordinator's monthly report. There is currently one sub-committee of two people (both m/c) that has been meeting weekly, developing written policies for the program.

---

[4] There have been other programs in the past funded by State Governments; including all of the programs in Victoria, until they were de-funded overnight some 10 years ago. One program was maintained on state funding alone (Outer East Program, Vic) until it too was de-funded around 1996 – though it had a new 3 year Funding and Services Agreement with the Dept!

There are two staff who work 38 and 15 hours respectively per week, one (Les) as Coordinator of the program, the other (Jenny) who overseas office tasks and some follow-along tasks.

The program is located just to the south of the main shopping precinct, but on the main access road, and is housed in an adjoined building that provides extensive car parking, a reception area, main office, kitchen and toilet facilities and a large board room. The office is tastefully furnished with wooden furniture and bookcases, and comfortable and stylish chairs. It has numerous 'split system' air-conditioners for quiet cooling through the very hot summer months. There is a small supermarket on one side, and a hair-dressing salon on the other and many eating and fast food establishments near by. It is close to a rear access laneway making entry and exiting vehicle access very convenient. The office is fully wheelchair accessible.

At the time of the evaluation there had been 26 matches made in the program, with 19 currently existing matches. One past match was a short-term crisis match. There are 4 people on the Working List. The program responds to people with disabilities, without focussing on any particular impairment category or age of onset. The determination of vulnerability is the main criteria, rather than diagnosis, and therefore can include people with mental disorders, post traumatic stress disorder, anorexia, acquired brain injury, physical disability, intellectual disability and combinations of these.

The team met with 12 of these relationships, usually but not always with both protégé and advocate.

1.4   The Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to assist CCA make many good matches. It is the very first CAPE in the history of CCA, and it is a privilege to be on the team for this first effort. This type of evaluation acts as a most effective means to safeguard the integrity and direction of a Citizen Advocacy Program, and therefore should be adopted as a regular process by any program serious about bringing excellence to its work. For this effort to be successful however, the evaluation has to be competent and valid, and the program has to be receptive and even eager to act on the recommendations.

As already noted, this CAPE specifically is intended to provide feedback as to the existence of any program distortion, as well as reinforce the good practices, while the program is in its relative infancy.

It is important to emphasise that the purpose of the evaluation is not to assess the individual advocacy relationships, but to assess the program's overall capacity to arrange and support these relationships.

1.5 A Brief Description of the CAPE Instrument

In evaluating the work of Capricorn Citizen Advocacy, we have used the evaluation instrument, <u>CAPE: Standards for Citizen Advocacy Program Evaluation</u> by John O'Brien & Wolf Wolfensberger (test edition), Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded.

CAPE is divided into 3 sections, each asking critical questions related to the identity, effectiveness and viability of a Citizen Advocacy Program:

(i)   <u>Adherence to Citizen Advocacy Principles</u>
        This section relates to the identity of the program, namely if a program significantly adheres to the Principles, then it follows that it is doing Citizen Advocacy. Conversely, if it is not, then it is not a Citizen Advocacy Program, but something else.

(ii)   <u>CA Office Effectiveness</u>
        This section is concerned with the effectiveness and quality of the office practices – the so-called "key office activities". Another way to put this is to ask, "Is the office making good use of the Citizen Advocacy Model to make Good Matches?"

(iii)   <u>Program Continuity & Stability</u>
        This section explores the program's viability over the long run – does it have what it is likely to require to continue as a program, from a funding perspective and also from a governance and leadership perspective?

- **The Process of the Evaluation**

To find the answers to these three questions, the team sought information about CCA from 3 distinct sources:

1)   Extensively reviewing program documentation. Some of these documents were made available to the team prior to the team's visit. Documents included:
        •   Relationship files
        •   Publicity & promotional materials
        •   Newsletters
        •   Advocate orientation policies and outline
        •   Program policies and procedures

- Interviewing both staff, but in particular, Les Pearce (as the main staff member intensively involved in making matches) for a total of 7 hours

3)	Other Interviews with:
- 5 (of the 7) Committee Members
- 12 Relationships
- 6 Advocate Associates

All 3 sources of information were gathered over 2 days and 2 evenings, with another two days and evenings of analysis (using CAPE) bringing a total of 52.5 hours (207 person-hours). The information was systematically analysed in a prescribed format referred to as 'conciliation', which the team conducted over the last two days of the evaluation. During conciliation the team extensively shared information and examined it against the 36 ratings of CAPE. In addition, the team extracted the main overriding issues for the program that both comes from its rating analysis but can occasionally transcend many, and sometimes all, of the ratings.

On the afternoon of Thursday 17th October at the completion of the team's deliberations, a *Verbal* Assessment Summary was provided to the Management Committee and staff that constituted a summary of the team's findings. Those findings now follow.

## PART 2	OVER-RIDING THEMES

2.1 The Strengths of Capricorn Citizen Advocacy
The team found that the program had many strengths. We feel it is important to highlight these major strengths in order that consciousness be obtained and maintained in respect to them, and how they contribute to an effective program be *sustained* and *built upon*. We have broken them into the following three areas.

2.1.1 The Strengths of the Management Committee
- The team noted the conscious commitment to devalued people on the part of the Management Committee and its resultant commitment to using the Citizen Advocacy Model.

This is apparent from the history of CCA, where much time was spent laying a solid foundation over several years of understanding of what the program was to achieve. Many of the people involved in these early discussions were familiar with the plight of people through their human service roles and involvements. They also knew that people's lives often remained empty and even damaged by the absence of a loyal voice and the

passage of people who through their paid roles would ultimately leave them.

Many of these people have appropriately left the Committee due to the conflict of interest presented by their human service roles but have left an excellent legacy of clarity and direction. Some of these people also remain on the current committee, continuing that legacy.

This is mentioned to highlight the necessity of maintaining and renewing such a vision for the program. It is common for programs, in the rapid passage of time *and* people to quickly lose touch with its roots and purpose, and to thus allow its goals to be supplanted by goals not originally intended (goal displacement). In Citizen Advocacy, the most common forms of goal displacement rapidly results in the program no longer doing citizen advocacy! Therefore maintaining a clear sense of purpose and fidelity to one's (good) foundation is a powerful safeguard against being seduced into doing other things.

- A strong commitment in investment, availability and effort by key members of the management Committee.

- A strong sense of loyalty by the Committee to the program.[5] This has resulted in clear and efficient working arrangements between the committee and staff, to the effective operation of the program.

- Diversity of skills and abilities within the Committee, that enables many functions to be performed by the people most appropriate.

- The Committee is very supportive and encouraging of the work of the staff.

2.1.2 The Strengths of the Staff
Jenny.
- Jenny has grown up and lived in Rockhampton. As such she enjoys a wide knowledge of the community and the individuals within it – a real asset to a CA program.
- She is well known and respected – influencing the respect that the program receives in turn.

---

[5] Many committees that employ people often expect them to do every task for the organisation, giving the committee a mere rubber stamping function.

- Jenny speaks well – expressing the ideas within CA competently and confidently.
- She has raised and supports a family and has had many life experiences.
- Jenny uses her time in the program very well and is highly productive.
- She can learn new skills very quickly.
- She has a firm sense of her boundaries and those areas of her life she will not compromise.

Les
- Les has a genuine concern for people and a real connection to Citizen Advocacy and the difference it can make to people's lives. This fuels a passion in Les to search and find people who will be effective citizen advocates. His determination runs deep – he doesn't give up on people, which is an indispensable quality in a CA coordinator.
- Les doesn't need to be needed by people, so he doesn't strive to make people reliant on him, but to simply use him as they need. In that sense, he helps advocates to stand on their own feet, rather than see him as the person they need to constantly reference. This quality also acts as an important safeguard against the coordinator personally doing advocacy on behalf of people.
- He is well known and well liked by everyone the team came into contact with. He is very friendly and very approachable, not pushy, but is also not afraid to ask the questions of people in becoming potential advocates. He is not afraid to ask his friends to be advocates for people.
- Les is therefore not embarrassed by the concept or reality of people being citizen advocates for others. He well knows that an advocate may indeed reap the greatest benefits.
- Les is not afraid of rejection. He is not fazed or discouraged by people saying 'no', and is therefore not enticed into performing the 'easier' role of providing advocacy himself.
- Relatedly, Les is able to 'ask' people – the central ingredient of a successful CA Coordinator.
- He can work alone, take initiative, and think through problems and avenues of address. He does however like the support that the committee and the wider CA movement bring. He seeks knowledge and is not afraid to ask.
- He has worked in a variety of roles and industries and brings a mature outlook to life with him.
- He uses his time very well – being circumspect with matters that are less/not related to making matches (for example, paper

work), but ensures these matters still receive adequate attention.

- Finally, Les uses the Citizen Advocacy Model very well, and trusts it to assist him make many good matches.

The team was very impressed to find someone whom in less than sixteen months had learnt and achieved a great deal. Les got on and made some successful matches very early upon his arrival (9 in the first 6 months, with only one discontinuation), and was able to use his extensive contacts to build a significant number of relationships.

2.1.3 Committee of Management/Staff Relationship.
The management committee and the staff have a relationship typified by effective interactions, good humour, serious effort, and openness to learning. The fact that you are holding your first CAPE just two years after your launch is also testimony to your relationship and your seriousness in ensuring an excellent program.

2.1.4 Strengths of the Program's Efforts.
- Efficient operation, policies and documentation – sufficient for the purpose at hand[3]. The program of course requires some suitable level of efficient administration, without overloading the effort of making matches (otherwise it can be another form of goal displacement). The program, the team believes, has achieved a careful balance of these factors; staff and committee are able to keep a handle on what has been done, while still providing an adequate means of accountability.
- The program's image in the community is very favourable – and from what the team could gather from activities like the film night – the program has a good standing in the community. This is an excellent accomplishment in such a short period of time.
- There is positive imagery about devalued people conveyed by the staff (appearance & interactions), the office (location & appearance), fund raising and language, and publicity materials.
- There is diligent attention to the importance of CA principles.
- There is excellent attention to the detail of the Key Office Activities, especially in respect to the review, planning, goal setting, and strategies for achieving targets. There are in

---

[3] CA relationships are *informal* in nature, as opposed to the contrasting nature of *formal* human service relationships. A CA program can convey the informal nature of such relationships by keeping bureaucracy to a minimum, or at least at a distance from the relationships themselves.

particular some excellent examples of active recruitment of protégés and advocates.

- The program (for now) is well resourced to do the job well.
- There are many matches that are very successful, especially in terms of commitment and the expressive components of the relationships.
- There are good links with the CA movement. There are examples of close relationships – collectively and personally – with those who share your struggle and gain mutual benefit.
- There has been a movement away from a service orientation and allegiance in wanting to offer something that is truly satisfying, beyond what service alone can bring.

- **Major Issues to Address**

As the team considered the ratings, two major issues emerged that could be seen to have some effect across multiple ratings. As such, these two issues act to reduce the potency in the program and therefore in the relationships you are trying to build.

Addressing these two issues, we believe, will serve to strengthen further your efforts.

- **The Question of Continued Association with Human Services (HS)**

As the team examined the evidence before it, a number of trends became apparent.

- A number of protégés came into the program by referral. Of the 19 relationships, 6 were family or self-referral and 2 referrals[4] were from Advocate Associates (acting in a human service capacity).

- Many advocates had human service connections (as past workers, volunteers to HS, still working in HS but for a different agency, and in particular Access Recreation and/or Cerebral Palsy League). A number also had past ties to Birribi. Of the 12 relationships the team met, 9 had advocates with human service associations – sometimes with past connections with the agency(s) that presently serves the protégé. <u>The team's concern here extends three fold</u>: (A) Some advocates from HS backgrounds *may* have certain human service mindsets and assumptions around many questions that are at

---

[4] This is a change from the data (6) presented at the verbal feedback. Later clarification with the coordinator revealed that the advocate associate in question was mistaken in their assuming responsibility for those 4 matches. The coordinator initiated the discussion of certain people who were later to become proteges – not the advocate associate.

odds with a protégé oriented perspective. (B) Such a background *may* also involve a continuing allegiance and relationship to human services and the manner in which they operate. (C) Such an allegiance *may* mitigate against the advocate acting vigorously on the protégé's behalf – because of A & B above.

- There are still significant links by a number of the Committee of management to human services and their management.

- The Staff have present and past links to human services and their operation.

- Most of the Advocate Associates are employed in human services. A number believe that it is a legitimate function for them to refer people from their agencies to this program.

- Some policies (notably eligibility, discussed in the next section) have strong roots in the service and 'imperial' cultures.

It is common that programs start out being sponsored by some human service entity. Citizen Advocacy has not always emerged out of concerned citizenry, but has relied on the actions of 'friends' in human services to initiate a program. This program is no exception, but it has clearly struggled to shed itself of its human service allegiances of the past in order to make this program as vigorous and independent as possible.

The issue here highlights the need for the effort to continue and that additional effort is needed if the program is to be as vigorous and independent as it should and wants to be.

Recommendations from the team regarding these efforts will be made in the recommendation section.

2.2.2 The Issue of Who Citizen Advocacy is For.
An alternative way of putting this issue is to ask, "how do we focus on people who are most seriously devalued and who have the greatest need?"

The team noticed that the program employs a wide definition of eligibility. It is not based on diagnosis or impairment categories, but extends to all people with a disability[5].

The team suspects that the program may have slipped into assuming that everyone who is 'eligible' is also suitable.

We heard a number of explanations of this policy from a number of individuals. They consist of assumptions that include:
"All should have an advocate."
"If they ask, and they want it, we can't say no."
"People have a right to advocacy."
"Serving everyone with a disability is equitable."

The team had an alternative view and wondered if the program's policy was indeed the most equitable possible, especially in relation to people who might be considered the most disadvantaged. For example, more capable and connected people, who have stable and secure service arrangements, who have other relationships including family, who may have past valued roles, competencies and reputations and may even have a measure of wealth, might refer themselves or be referred by family members, or in other ways be accepted into the program.

If such individuals (who might indeed have certain identifiable vulnerabilities) are able to receive a citizen advocate, does this limit access to those who are indeed voiceless and powerless? That is, should those with less pressing needs be given priority over those who are the most disadvantaged?

Vulnerability can become a loose term applied across many different circumstances to many people. Indeed, we all have vulnerabilities – but for the most part they are not very heightened or intensified. One must establish (a) if a person exists in a heightened state of vulnerability, (b) what the nature, degree of severity is, and how it expresses itself in the person's life (c) are there circumstances already in the person's life that 'cushion,' protect or compensate for the vulnerability, (d) is citizen advocacy is the most relevant response for such a person?

If vulnerability is seen as a somewhat 'umbrella' term, it could become difficult to argue against a person having an advocate, simply because they are 'vulnerable'. How can one argue against a proposal built on a notion of vulnerability? It's possible that the most vulnerable could remain invisible – or be 'squeezed out' by more easily recognised people.

---

[5] The team was led to believe that Access Recreation also works from a similar eligibility base. This may be just coincidental.

Thus the most disadvantaged may be further disadvantaged by the eligibility criteria. This is an expression of the "universal conflict of interest, namely, that of needy people with each other." (Wolfensberger & Peters 2002)

Another consequence of a broad criterion relates to the practical capacity of the program to be infinitely responsive. It's common to see human services over-extend their capacity, promising wondrous accomplishments in a short period[6]. Such claims come from systems often bereft of consciousness with respect to the actual effects that they have on people's lives. But aside from the idolatrous nature of the claim, it can be a technical mistake to think that one can "bite off more than one can chew".

A separate but related issue is the question of adequately supporting diverse advocacy needs. It will be **very** important for the program to consider the long-term repercussions of trying to meet the on-going advocacy needs of such a diverse group of people. For example:

- Will the committee of management and the program actually be able to *identify* closely with the plight of such a diverse range of people?
- Will it be able to provide competent preparation to advocates to such a diverse group?
- Will the positive image of people be maintained when they are grouped together by a program that tries to meet all of their needs – together?
- Will future staff and committee be able to cope with the numbers and diversity of supporting such relationships?
- Will diversity of protégés draw the program into recruiting 'easier' protégés as one way of dealing with the complex range of needs?

If we accept that it is important for Citizen Advocacy to associate itself with those who are the most vulnerable, there will be weighty implications. For example, the program has been very successful making "advocate-seeking matches"[7]. This is laudable considering the youth of the program. However, as protégé needs become more extreme, with difficulty even finding or being with some protégés (they are in jail, get moved around by systems, foster-care, etc) it may also be harder to find advocates who can respond to such demands.

---

[6] The Victorian State Plan claims to eliminate devaluation in 10 years, the Illawarra Mental Health Service claims to be able to eliminate the stigma of Mental Illness in 5 years!

[7] This is in contrast to protégé-seeking matches where the office finds an advocate, and then goes looking for a suitable protégé. Advocate-seeking matches are regarded as much harder to do, but result in longer term and more vigorous relationships. See Wolfensberger & Peters 2002.

We'd like to propose for your consideration just a number of alternative assumptions.

"Not everyone can have a citizen advocate (immediately)."

"People are not equal in their disadvantage."

 "Those who have the most need should get the most potent response."

(Some may recognise this last assumption as a summary of the Conservatism Corollary of SRV).

There remains the problem of how to identify and find those who are most vulnerable[8]. If the eligibility and suitability of protégés is broad – so will be the advocate responses called for.

We found that virtually all the relationships (with only a few exceptions) had low or no spokesmanship. This struck us as odd, because *if* the vulnerability of protégés were particularly heightened, it would suggest the need for more aggressive instrumental address of protégé needs. Thus while protégé identity is relatively wide, advocate roles have remained fairly narrow, and have seemingly emphasised expressive functions.

And finally, if advocates are vigorously addressing issues in the protégé's life, one might also expect to see human services being confronted – but this could prove difficult unless advocates are completely uncompromised by past associations and connections to the service system.

The team has tried not to overstate these two concerns, but to point out the potential for *future* program distortion if these two issues are not addressed in some way. The program has achieved a great deal in a short time, for which you should be congratulated. Yet failing to address these two concerns has the potential to undo much of that good work.

---

[8] Though not universal, intellectual disability is often a good indicator of heightened vulnerability, because of the combined image and competency (& therefore social) impairment that usually accompanies such a diagnosis. While other people with disabilities can also be very vulnerable, and should be considered, their disability is not necessarily the only significant attribute.

We would like to provide you some recommendations for your consideration in the weeks and months ahead, as well as suggest broad strategies for implementation.

1. As you naturally replenish the ranks of all your positions (protégés, advocates, advocate associates, Members of Committee, and staff) do so with people who have no connection whatsoever to the service system. For example, gradually reduce the percentage of people that the program recruits who come as a result of or from human service connections. The team is aware that the coordinator has already made excellent inroads into "community based" recruiting of protégés (like Norman) and advocates (like Steve) and advocate associates (like Celeste). This recommendation is to further encourage that direction.

2. Develop a clear approach and policy to people who may be referred from 'friends' in human services. That is, are there some 'friends' who understand your policies, but know that some people are indeed invisible and are being treated particularly badly and/or in need of long-term assistance, or a short term/crisis response? The policy might include how the staff are to respond (do they visit?) and the right of the program to make the final decision as to how it will respond.

3. Clarify the role for Advocate Associates, especially for those associates who feel compelled by *their human service role* to make referrals to the program.

4. Plan and develop goals and strategies, with the committee's involvement, for increasing connections and involvements in the non-service-related part of the community.

5. Work out a process/approach or set of strategies for finding the most vulnerable people. In particular, clarify the differences between levels of heightened vulnerability versus having a vulnerability risk (a sense of a continuum and degree of vulnerability versus a black or white perspective). The urgency of a person's needs and the likelihood that a person's needs might be met by other structures and relationships might also guide a decision around the priority for seeking an advocate.

6. Thus, plan for (as part of the protégé recruitment plan) and find protégés who need vigorous spokesmanship. Typically, advocates may be harder to find for such relationships, yet once found, both the protégé and the program will benefit enormously.

7. Increase clarity about heightened vulnerability and urgency of needs. Provide greater clarity in written descriptions of protégés' situations and advocate requirements. Presently, descriptions are full, but similar, carrying little distinguishing information and may account for the similarity of advocate response and roles.

8. Communicate a specific role (as opposed to tasks) that focuses on the most urgent and immediate issues to be addressed. Advocates find it very helpful to have a clear sense of instrumental[9] direction from the very outset of the relationship. As only the staff at this point have met and know the protégé, the advocate will appreciate initial specific guidance as to their most immediate and urgent actions. Such actions, and the sometimes spectacular results, often serves to propel the relationship along, especially as the advocate begins to see how their actions really do count. In time, the advocate will better know the protégé – and if possible grow in their affection and even love of the protégé. Such expressive involvement can fuel continued intense instrumental action.

9. Fully utilise 'follow along and support' opportunities to continue to shape the relationship in positive ways. Certainly, as advocates identify with the protégé and their situation in a sustained manner, the advocate's capacity to perceive the needs of the protégé accurately will increase. However, until then, staff have an opportunity to add their perspective and share with advocates the insights they may have. Such approaches are consistent with ordinary involvements within typical relationships and need not violate the independence of the relationship or the advocate's freedom to act.

10. Increase the amount of support the Committee provides for the staff, especially the Coordinator. While Les and Jenny have considerable ability to perform their respective roles very well within the program, that doesn't mean that they don't have certain needs. For example, the Coordinator's work is challenging, is unlike other jobs, sometimes complex and frustrating, at times morally and legally tricky, and can be very lonely. Les' closest source of professional support is from concerned and competent committee members who provide him the time to debrief, share concerns and gain sustenance. Any committee that concludes that competent workers need not be supported will eventually

---

[9] Unless of course the relationship is purely an expressive one.

be looking for new staff. The team wants to encourage the committee to carefully ensure that the necessary support is forthcoming. Some committee members do feel somewhat under-utilised or are unclear in how they might most fully be utilised. Regular phone or spoken contact and the odd cup of tea are valuable. In addition, it is highly valuable for committee members to become more keenly aware of the technical aspects of Citizen Advocacy, such as by joining the coordinator in visits to protégés prior to matching and in the development of protégé and advocate profiles. Generally, committee members have a role in supporting, supervising, visiting and generally supporting staff morale – especially given the isolated nature of the work. There are many benefits to the program and committee in being involved with some day-to-day functions, as will be outlined later in the report. One of the traps in having an effective coordinator is that it looks like the committee isn't really needed. It can be hard to keep going – especially year after year. A number of committee members are providing support; sharing that responsibility has the potential to benefit everyone.

┌───┐
│   **PART FOUR- CAPE RATINGS –SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT**   │
└───┘

3.1 ADHERENCE TO CITIZEN ADVOCACY PRINCIPLES

Principle one: Advocate independence

Description from CAPE

In order to effectively represent protégé needs, advocates must be free to develop a primary loyalty to protégés and to act as independently as possible in meeting protégé needs. This means that: (a) advocates should see themselves as supported by, but independent of, the advocacy office itself; (b) advocates should see themselves as independent of the agencies and settings which provide services for protégés; and (c) advocates should be able to see themselves as independent from the families of protégés in those instances where family interests are different from those of individual protégés. Briefly, the citizen advocacy program should be structured to support citizen advocates as unpaid, independent volunteers to an individual person. (p.1)

- **Unpaid roles** (CAPE rating R111)

    Description from CAPE
    The citizen advocacy relationship itself offers a wide range of intangible rewards for participants. To the extent that advocacy programs offer advocates material or other external compensation for their activities , the program compromises the advocates capacity to freely and primarily identify with a protégés needs, and may create a barrier to independent advocate action. Further, external compensation to advocates interprets protégés as being people to whom others would only relate if they were paid, and denies individual protégés the 'world building' experience of a freely-given relationship.

    Compensation can take a variety of forms. <u>The most obvious and the most compromising is money</u>. Other forms of compensation include: academic credit, paid time off from regular employment and service in expectation of a paid position. Any external compensation mechanism that raters discover should be rigorously tested against the principle that citizen advocate must be 'unpaid' volunteers.
    (p.1 added emphasis)

    <u>Assessment of the team</u>
    There is no evidence of any payment or in-kind reward and therefore no external coercive influence on relationships.

- **Loyalty to protégé** (encompassing CAPE ratings R11211 – Internal Promotion, R11212 – External Practice, R1122 – Advocacy Practice)

Description from CAPE
Most protégé will be at least somewhat more dependent on human services and on their families than will others of their age. The people on whom a protégé depends will develop their own perspective on the protégé's needs. Sometimes these perspectives are so strong as to distort the protégé's own interests to conform to the needs of service providers or even families. It is essential to Citizen Advocacy that the advocate strives to define situations from the perspective of the protégé, and to act to influence situations involving the protégé in terms of the protégé's perspective. While the principle can be simply stated – the advocate voluntarily acts as an agent of an individual protégé – defining a meaningful awareness of the protégé's perspective is typically a process which will develop through the advocate / protégé relationship. The more complex a protégé's situation, the more this necessary task will challenge the advocate. (p.2)

Assessment of the Team
The first of these three ratings (R11211), according to CAPE, is "concerned with the role of the CA office in *interpreting* the principle of advocate loyalty to protégé interests and in *supporting* the independence of advocates to enact this loyalty" (original emphasis)

The program policies are very clear with respect to communicating the independent nature of the relationship from the program. Also, orientation provides clear indications to advocates and protégés that they 'own' their relationship – and that it is not controlled in any way by the office. Follow-along also reinforces this, though may be adversely influenced by efforts and/or concerns to not influence the relationship at all.

Recommendations:
There is very good practice here overall. One potential concern is the practice of obtaining a commitment of the advocate to the relationship prior to meeting the protégé. In that sense, the advocate has declared a commitment to the coordinator/program for a relationship they haven't yet entered. This not only struck us as a bit odd, but also carried the potential of (unconsciously) directing the commitment towards the program and staff, and not the protégé.

We wondered whether it is feasible to alert the advocate to the dangers for the protégé of leaving the relationship early or in abandoning them, yet permit the advocate's commitment to develop 'naturally' as the relationship does.

The second rating (R11212) examines the CA office's efforts to promote advocate loyalty to the protégé particularly with respect to external agencies/services and protégé families.

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
The program expresses clarity to service providers and families – especially verbally with reference to this issue.

Recommendations
There as yet don't appear to be any conflicts between advocates and agencies or families that could serve to draw the program into an issue here. Our question to the program though is whether the program has some clear strategies for dealing with conflicts (eg an agency attacking the program because of an advocate's actions) when they arise. As increased instrumental advocate action occurs and fewer people are associated with human service pasts, the program may be more challenged around this issue.

The third in this cluster of ratings (R1122) looks at the actual practice of advocate loyalty to the protégé.

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
Many relationships demonstrated some degree of proactive action on the advocates' part – though most kept well within certain office or agency bounds. While the program is young, and relationships new, many advocates are still learning the scope of their influence and potential for action.

Recommendations
There is room for the office to suggest and question advocates' utilisation of lines of appeal, including agency or governmental appeal processes and instrumental actions generally. Basically, the office is able to challenge advocates to take more action (as demonstrated in the occasional frustration of office staff) – even if the advocates disagree or reject such advice.

Principle two: Program independence

Description from CAPE

In order to support the development of effective advocacy relationships, advocacy office itself must be independent. Independence implies the greatest possible freedom from conflict of interest in administration structures and funding. (p.6)

- **CA program separation from direct service** (CAPE rating R1211)

  Description from CAPE

  A Citizen Advocacy program should share few or no aspects of governance or administration with an organisation providing clinical or case management services which are relevant to actual or potential

protégé. An advocacy office should either have a governing board which does not govern any services, or at least it should be governed by a governance structure which has no responsibilities for the provision of direct services to actual or potential protégé.

Staff members should be independent of loyalties to agencies which would provide services to (potential) protégé. For instance, staff should not hold concurrent jobs with service-providing agencies and key staff with strong family ties to service providers should be avoided.

While the governing board members should be independent of agencies that might service protégé, some (perhaps a third) of the members might come from such agencies if their presence brings important benefits and safeguards are implemented to reduce the chances that their contribution does not jeopardise the advocacy office's independence… (p.7)

Assessment of the Team
As outlined in the major overriding issues for the program, there are considerable links between human services and the program – especially links that potentially involve (future) protégés of the program. These come through 3 avenues: 1) Personal backgrounds and job roles of a significant number of committee members and staff; 2) Certain program policies that mirror service legislation requirements – for example, eligibility criteria; and 3) Advocate associates in human service roles who sometimes make referrals apparently as part of their human service function.

Recommendations
1) For all new staff and Committee members, seek individuals who have little or no past and present connection with human services – especially services that serve (potential) protégés.
2) Define the roles of advocate associates so they are not tempted to make referrals as part of their human service role.

- **Independent CA office location** (CAPE rating R1212)
  Description from CAPE
  The physical location of the advocacy office should enhance its independence. Advocacy offices should not share space with, or be in direct proximity to, direct service providers that might service (potential) protégé.   (p.8)

  Assessment of the Team
  There are no problems with the present office location with respect to this issue.

- **Independence of funding sources** (CAPE rating R122)

  Description from CAPE
  The funding of CA offices – including indirect and in-kind subsidies such as donated space, equipment, supplies, secretarial services, etc. – should come from as distance a source as possible from funders who operate services which could serve (potential) protégé. As well, an advocacy office should have multiple*, distinct funding to ensure that freedom of perspective and action are not compromised if one or several funders disagree with the advocacy office's actions, and thereby do remove support…* (p.9)

  Assessment of the Team
  The program relies on a single recurrent state government grant from the same source that funds and provides direct service to many/most of the (potential) protégés. While reliance on a single source is dangerous to the continuity of the program (handles in a later rating), the issue here is the capacity of advocates to operate fearlessly and without compromise because the offices' independence permits it. Clearly, this is not presently the case. While the present funder and its officers are apparently supportive, this might not always be the case (as with a number of programs in NSW as I write), thus potentially limiting the actions advocates may take.

  Recommendations
  Develop, over an extended period of time, multiple sources of income and in-kind supports from a variety of benefactors that permit advocates to act in their relationships without fear of causing any backlash to the program as a whole.

Principle Three: Clarity Of Staff Function

Description from CAPE
In order to develop the full range of its potential, an advocacy office needs a staff who understand the nature and possibilities of Citizen Advocacy and who communicate this understanding by supporting, not supplanting, advocate/ protégé relationships; and by directing their energies toward building and maintaining the citizen advocacy program as a whole. Clear and effective staff functions requires the distinction of a well defined staff role from the role of the citizen advocate, non competition with advocacy roles, and staff involvement with others in developing Citizen Advocacy concepts and program. (p.10)

- **Focus of staff role definition** (CAPE rating R131)

  Description from CAPE
  Advocacy office staff are responsible for planning and implementing a Citizen Advocacy program which would meet an increasing amount of the need of the community's handicapped people for individual citizen

advocacy relationships. Whilst the focus of each advocate is on the individual protégé, the focus of advocacy office staff is on the advocacy program as a whole. While the perspective of each citizen advocate is on the development of the individual relationship, the perspective of the advocacy office staff is on the long term development of the potential for a wide variety of relationships. To ensure that adequate energy is available to develop the advocacy program as a whole, staff role should be structured and supported so as to ensure that the staff do not confuse their roles with citizen advocate roles. Advocacy office staff who identify themselves with the needs of a particular protégés are unlikely to maintain the perspective necessary to the long term needs of present and future protégé. Advocacy office staff who see themselves as responsible for personally representing the needs of protégés as a group (as advocates for all the program's protégé) are unlikely to maintain the focus of energy necessary for program development and individual advocate recruitment and support. (p.11)

Assessment of the Team
Staff are *very* clear as to their role and its distinction with the role of advocates. This has resulted in a very strong sense of purpose for the program that also fuels clarity for advocates and protégés in respect to their own relationship and their involvement with the office.

Recommendations
The team was not able to find documented descriptions of the staff role(s). They may exist – but if not, these would be one safeguard against future blurring of staff functions. The could also be present within the Committee Manual.

- **Staff independence from other advocacy forms** (CAPE rating R132)

Description from CAPE
As a group, people with handicaps need a number of types of advocacy. For example, some will need legal assistance to establish their rights in a particular situation. Many will benefit from a variety of class advocacy efforts pursued on behalf of handicapped people as a group. Each advocacy form has its own strengths and limitations; different advocacy types need different organisational and belief structures so as to ensure their optimal delivery. Each needs to make unique demands on its staff. This rating is concerned with the differentiation of the advocacy office staff from other necessary or at least desirable advocacy forms. This does not imply that element of Citizen Advocacy program might not be involved with other advocacies. Indeed, other ratings will reward Citizen Advocacy programs which develop advocates associates who represent special knowledge in other advocacy forms, and programs which encourage advocates to become active in voluntary associations. Moreover, this rating applies only to advocacy office staff in their work roles, and is

not intended to discourage staff from citizen activism in their non-work time. (p.12)

Assessment of the Team
The program has demonstrated particular clarity with respect to this question. The Committee consciously selected Citizen Advocacy as a distinctive advocacy form as a purposeful preference against other possibilities. The programs actions have been developed from that clear foundation.

Recommendations
As the program grows in size and age, it will need to safeguard this clarity from potential deterioration due to staff and committee turnover and against possible goal displacements. One way this could be done is via annual retreats or in-service days that review the history and circumstances that make CA so necessary ie; review wounding & deathmaking etc.

- **Ties to the Citizen Advocacy movement** (CAPE rating R133)

  Description from CAPE
  CA is a helping form which is especially demanding of staff. Though the concepts basic to Citizen Advocacy can be simply stated, their implications are complex and continue to be developed. Moreover, there are many forces acting on the typical Citizen Advocacy office which push it toward limiting its scope, eg. Over focusing on the recruitment of advocates to fill one type of advocacy role; concentrating on protégé with one particular type of need; or confusing its mission with another advocacy form. Finally, reward for CA office staff is not clear and immediate. Staff need the back up and support of governing board and advisory committee members who are themselves involved in increasing their identification with an understanding of the CA movement. Mechanisms for providing such mutual support include:

- *Activities which build a sense of collective identity such as an annual picnic or other celebration shared with advocates and protégés;*

- *Membership in CA interest groups and / or associations;*

- *Participation in training activities focused specifically on Citizen Advocacy values and practice;*

- *Developing concepts and practices which contribute to the CA movement by developing position papers, disseminating useful practices, sponsoring, contributing to or presenting training events.*

  Participation in such activities can occur locally, among CA offices in a region, a state or province, or nationally/internationally…(p.14)

Assessment of the Team

The program in its relatively short history has built an extensive array of connections within the legitimate CA movement. The program has now learnt many things that it may be able to share with other programs in the various learning/sharing forums that occur. The team would like to encourage the program to develop concepts, consistent with good CA practice and share those things (as in the CA conference in March 2003).

Principle four: Balance orientation to Protégé needs.

Description from CAPE

People with handicaps have a wide variety of needs for representation and relationships which can be met by citizen advocates. One of the greatest potential strengths of Citizen Advocacy, is the flexibility to define and support those relationships which can, if the participants choose, fit the changing individual circumstances of a protégé. However, realising this potential requires that the Citizen Advocacy office staff should be capable of developing and implementing complex, multi-path relationships. Many Citizen Advocacy offices have developed in the absence of such a multi-path strategy, and have greatly narrowed both the types of protégé need they perceive, the kinds of advocates they recruit, and the kinds of support they offer. This narrowing can easily define the pattern of growth of a Citizen Advocacy office over time such that potential flexibility becomes fixed in one or a few categories of response. Narrowing the range of possible citizen advocacy roles can result either in provision of overly restrictive relationships, or an inability to meet a substantial need for protection.

These ratings consider the Citizen Advocacy office's balance of response to protégé needs from two complementary perspectives: protégé characteristics which call for certain types of citizen advocacy, and the range of citizen advocacy role options which the Citizen Advocacy office structures. (p.15)

Protégé characteristics
Many individual characteristics of advocates and protégé's must be considered in developing an appropriate individual match. However, review of Citizen Advocacy implementation to date has identified four dimensions of protégé need which have the potential to be ignored or under-emphasised. These are: (a) a limited age range in protégé recruitment, thus limiting not only the range of their services but also the potential to recruit some advocates who identify more readily with an ignored age group; (b) service to people who have limited ability to reciprocate relationships; (c) people who need active spokesmanship to protect their rights; and (d) people who need relationships which will be long lasting. (p16)

- **Protégé age** (CAPE rating R1411)

Description from CAPE
People of all ages can potentially benefit from citizen advocacy relationships. Even newborns may require citizen advocates to protect them if their natural families and the human service system are uncertain as to their best interests.

At least eventually, if not initially, the advocacy office should plan its recruitment strategy to include people of all ages and should design its advocate recruitment process to invite citizens who are interested in representing people of all ages. (p16)

Assessment of the Team:
The program is doing very well in obtaining a good cross-section of protégé ages within the program especially so given the newness of the program. The team feels that changing the age differentiation from 65 to 56, doesn't appear to make any real difference apart from potentially propelling people of working age, into a non-working age category.[10]

Recommendation
Review your age categories once again taking into account the above perspective.

- **Protégé capacity for relationship reciprocity** (CAPE rating R1412)

Description from CAPE
A number of people who need the protection and representation offered by Citizen Advocacy are limited in their ability to respond to others, including citizen advocates. Non-responsiveness may be a general characteristic of the person – as when a person is profoundly handicapped – or it may primarily characterise the person's strong negative or abusive response to people who are seen as trying to 'help' or control. One of the major challenges facing Citizen Advocacy offices lies in recruiting and supporting advocates to fill a variety of roles for people who do not reciprocate. (p17)

Assessment of the Team:
The team found a good representation of protégés in the program who would ordinarily be regarded as non-reciprocal. We noted the program had chosen to define people as High, Medium or Low Reciprocity, which had a certain degree of ambiguity. We wondered whether a protégé might more simply be understood as non-reciprocal or not. If a person can respond a little, there might be many other reasons for

---

[10] We understand the point of this age demarcation to be intended to place people into age categories as a reflection of their changing needs. Though 26-65 is large – it's essentially a population of people whose needs are otherwise similar, whereas people over 65 fall into a distinctly different need category. 56+ mixes these need categories.

this that could get hidden behind a L, M, or H reciprocity description. For example, they might have low motivation, its their personality or a reflection of their present feelings etc. Thus determining a 'level' of reciprocity isn't necessarily helpful in understanding the situation of the protégé – and might even cloud it.

- **Protégé need for spokesmanship to defend human and legal rights** (CAPE rating R1413)

  Description from CAPE
  A number of handicapped people will, at some point in their lives, need another person to vigorously represent their interests in a situation in which their rights are (or are at risk of) being compromised. A person's need for such spokesmanship can be effectively – even inspiringly – met by a citizen advocate, either on the basis of an ad hoc, short-term relationship, or in the context of a long term relationship. Since spokesmanship needs usually come and go in a person's life, this rating is based on evidence of a history of vigorous spokesmanship by a variety of citizen advocates.

  Assessment of the Team
  Of the relationships the team met, we found evidence of some spokesmanship in 7; no spokesmanship in five and one relationship with medium to high spokesmanship. There appeared in both the descriptions we heard and the written documentation to be an emphasis on friendship/expressive roles in some circumstances where more active instrumental and especially spokesmanship roles were warranted. This may have some relationship to the initial roles given to advocates.

  Recommendations
  Clarify in your relationship review the difference between what is needed versus what is happening.
  Plan to recruit protégés who need various levels of spokesmanship.

- **Protégé need for long term relationships** (CAPE rating R1414)

  Description from CAPE
  A substantial number of people with handicaps need a relationship which will endure over a long time – perhaps even throughout a person's life. Many of them will have experienced what has been called a 'relationship circus' in which 'helping' person after 'helping' person has come into their lives and then, as quickly, left. The advocacy office should recognise and seek response to this need.

  Assessment of the Team
  The programs understanding of the importance for long-term relationships is commendable. Because of the early age of the

program & its relationships, its difficult to gauge which relationships may be life-long (though one clearly appeared to be), yet at least 10(of the twelve) other relationships were clearly long-term. The program contains clear policies and procedures to which support the development of long-term relationships.

- **Diversity of advocacy roles** (encompassing CAPE ratings R1421 and R1422)

  Description from CAPE
  The range of citizen advocacy roles which an advocacy office staff conceptualise and plan for as they recruit, match, and support advocates is perhaps the single most powerful determinant of an offices' long term success. This does not suggest that citizen advocates themselves are, or should be, bound to any sort of a 'job description.' Citizen advocates choose the investment they wish to make, and choose, together with the protégé, the direction and content of their relationship. However, most advocates make their choices in the context of options defined and supported by the advocacy office staff. Without a complex and flexible scheme for defining potential advocate roles, the complex and varied needs of potential protégé will be funnelled into only a few categories of response.

  There are at least three dimensions necessary to define an adequate range of advocate roles:

  - *The distinction between formal and informal relationships.*

  - *Formal relationships that are created by the due process of law and include purely instrumental roles (eg. Conservator, or guardian of property) and instrumental-expressive roles (eg., adoptive parent, or plenary guardian of a person).*
    (b) Informal relationships are created by the choice of those who are party to them.

  - *The instrumental-expressive action continuum where instrumental actions are taken to solve practical, material problems, and expressive actions are taken to meet needs for communication, relationship, support and love.*

    1. *The degree of demand experienced by the citizen advocate in the relationship.*

  Assessment of the Team
  There are presently no formal roles represented in the program. There are no purely instrumental (informal) roles represented.

  Recommendations
  - Seek formal roles for advocates where relevant

- Seek purely instrumental roles
- Define clear instrumental roles and tasks in Instrumental /Expressive relationships versus emphasis on expressive components (this recommendation might also impact on spokesmanship)
- Follow your plan, and recruit people into many different roles.

- **Availability of crisis advocates** (CAPE rating R1423)

  Description from CAPE
  Situations will arise in which a person has a critical, immediate need for representation or instrumental support. The typical process of recruiting, orienting, and matching advocates will be often too slow for needed immediate response. In addition, a protégé who is already matched needs to avoid involvement in crisis situations which are so demanding as to strain the ability of the advocate to support the relationship. In order to ensure that the advocacy office can adequately represent people in crisis without drawing staff into a service-providing relationship with an individual protégé, the office should recruit and support a number of stand-by, crisis advocates. Crisis advocacy relationships will typically be instrumentally focused and time limited, though the potential exists for the advocate (and where possible the protégé) to choose to broaden their relationship after the crisis situation is resolved.

  Assessment of the Team
  There has been several crisis advocacy situations, one which could also be thought of as a 'blessed relationship' that experienced a period of intense instrumental involvement, and the other has become (gratifyingly) a long-term relationship. However, the program may want to clarify its understanding of Crisis Advocacy and the type of conditions where it occurs. This might provide a basis for recruitment and orientation of potential Crisis advocates and for being alert to the environments and circumstances[11] where certain crises regularly occur for people.

  Recommendations
  - Develop a plan to recruit a person who can act as a Crisis Advocate. (They might also have other involvements in the program that maintain their involvement and freshness to the issues; example a member of the committee – or partner of committee member)
  - Consider the kind of skills that would be needed, the contacts and approaches they would need to use, their sensitivity to the dangers that protégé's face etc.

---

[11] For example, police & prison circumstances, hospital, sexual & physical assault possibilities. WW Monograph for protecting people in hospital settings could be a valuable resource.

- Consider what a crisis constitutes and the environments where it is likely to occur and how protégés might be discovered.

- Be sensitive to the issue of not over-responding to crises as though they are one off events, when many devalued people experience cycles of intense and less intense periods – that may really require a long-term relationship – not just short term crisis intervention.

- **Avoiding social overprotection** (CAPE rating R143)

Description from CAPE

CA is founded on the conviction that – eventually if not immediately – citizen volunteers can be recruited and supported to provide handicapped people with as much support and/or protection as they need and not more. This requires: (a) that the CA office identifies protégés who need formal relationships and recruits advocates willing to provide them (this is rated in R1421 Diversity of current advocate roles); and, (b) that the CA office minimises the possibility that a relationship will be socially overprotective (rated here).

Socially overprotective practices are based on a presumption that handicapped people are less capable of exercising their rights and meeting their needs than they in fact are, or could become with increased responsibility. Social overprotection is detrimental both in reducing the level of development challenge a person experiences and in its contribution to the stereotyped perception of incompetence.

Assessment of the Team
The team did not observe any evidence of social overprotection in any aspects of the programs' operation.

Recommendations
- Be sure to include reference to social overprotection during advocate orientation.

- As instrumental and instrumental/expressive actions increase – this might become a more common consideration.

Principle five: Positive interpretations of handicapped people

- **Positive interpretations of handicapped people** (CAPE rating R15)

  Description from CAPE
  The advocacy office should be a model in the interpretation of handicapped people. This implies both a systematic, highly conscious orientation to avoiding various types of deviancy-image juxtaposition and actively seeking the most positive possible and yet honest interpretation. This does not mean that the advocacy office will deny the existence of people's handicaps, or the nature of their social situation.

  Various types of deviancy images and powerful historic negative role perceptions have been described in detail by Wolfensberger in Normalisation (Toronto, 1972) and by Wolfensberger and Glenn in PASS 3 (Toronto, 1975). Interpretations which suggest these negative roles or images, even very subtly, contribute to the devaluation of people with handicaps.

  Specifically, the program should avoid places actions, or images which connect handicapped people with images or practices which connote:

- *death or decay*
- *subhumanity*
- *animality*
- *menace*
- *triviality, worthlessness*
- *sickness*
- *pity or charity*
- *eternal childhood*

  Instead, the advocacy office should seek the most highly positive, value-conferring and yet valid possible associations which support the developmental growth potential, citizenship role, and individual human personhood of people at risk of social devaluation.

  Assessment of the Team
  The team considers that the program has been quite conscious of the importance of positive interpretation of people through all its programmatic efforts (location, materials, dress, activities, fund raising etc.). Continue to pay attention to this area, especially in any fund raising efforts in the future.

- **CITIZEN ADVOCACY OFFICE EFFECTIVENESS**

Description from CAPE

The impact of a Citizen Advocacy office depends on the availability of sufficient staff time to effectively perform a balance of seven key activities, which, include: protégé recruitment, advocate recruitment, advocacy orientation, matching, follow-up and support, ongoing training, and involvement of advocate associates. These activities will back up and coordinator volunteer citizen advocates so as to maximise the probability that their protégé will experience continuity over time despite changing needs.

- **Vision and creativity of protégé recruitment** (CAPE rating R21)

Description from CAPE
Protégé recruitment practices have a strong influence on the direction of the advocacy office's development. If protégé recruitment is confined to a narrow group of people, it will make the development of an adequate range of advocate role options either impossible or reliant on significantly over or under servicing some protégé. If protégé recruitment is essentially a passive process which relies on human service agencies for protégé referrals, it is possible that many people most in need of Citizen Advocacy will be screened out as 'unsuitable for a volunteer' or even as a person for whom service providers are disinterested in active spokesmanship. If protégé recruitment does not result in valid information which clearly defines protégé needs, preferences and characteristics, advocate recruitment cannot be targeted precisely.

Assessment of the Team
The team found that a good number of protégé's had been found by the coordinator – many through previous knowledge and contacts – but some also through very active recruitment practices. There were a number (2) of referrals via advocate associates (though not as many as originally thought) and some as a result of direct family referral (6 – to our knowledge). However, the emphasis on 'advocate seeking' practice is praiseworthy given the youth of the program and the experience of the staff.

Certainly, the coordinator has made use of known people and situations in which to find people, but this is somewhat expected – though might need to now emphasise, at an increasing level, the proportion of people found who were previously unknown, and/or in other community settings.

Recommendations
- Develop community networks outside of service sector
- Specify who you are looking for – and go and find them
- Inform various current contacts that coordinator will perhaps approach *them* about people he is looking for. (We know this currently happens,

but some Adv Assoc still under misapprehension that they will take lead on that).

- Consider where people are who are desperate, lonely or in dangerous circumstances – but are hard to find, and try and find them.

- Develop a clear idea of who should the protégé be (refer to the earlier discussion of vulnerability/eligibility) – then follow recruitment plan.

- Work towards greater clarity in profiles (for eg; how met protégé and their distinctive circumstances that require specific immediate responses from the advocate.

- Be prepared at some point to burn your bridges with the service system.

- **Advocate recruitment** (CAPE rating R22)

Description from CAPE
Effectiveness in advocate recruitment results in a growing number of people becoming involved in each of the fifteen possible citizen advocacy roles. Ensuring effectiveness requires a written plan which is updated at least annually, which specifies target groups for recruitment, recruitment objectives, time-lines, and a variety of options for recruitment activities; is coordinated with the protégé recruitment plan; and is intended to track performance. Advocate recruitment strategies which rely on direct, person to person efforts which are specific to the defined needs of a particular protégé have proved most effective. Second in effectiveness appears to be presentations which are planned to interpret specific protégé needs to a target audience selected to ensure a high likelihood of producing people who would accept a particular advocacy role. Generalised public appeals, or generalised presentations to unselected groups, have shown only minimal return compared to more specific tactics.

Assessment of the Team
The team found that the program employs considerable person-to-person efforts to find advocates. The program and staff do not rely on broad appeals, but make specific approaches in order to find advocates. There is a written plan, which is updated annually. Advocate profiles are developed (though many are very similar and to a narrow range of tasks – versus roles). The profile does not describe particular targeted roles or initial points of address though do refer to overarching considerations (this may affect orientation of course).

Of the relationships the team met (12), nine had human service backgrounds or associations. The team considered some *possible* repercussions on the program and especially the relationships due to the emphasis of human service identity - & we include them here for your consideration[11]. They included:

---

[11] These factors were not necessarily directly observed, but they constitute feasible potential dangers.

- People with HS backgrounds can carry 'HS mindsets' about many things that could potentially interfere with protégé identification.

- Do people from HS backgrounds always understand the differences between formal versus informal involvements?

- Will they have the capacity to strongly go up against services?

- Does CA become a way for HSW's to become 'ennobled'?

- Are people in the community prevented from becoming citizen advocates each time a HS person becomes one?

- Does this make it harder for the program to broaden its constituency in the community and remove itself from a HS culture?

- The team acknowledges though, that some past human service workers who may have always maintained a clear allegiance to the recipients of a service can and do make effective citizen advocates.

Recommendations

- The Committee of Management have scope here to be involved in suggesting people from their own networks who have the needed attributes, & capacities.

- Continue in clarifying and specifying what roles an advocate is to fulfil and what specific qualities they need to do the job. The more specific this can become, the clearer it may be to identify people who have those capacities.

- **Advocate orientation** (CAPE rating R23)

Description from CAPE
The orientation required by advocates who are beginning a citizen advocacy relationship provides them with a necessary framework of understanding. Orientation can be productively provided into pre-match and post-match time blocks. In whatever minimum time is allocated to orientation, there should be adequate coverage of at least:
- *The social situation of handicapped people;*
- *Description of the basic principles of Citizen Advocacy, with special reference to advocate responsibilities to the protégé, and to the full range of necessary citizen advocacy roles;*
- *Clear description of the role and function of the Citizen Advocacy office from the perspective of what advocates can and should expect from staff and advocate associates;*
- *Information on a range of effective means of meeting the advocacy needs of handicapped people;*
- *Information on other available resources to assist advocates and protégé; and*
- *Specific information necessary to an initial sense of understanding and competence in undertaking a chosen advocacy role.*

The team noted many good and successful aspects to the orientation of advocates conducted by the program. There was a good range of topics addressed, pace is very good, files are well structured and there is some good attention to the protégé's situation. As noted previously, as the advocate role becomes more distinct, the orientation will become more 'action' oriented especially with respect to immediate and necessary actions.

Recommendations

- Continue to orient advocates to the protégé and their circumstances, so that virtually all topics can be addressed from the point of view of the protégé.

- Provide the advocate distinct roles through which they address the protégés situation. Indeed, the role clarifies the goal that is to be achieved – but gives scope to the advocate for how that goal will be accomplished.

- It may be useful to utilise advocate associates as part of the orientation, and thereby introduce another supportive relationship. If advocate associates can't be used – they may not be entirely relevant to the matches being made – which will have implications for what advocate associates are recruited.

- **Advocate – Protégé matching** (CAPE rating R24)

Description from CAPE

Matching involves the selection of an advocate and a protégé who are likely to begin a successful relationship, and providing an initial structure for introducing each to the relationship. In terms of advocacy office staff activity, the quality of the match depends on:
- *The quality of information available on the specific needs, personal characteristics, and preference of individual protégés.*
- *The quality of information available on the advocate initial expectation, the type of advocacy role he/she is interested in, the level of advocate commitment and advocate skills, personal characteristics and preferences. What becomes apparent here is the utility of advocate recruitment methods which are specifically targeted to well defined protégé needs.*
- *The ability of the staff performing the match to select advocate/protege pairings which provide a best fit between advocate expectations and characteristics, and protégé needs and characteristics.*
- *The ability of the staff devising the match to (a) predict areas of a relationship which are apt to lead to confusion, initial disappointment, or conflict; and (b) to structure initial contacts so as to minimise potentially negative experiences.*
- *The ability of the staff devising the match to sensitively and positively interpret the need of each person to the other.*

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
The matching is an integral part of orientation, with the actual meeting of the two people being the culmination of much preliminary work. There is a good balance in how the program presents a positive perspective of the protégé combined with a balanced sense of the reality of their circumstances and (sometimes personal) dilemmas and characteristics.

- **Follow-up and support** (CAPE rating R25)

Description from CAPE

Follow-up and support activities are distinct, but closely related. Follow-up includes regular, systematic, low profile checks on the status of each relationship; provides the CA office with a measure of its effectiveness in meeting the needs of protégés; and identifies an advocate's need for support.

Support activities provide practical and, when necessary, emotional support to advocate/protege relationships. The rating assesses the responsiveness of the CA office to needs for follow-up and support and the ability of the office to balance responsiveness to advocates' and protégé needs with avoiding intrusion on developing relationships.

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
The team found that there is a very good level of support and follow-along provided for by both Jenni and Les with the office being very responsive to advocate enquiries. There is a high level of awareness of avoiding over intrusiveness – yet providing a suitable level of support that facilitates contact and involvement between advocates and protégé's – especially while relationships are young and advocates are still feeling their way. This rating concerns itself mostly with the *process* of follow-along & support (which is *very good)*, but the team would like to make some comment also on the *content* of the follow-along and support.

Recommendations:
- Consistent with earlier comments, the team believes there is some room for staff to put questions, make comments and express observations about the protégé's circumstances. The team knows, and has seen examples of this being done that in no way impinges on the freedom and ownership of the relationship. What it can do though is to indicate a real interest in the relationship, and to instruct/support the advocate in their instrumental aspects of their roles.
- An increased instrumental role for advocates – and the content of the follow-along and support, will put additional loads on the office. For example, it will get everyone out of the comfort zone of expressive emphasis, and of course challenge the service system a great deal more – which will have possible repercussions on relationships and connections as we have already covered.

- Therefore, the team recommends that the program review its assumptions that govern comments to relationships. We would suggest that the program might regard as normative the possibility and capacity to make comments, especially when someone does have some competency and interest in the relationship.

- **Ongoing training** (CAPE rating R26)

Description from CAPE

As advocates become involved in their relationships, some will desire additional training in some aspect of concern to the relationship. While orientation and follow along are necessary for each advocate, ongoing training should be available according to the choice of individual advocates. For efficiency, the advocacy office itself should only provide training when no other suitable sources of training are available. In particular, the citizen advocacy office should carefully weigh any decision to provide technologically oriented training on handicaps, available resources, etc. or training that would be better presented by people who practice another advocacy form. Highest priority for CA office-sponsored should be exploration of the values necessary for provision of moral services, and the handling of CA challenges and dilemmas.

Assessment of the Team
There has not been a great deal of direct activity with respect to further training, though the team heard of new efforts to provide training opportunities around legal and SRV issues. There has also been some notification of training opportunities where external parties provide the training.

Recommendations:
- There is perhaps room to involve the management committee in organising and arranging training.
- The training necessary should flow from and be relevant to the needs expressed or issues expressed in protégé lives.
- Surveys of advocates as to what issues they believe they need addressing may also help.
- Follow-along will often reveal if there are any areas that need or could be addressed via training eg; spokesmanship.

- **Advocate associate emphasis** (CAPE rating R27)

Description form CAPE

Advocate associates are volunteers to the advocacy office who possess skills and knowledge useful to advocates and protégés. From time to time,

an advocate associate can offer advice and perspective on such matters as the technical dimensions of the services which a protégé receives or seeks to receive, strategy development for management of a demanding situation, or advice on technical matters that have relevance to the relationships (e.g., advocate on managing an issue related on guardianship of property). A sufficient number of active advocate associates provides a safeguard against staff being drawn into individual advocacy activities, and provides a major support to advocates and their protégé who chose to avail themselves to their counsel. Advocate associates should be respectful of the advocate role in the relationship, and should avoid supplanting efforts the advocate is willing to make.

The advocacy office should recruit, orient and actively utilise a number of advocate associates who represent a variety of technical skills. Further, staff should actively link advocates to advocate associates, as necessary. Advocates should be informed of the availability of advocate associates, the skills they possess, and how to gain access to them.

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
The team observed that there had been good attention paid to the recruitment of advocate associates. There had also been a very thorough and complete orientation of these people – each understood very well, the function and role of citizen advocacy. There did appear to be some repetition or overlap of skills (eg; OT's), even though they did work in different fields, we wondered if this would really make a difference. There were a couple of instances where advocate associates appeared to misunderstand their role and saw themselves as providing an extension of their own service by being able to make referrals to the program.

Recommendations:
- Select potential advocates from the protégé recruitment plan
- Create ways of helping them to be used – as in incorporating them (bodily) into an advocate orientation session.
- Seek people from generic sources as well as specialised disability specific sources. Examples include pharmacist, exercise physiologist, fitness trainer etc.

- **Balance of CA office activities** (CAPE rating R28)

Description from CAPE

The seven previous ratings have examined each key activity in turn. This rating requires consideration of the balance of these activities and its likely long term effects. A CA office which has an effective balance of activities will do enough of the right thing at the right time to ensure that it will achieve its mission. Some examples of an ineffective balance of activities follow:

A CA office may have an ineffective balance of activities in consequence of doing the right thing at the wrong time. For instance, staff may spend a disproportionate amount of time in advocate recruitment before protégé recruitment is well established. This typically results in a substantial delay between the time an advocate volunteers and the time she /he is matched, and could lead either to imprecise matching or advocate drop out.

An office may over invest its time in one activity at the expense of another needed activity. For example, if time is spent on recruitment at the expense of supporting advocate/protege relationships the office may lose relationships which have the potential to develop to effectively meet protégé needs.

An office may do too much of a needed activity. For example, staff may become overly concerned with protégé recruitment early in the office's history and make extensive efforts to 'get referrals'. This may results in a backlog of protégé too large to match effectively.

Assessment of the Team

The team noted that the program had indeed accomplished a good level of balance, especially so given the young age of the program. There is room for some refocussing – especially around training and some more time given to the active recruitment of protégés (though there are some fine examples of this as well).

Recommendations:

- Re-revaluate the notion that all areas of the key activities are equally important, and consider the potential that a program is really driven by the nature and needs derived from protégé recruitment. In that sense, the team suggests they are not equally important – but that protégé recruitment is substantially the most important key activity – not because it deserves more time, but because it drives all the other activities. In that sense, it is central to the identity of a program.

- **Encouragement of advocate involvement with voluntary association** (CAPE rating R29)

Description from CAPE

Citizen advocates can derive multiple benefits from membership in a voluntary association concerned with class advocacy on behalf of people who share their protégé's handicap. Often, they can find a source of information, personal support, and civic influence which can potentially benefit their protégé. As well, based on their personal knowledge of their protégé's situation, citizen advocates can make a substantial contribution to the effectiveness of a voluntary association. While it would be inappropriate for the citizen advocacy office to require the advocates and protégés to join voluntary associations, membership should be actively encouraged.

As the program progresses, and relationships mature, there may be a place to develop this for some advocates.

- **Sufficiency of CA office staff** (CAPE rating R210)

Description from CAPE

Though Citizen Advocacy is a volunteer effort, the key activities which establish and support volunteer relationships require the contribution of staff that is (a) full time, and (b) almost always paid.

The current state of knowledge does not permit the writing of an exact, or even an approximate, staffing formula for Citizen Advocacy offices. However, many programs are in fact understaffed and cannot manage all the necessary seven key activities for the number of relationships they carry; raters should exercise their best judgment in terms of required work load and growth potential.

Assessment of the Team
There is reasonable sufficiency of office staff while the program is still in its early growth phase. Though once numbers of relationships continue (on the basis of their current rate) then staff will be considerably stretched to provide sufficient support to those relationships and as well continue to build new ones.

- **PROGRAM CONTINUITY AND STABILITY**

Description from CAPE

If the advocacy office is to support citizen advocates who maintain long term relationships, it must maintain itself over time. If staff are to have the capacity to perform the key activities required to develop and to support the program, there must be a stable organisational and financial context. These ratings assess features of the program structure that contribute to program continuity and stability.

- **Feasible governance and guidance structures** (CAPE rating R311)

Description from CAPE

Implementing and maintaining an advocacy office offers a variety of challenging organisational problems. The program should have a board and advisory committee structure which maximises the involvement of local citizens in controlling and advising the program.

The team noted the presence of at least one regularly meeting sub-committee.

Recommendations:

- Continue to develop the presence of relevant advisory/sub-committees.

- The main committee develop, maintain, plan and give direction to sub-committees

- One might also recruit specific people onto a sub-committee who are not members of the main committee eg; fund raising.

- Orientation of committee members needs to be more systematic, planned and frequent – and could also be done by other committee members.

- Consider annual events for the management committee; training days, retreats. The meal with meetings is a great idea.

- **Composition of governance and guidance bodies** (CAPE rating R312)

Description from CAPE

The governing board and advisory committee structure should reflect a balance of skills, identities, interest and abilities.

Assessment of the Team
The present committee does enjoy a very good cross-section of skills and abilities. However, there is still capacity for the committee to extend its current membership.

Recommendations:

- Continue to seek suitable advocates as members of the committee (without displacing the importance of their relationship)

- Consider if there is a protégé with suitable skills for the committee.

- Recruit members to the committee who might have different views and opinions – and with a non human service perspective.

- **Level of leadership involvement** (CAPE rating R313)

Description from CAPE

Members of the board and advisory committees need to be actively involved in controlling and advising the advocacy office. Without such active involvement, the office will come to 'belong' to the staff with the probable result that program reputation and continuity will come to depend solely on staff who are, as a group, more likely to be transient than a well-established board. In that case:

- *major board involvement will be with the (possibly uninformed) hiring of new directors;*

- *the office will lack advice and guidance from a variety of people*

- *the office will have a narrowed base of community support, particularly when difficult, value laden choices must be faced.*

Assessment of the Team
The team found that the committee clearly owns and is responsible for this program. There are some points of concern however, which have to do with general attendance levels at meetings, clarity of roles for some committee members, as well as a sense of usefulness and mechanisms for being more involved for others. It is clear that staff welcome opportunities for members of the committee to be more involved with the program.

Recommendations:

- Perhaps as part of the increased orientation for committee members should include clarification and shaping of a committee person's role and the function(s) they wish and are able to play.

- Increase involvement in KOA, and in particular, protégé and advocate recruitment, developing protégé and advocate profiles are usually excellent ways of bringing committee closer to the realities for people and the necessity for CA (that is, it will affect enthusiasm and passion for CA.

- **Long term funding potential** (CAPE rating R321)

Description from CAPE

Many advocacy offices are destroyed by their over reliance on funds which are time limited (e.g., developmental disability funds) or temporary (e.g., various manpower –related grants). An office needs stable source for most of its funding, so as to avoid potential loss of program continuity and an annual panic about funding, and diversion of staff time from other activities. There should be a long term financial plan which specifies funding objectives, sources, and alternative actions for developing multiple sources of funding. In assessing long term funding potential, raters should distinguish between funds which have a definite time limit and funds which must be reconfirmed annually but have not set time limits (such as a continuing legislative appropriation). Funds which are indefinitely renewable but must be annually confirmed should be considered as potentially stable.

Assessment of the Team
The team found that there was long term funding potential, but that at the same time, one shouldn't be complacent about the endless continuity of funds. Therefore

Recommendations:

- Build safeguards into securing ongoing funding favour.

- Furnish the department – whether they want it or not – with specific detailed information about the activities of the program (as if one was having to convince them the necessity to continue).

- Include rich stories of how protégés lives have changed as a result of the relationships the program has made & supported.

- Show its cost effectiveness (see Brian Martin's article at the CAN website).

- Provide an executive summary; with the detailed account over 5-10 pages.

- **Local funding participation** (CAPE rating R322)

Description from CAPE

An advocacy office which has evidence of strong local funding support is in an advantageous position. Not only does local money demonstrate community confidence, it also provides a source of matching funds for a variety of funding from other governmental levels. Support may be in kind (donated space, time, or equipment), but is most impressive when it is in cash…

Assessment of the Team
There is little local funding support – and therefore in that sense, little local ownership of the program. Local ownership is an important safeguard for program continuity in the event of "sudden death" brought about by sudden defunding.

Recommendations:

- Develop local funding support – even if some or much of the funds seem meagre.

- Build local ownership of the program – perhaps as a stated goal. This goal is often accomplished thru $.

- Aim to diversify ones funding – another safeguard against sudden death.

- Consider also certain possibilities for in-kind donations.

- Consider the expertise of some people (like Bill), but monitor the imagery issue.

- **Program Legitimisation** (CAPE rating R323)

Description from CAPE

An advocacy office's position with funders depends in part on the degree of legitimisation it enjoys. At the lowest level, this involves the capacity to attract endorsement in seeking funds from a distant treasury. More significant is recognition by a community or high-level planning or fund-allocating board (a state's development disability plan, or the decision of a provincial-level civic association to act as a fund raiser, etc.). Governmental action which authorises the program without appropriation of adequate funds constitutes the next level of legitimacy. At the highest level is the presence of an endorsement or a mandate to provide the program, accompanied by authority and money for operations…

<u>Assessment of the Team</u>
The program enjoys the legitimacy provided by the recognition government funding provides.

1)   Adherence to Citizen Advocacy Principles
This section relates to the identity of the program, ie; if a program significantly adheres to the Principles, then it follows that it is doing Citizen Advocacy. Conversely, if it is not, then it is not a Citizen Advocacy Program, but something else.

Having considered all the evidence associated with the adherence to the CA Principles, the team is very pleased to find that CCA is indeed a Citizen Advocacy Program.

2)   **CA Office Effectiveness**
This section is concerned with the effectiveness and quality of the office practices – the so-called "key office activities". Another way to put this is to ask, is the office making good use of the Citizen Advocacy Model to make Good Matches?

The team found that the program is making many matches – and is therefore effective – but that it is possible to be even more effective.

3)   Program Continuity & Stability
This section explores the programs viability over the long run – will it continue as a program, from a funding perspective and also from a governance and leadership perspective?

The team found that the program has considerable strengths in its governance, though with some drawbacks, and that its funding and independence is under some risk due to relying on one source.

CONCLUSION

Citizen Advocacy is not easy to do, yet needs to be done very well to be effective.

This program has achieved a great deal in its relatively short history. There are many accomplishments as well as some aspects to improve on.

The team has been honoured to be involved in this process with you, and we wish you every success as you continue to strive to be as effective and influential in the lives of people with disabilities as you possibly can be.

APPENDIX A

CAPE CHECKLIST

CAPRICORN CITIZEN ADVOCACY
DATE: October 14-17, 2002

_____

Advocate independence
R111 Unpaid Roles   Level 4
R11211 Internal promotion   Level 4
R11212 External promotion   Level 3
R1122 Advocate practice   Level 3

Program independence
R1211 CA program separation from direct service   Level 2
R1212 Independent CA office location   Level 4
R122 Independence of funding sources   Level 1

Clarity of staff function
R131 Focus of staff role definition   Level 4
R132 Staff independence from other advocacy forms   Level 5
R133 Ties to the citizen advocacy movement   Level 3

Protege characteristics
R1411 Protege age   Level 3
R1412 Protege capacity for relationship reciprocity   Level 4
R1413 Protege need for spokesmanship to defend
    human and legal rights   Level 2
R1414 Protege need for long term relationships   Level 4

Diversity of advocacy roles
R1421 Diversity of current advocacy roles   Level 2
R1422 Balance of current and planned advocacy
    relationships   Level 2
R1423 Availability of crisis advocates   Level 3
R1424 Involvement of youth advocates No need to rate
(R143) Avoiding social overprotection   Level 3
(R15) Positive interpretations of handicapped people   Level 5

Citizen Advocacy office effectiveness

R21 Vision and creativity of protégé recruitment	Level 3
R22 Advocacy recruitment	Level 2
R23 Advocate orientation	Level 3
R24 Advocate - protégé matching	Level 3
R25 Follow up and support to relationships	Level 4
R26 Ongoing training	Level 3
R27 Advocate associates emphasis	Level 3
R28 Balance of key CA office activities	Level 3
R29 Encouragement of advocate involvement with voluntary associations	Level 2
R210 Sufficiency of CA office staff	Level 3

Community leadership involvement

R311 Feasible governance and guidance structures	Level 2
R312 Composition of governance and guidance bodies	Level 3
R313 Level of leadership involvement	Level 4

Funding related issues

R321 Long term funding potential	Level 3
R322 Local funding participation	Level 1
R323 Program legitimisation	Level 4

APPENDIX B

John Armstrong (Team Leader & Report Writer)

As a trained teacher of the deaf, and has taught in Aboriginal communities in Central Australia, and Special Schools, and Early Intervention Programs in regular preschools in the NT & Victoria. He has been an adviser to families, schools and adult services for people with intellectual disability and autism.

Since 1986, John has worked firstly for government and from 1991 independently as a senior Social Role Valorisation trainer, having studied with Dr. Wolf Wolfensberger in 1992. He is President and an advocate/guardian with Citizen Advocacy Sunbury and Districts in Victoria, Australia.

Brian Martin (Report Editor)

Brian Martin has been chair of the board of Illawarra Citizen Advocacy since 1998, has attended SRV and PASSING workshops and written several short articles about citizen advocacy. He is associate professor in Science, Technology and Society at the University of Wollongong, with primary research interests in nonviolent action, whistleblowing and information issues.

David Abella

David Abela has been Coordinator of Citizen Advocacy Sunbury & Districts since August 1991. He has a Bachelor of Arts (Recreation) and has previously worked as a community development officer for people requiring long term care from the effects of polio; a leisure Coordinator at the Royal Talbot Rehabilitation Centre for people with brain injuries and community recreation worker in a Victorian country town. David has been involved as a team member in three other CAPE's in Victoria, NSW and WA. He has also participated in SRV and PASSING workshops and events. In 1996 the program David is Coordinator of was evaluated using CAPE. David has four young children and lives in a small country town near Sunbury, Victoria.

Robyn Rooke

My name is Robyn Rooke and I had never been involved with people with intellectual disability until a friend's family offered me employment here on the Sunshine Coast, in a residential home managed by one of the local service providers. I found I became obsessed with the notion that if I was available to the residents whom I had grown to love, twenty-four seven, that I could protect them from many of the support workers, who worked with them in their home.

I realised that this was an impossible task from an internal position, and so after persevering with this service provider for eighteen months, resigned in outrage of their shameful culture, seventeen months and three weeks, too late. Like a God-send, the position with Citizen Advocacy presented itself directly, and although I had never heard of the programme, liked what I had been given to read and so applied for the position. No amount of reading could have prepared me for the amazing way that Citizen Advocacy is such a rapid one-on-one response that directly protects and supports the most vulnerable individuals.

APPENDIX C
A BRIEF OUTLINE OF SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT CONCEPTS & ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING CITIZEN ADVOCACY

By Wolf Wolfensberger

This article is an edited and expanded transcript of a presentation first given at a Citizen Advocacy workshop in Adelaide, Australia, in September 1992. This material can be understood freestanding, as presented here, but the majority of the Australian audience had just attended a 5 day workshop on Social Advocacies in which there was a one-hour presentation on the nature and role of assumptions in advocacy, and another half-hour review of those assumptions that we believe to be valid and adaptive for all kinds of advocacy. Thus, most of the audience was already familiar with these basic concepts, and the material presented here was meant to elaborate these concepts more specifically as they apply to Citizen Advocacy. I am indebted to Tom Doody for suggestions in the revision of this manuscript. W. Wolfensberger.

Certain painful realities (reviewed earlier during the workshop) inform us of three things.

1. Social stratification and social devaluation are true universals, found everywhere at all times.
2. These things are most painful reminders of human imperfection, and what traditional Christianity used to call the human "inclination to sin."
3. In addition to the harm that gets done to people by other people, there is the harm that comes to us by nature, as via accidents, disease, genetic "mistakes" and mutations, and aging. These things are also signs and reminders of our imperfection and vulnerability.

Now in contrast to the above, there also exists in humanity a capacity to (a) try to escape from the dreadful burden of our moral weakness, and from our doing harm to others, and to (b) be good to others, including those who have been afflicted either by nature or by human malefaction. It is rather instructive for those willing to be instructed that human efforts along these lines are vastly more likely to succeed on the individual level than the societal one. In other words, individuals can go a long way in overcoming their own devaluations, extricating themselves from societal harm-doing, and being good to their neighbors - even as their very own society as a whole continues to do all sorts of massive harm to its devalued and oppressed classes.

There are, of course, many morally valid ways to be good to others, and to combat humanity's inhumanity of humanity. Even systemic ways of doing it may be morally valid, and there are many personal ways of striving to do it.

But we can also say with certainty that systemic efforts in the absence of extensive personal effort are bound to fail. Failure to perceive this has been the error at the heart of many social theories and political systems, such as Marxism, which proposed that a good society could be built by force so as to eventually make people more moral, rather than that it takes moral people to build a better society.

Among the many personal moral strategies to pursue, Citizen Advocacy (Wolfensberger & Zauha, 1973) is merely one. Whatever systemic elements it has are focused first and foremost on the promotion of individual humans being good to other individual humans.

We will now review a set of twenty- two assumptions that come together to point to, suggest, and support Citizen Advocacy rather than some other valid moral strategy. Prior to September 1992, these assumptions had never been collated, but could be identified here and there in the conceptualization of Citizen Advocacy, in the way it was taught, and in the Citizen Advocacy literature.

1. Human beings not only are interdependent, but should strive to interdependence. In other words, they should acknowledge such interdependence as both a fact and a desirable characteristic, and not be ashamed of it or make war against it as the modernists are doing in the name of individualism, self- determination, self-advocacy, and "choice." This means that people should be prepared to help each other, give help when it is needed, seek help when they need it themselves, accept help graciously when it is given, and hopefully give it as graciously as they should accept it.

   A corollary to this assumption is that it is very bad for people's moral identity if they cut themselves off from a close walk with needy or suffering people generally, and especially with the lowly people of the world. In fact, some of us go one step further (though this is not needed as an assumption for Citizen Advocacy); namely, some of us have come to believe that people who cut themselves off from a close walk with the lowly will in time suffer a form of moral death, with all sorts of bad derivative consequences.

   Another corollary seems to be that the expressive element in Citizen Advocacy must always be expected to play a major role, because personal interdependence rests at least in part on mutual positive feelings, and helping people whom one does not like is almost impossible to (a) do right, or (b) sustain over the long run.

2. Many people who are afflicted or in the lower societal strata need help – some to merely survive, some to lead a less wretched life, and some to break out of devalued status. A corollary to this point is that if the relevant help is not forthcoming, a lot of people will die, will lead more wretched lives, and/or will never escape devalued social identity.

3. People will differ widely in terms of what help they need, the amount of help that is needed, and its duration.

4. In at least a certain proportion of cases where help is needed for the reasons already mentioned, this help has to come from people who have competencies or resources in which the needy person is lacking.

5. Among the competencies or resources that helpers need is the ability to extract from third parties whatever is needed. Therefore, competencies that will often be relevant are skills of communication and persuasion. Resources of helpers that will often be relevant include a positive image in the eyes of those parties from whom one needs to extract something, because it will often get action that positive images alone would not elicit.

6. While there are all sorts of ways to help people, some situations are such that very special power adheres to a committed one-to-one way of helping.

7. All people – including handicapped people – have some important needs which can only be addressed by or within a freely – given, voluntary relationship, i.e, a relationship in which neither party receives outside motivators or incentives for engaging in the relationship, and especially not payment, because this would denature and degrade the relationship, and reduce, or even nullify, some or all of its potential benefits. Eight needs along these lines are the following.[2]

    a. The need for acceptance, affection, and love. If someone is getting paid to "be accepting" and to "act lovingly," then the recipient is apt to question - and rightly so - whether the acceptance and love are for real, or whether they are just a sham that the person is pretending to feel because it is part of the job. For instance, if someone needs a friend, and needs to be convinced that the friend is for real, then it simply will not do to have paid social workers or therapists trying to meet the need. Paid friends are a bit like paid lovers, and we have a nasty word for paid "love."

    b. The need for continuity of relationship, and especially in important relationships. While continuity can never be guaranteed, the potential for it is more likely to exist in unpaid relationships than in paid ones, because in paid ones, the very nature of the relationship contract is that the relationship continues only as long as the employer's or payer's mandate and payment continue. When payment ceases, neither party is obligated to continue the relationship. In paid human services, this tends to be exactly what happens: once a service worker is no longer paid to relate to a client, then the server almost always ceases to have contact with the person. The fact that turnover rates in human services today are so very high adds another reason why it is even less likely that paid relationships will have much continuity. Even where a paid worker continues in a specific job slot, the relationship rarely lasts, often because the paid worker gets mandated to do other things instead.

---

[2] In other contexts, we elaborate at much greater length on each of the following points.

c. The need for membership in an intimate communality, of which the family is one example. Without this, people can end up very ill-socialized and maladapted for social intercourse. Again, such belongingness takes on a very different hue when the group of which one is a member is paid to accept one, than when the group takes in the person voluntarily. As long as there is payment, there remains the doubt whether one's place in that group is certain, or whether one would be extruded when payment dries up. Indeed, this is precisely one of the issues that can make it very difficult for foster children to feel secure, and to become well-integrated into foster families, even if they live in such families for many years.

d. The need for security. In part, this need can be addressed by ongoing acceptance and continuity, as covered earlier. It is especially when a person is freely and voluntarily chosen by someone else that the person feels, "I am worthwhile; I am valuable; someone chose me out of everyone else in the world for a friend, spouse, companion, etc." This is an especially crying need for so many devalued people whose life circumstances have usually rendered them deeply insecure about many things: where their next meal is coming from, if they will have shelter for the night, whether they will get moved about and "transferred," whether anyone loves them, etc.

e. The need for a valued social role; including positive valuation by others, respect, prestige, and valued membership in society. As is explained in much greater detail in both teachings and writings on Social Role Valorization (e.g., Wolfensberger, 1992), if a person fills valued roles in society, then the person is apt to be granted the good things in life. Thus, societally devalued people need to have valued roles in life: family member, aunt or uncle, students, worker, home-owner, good neighbour, choir member, club president, athlete, etc. It is true that paid services can foster some valued roles, but there are yet other valued roles that are only valued if they are freely given, and freely supported. The clearest examples are the roles of family member and friend. However, in addition, other people are more willing to extend positive valuation and respect to a person, and therefore must see the person as valuable. If no one wants to be a person's friend, or to otherwise voluntarily spend time with a person, then observers will conclude that the person is not very valuable, and that they too should stay away from the person.

f. The need for competence and mastery. People need to gain competence over their environment, to be able to act effectively, and to accomplish things. Again while many competencies can certainly be learned in paid contexts, yet others cannot, the most clear-cut ones being relationship competencies. For instance, one cannot learn how to be a friend unless one has friends. Paid friend- substitutes may be able to teach one many things, but not how to be a friend. And so it is with any number of relationship competencies, such as the give-and-take of getting along with others, how to relate to people in different roles, some elements of etiquette, how to show affection, how to resolve interpersonal disagreements, etc.

g. The need for self-respect. One's self-image largely derives form the messages about oneself that one gets from one's environment, including the people in it. If one has experienced much rejection, bad treatment and abuse, then one is apt to come to see oneself as not very valuable, perhaps even as un-lovable. But if other people treat one with respect, and especially, if they freely and voluntarily extend relationship to one, then one is apt to see oneself as someone whom other people enjoy being with, someone who has something to offer to others, someone who deserves to be treated well.

h. The need to be protected from neglect, abandonment, abuse, and exploitation. Particularly for people who are especially vulnerable to these things, it is important that other people who are competent, and who have value and prestige in society, stand by them, advocate for them, and protect them from the bad things that are very likely to happen to them. At least some of this protection must be freely extended, because any that is paid for is apt to be controlled by the parties that render the payment. This means that if those parties themselves engage in destructive policies or practices, then the paid protectors will be constrained in their ability to advocate for the ill-treated party, because doing so might jeopardize their payment. People who offer such protection and advocacy voluntarily have much less reason to be afraid for their income if they confront any parties, because they are not beholden to these parties for their income.

To jump ahead a bit, we are not implying that all of the many kinds of advocacy should be concerned with meeting these needs, nor that none of the other advocacy or helping forms can address them effectively- but only that those advocacy or other helping forms that are freely-given can do certain things that the paid ones cannot, or can only do in attenuated ways.

8) The previous point is even more true for deeply wounded people, and above all for people who have built up an expectancy to be rejected because of their previous experiences of rejection, and/or who have a long history of disappointments with paid service functionaries. Therefore, it is people with such wounds who have particularly intense needs for freely-given, unpaid, committed one-to-one relationships.

9) For many needs of the lowly, it is not sufficient for another person to step in on a one-time basis to address the need, and then step out of the person's life again. Rather, there is often a need for an ongoing, perhaps life-long relationship commitment by the helper to the afflicted person. Indeed, we must assume that for many people, continuity in a relationship freely given to them is of vast - even decisive importance.

A corollary of this point, and of No.3, is that one cannot (as some people have done) look to Citizen Advocacy as merely a fix to a problem from which one can then walk away. While this may be possible in some instances, there are also people who will need vast amounts of help until the day they die, and one should work toward Citizen Advocacy relationships with them in which the

advocate will remain faithfully attached to the protégé at least for as long as needed. I say "at least" in the sense that in ordinary life, one does not necessarily cut oneself off from all people who do not- or no longer- need one. Hopefully, many persons needed in a certain advocacy role for a certain length of time would even if the advocacy need vanished - continue their involvement with their former protégé in a different kind of role, perhaps as old friends.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, this is not to deny the importance and the benefits of what in the Citizen Advocacy scheme is called "crisis advocacy" and "crisis advocates." However, the Citizen Advocacy scheme as a whole rests on the assumption that one-time problem-solving is insufficient many ways to address the needs of many impaired and otherwise vulnerable people.

10. The kind of commitment that can be so crucial in so many cases requires that the helper set aside all sorts of his or her self-interests that might get in the way of the commitment. So at least in respect to what needs to be pursued, the helper's conflicts of interest should be as low as possible; such interests as remain should be of a nature that create the least possible conflict with the interests of the person helped. In at least some cases, this means that a helper has no significant conflicts of interests to start with; in other cases, it could mean that the helper surrenders certain interests that could become sources of conflict.

11. For any conceivable kind of help that might be needed by an individual, there is someone willing to respond. However, by this statement we are not implying that all needs actually will be met by human helpers, only that there is no such thing as a need that no one would ever be willing to address.

12. While not everybody who is willing to be a citizen advocate has the prerequisite competencies, there will always be people who do, and who will respond to the challenge to become citizen advocates.

Both number 11 and 12 are now almost self-evidently true, and yet it was these assumptions that were rejected by so many people when Citizen Advocacy was first proposed in the late 1960s. Even parents of handicapped children often rejected Citizen Advocacy on the grounds that no one but they themselves would ever want to relate to a child who was as badly off as they thought their child was.

13. While there will always be people willing to engage themselves with the lowly and needy, many more people would do so if they were personally (i.e. directly) challenged to do so.

14. More people will engage themselves if they are challenged to do so by people who are comfortable and confident in their role as challengers, and confident that there are people ready to respond to the challenge.

15. More people will respond to a challenge if they are offered the kind of engagement that appeals to them, and for which they are suited.

16. More people will respond to a challenge if they are confident that they will receive support in their engagement when they need it.

17. Relatedly, people are much more likely to endure in a challenging helping role if they are reinforced in it, and if they receive support when they need it. Several of the above assumptions form the rationale for the existence of a staffed Citizen Advocacy office.

18. There will be people who can be called forth into voluntary engagements with the lowly or needy even though they will not be compensated for it, even though their life is apt to be made harder in certain ways for it, and even though they have no prior obligation to the person in need.

19. There will also always be people who, though they are not entering Citizen Advocacy roles themselves, will support Citizen Advocacy in other ways.

20. Citizen Advocacy - even more than most other kinds of advocacy-will be marginalized or even under attack. All over the world, the experience has been that Citizen Advocacy offices are tenuous in their existence and because of pressures to be something else in their orthodoxy. All of this is explained in more detail in a monograph under preparation, entitled Safeguarding the Identity, Quality and Viability of Citizen Advocacy Enterprises: Volume II of a Series (Wolfensberger, in preparation.)

21. Despite the great difficulties that have always beset Citizen Advocacy, and despite the rise of modernistic values and the increasing decadence of modernistic societies that make the operation of Citizen Advocacy programs increasingly difficult, it is still possible to initiate and operate such programs, and to do so with most gratifying results.

22. Finally, we make the assumption that societies will be better societies if their individual members voluntarily take care of each other in a direct, personal, concrete way, in contrast to either not taking care of the needy at all, or mostly doing it impersonally, indirectly, distantly, involuntarily, or on a paid basis. Of course, this assumption would point to many different measures, of which Citizen Advocacy would only be one. However, improvement or building of community must be clearly seen as a benefit of Citizen Advocacy, rather than as a primary rationale for its existence. Helping individuals in need on a one-to-one (or near one-to-one) basis is the primary rationale of Citizen Advocacy, which should never be made subservient to community-building efforts. There are myriads of other ways to build community, but few alternatives to Citizen Advocacy.

Later (in the workshop) when we explain Citizen Advocacy itself, you will see how all these assumptions play themselves out in it.

One should note that many of the points stated as assumptions could actually be reworked as conclusions drawn on the basis of strong empirical evidence.

In other contexts, we review some of these facts and assumptions in vastly more detail. Indeed, we have days of workshop material on these. Nor do the facts and assumptions that we have briefly reviewed here explain Citizen Advocacy; they merely provide a significant proportion of its conceptual background.

People already in Citizen Advocacy, or thinking of promoting it, really need to think deeply about the facts and assumptions that we have presented, and ask themselves whether they believe them whole-heartedly- and if not, why not. After all, an indifferent attitude toward any of these points, or even an outright rejection of any, is apt to result in the rejection of any number of the important, or even essential, elements of Citizen Advocacy, or of the disciplines of its implementation. It is therefore very important that people who want to "do Citizen Advocacy" or support it bring out to full consciousness, and openly debate, any concern with the posited facts and assumptions.

As I was finalizing this paper, it occurred to me that so many "perversions" of Citizen Advocacy derive from actions of Citizen Advocacy staff (and sometimes board members) that reveal that they do not hold one or several of the above assumptions. For instance, if one does not really believe that people will help each other without compensation, then one is apt to offer advocates some kind of compensation, or even switch to some form of paid advocacy altogether. Similarly, if one doesn't not believe that advocates will stick with an advocacy engagement over time, then one is apt to recruit people only to solve current problems but not to make a commitment to protégé, or one may fail to interpret to advocates the ongoing needs of their protege. If one does not believe that people will undertake difficult and challenging advocacy tasks, then one is apt to recruit advocates only for those proteges who are easy to identify with and relate to, or whose problems are relatively minor. And so on.

Accordingly, it also occurred to me that a review of the above assumptions might be (a) a good way to screen candidates for Citizen Advocacy office positions, especially those positions most responsible for recruiting, matching, and supporting advocates; (b) a good medium for teaching Citizen Advocacy to staff and board members of Citizen Advocacy offices; and (c) a useful component of the evaluation of Citizen Advocacy programs.