

# Report

Report to:	<b>Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>21 February 2022</b>
Report by:	<b>Chair of Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Implementation Steering Group</b>

Subject:	<b>Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Risk Assessment and Validation of Promoting Positive Behaviour (PPB) Physical Interventions</b>
----------	--

## 1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ update the Joint Committee on the analysis and risk assessment of the existing PPB physical interventions carried out by Robert Gordon University (RGU)
- ◆ inform the Joint Committee of the introduction of a new physical intervention to be added to the suite of moves
- ◆ inform the Joint Committee of the appraisal of risk associated with this new physical intervention as carried out by RGU

## 2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Joint Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that it be noted that a thorough and robust quality assurance and risk assessment process has been carried out to ensure that risks associated with PPB physical interventions are mitigated as far as possible;
- (2) that the outcomes of the analysis undertaken by RGU in relation to the use of PPB physical interventions be noted; and
- (3) that it be noted that the analysis, feedback and recommendations on risks associated with the new physical intervention will be carried forward and introduced to the core PPB training programme.

## 3. Background

- 3.1. Although they only constitute one aspect of the PPB programme's content, the physical interventions carry the highest degree of risk. It is therefore essential that this risk is managed on an ongoing basis.
- 3.2. An initial risk assessment of the physical interventions was carried out by Robert Gordon University (RGU) in 2013 before the launch of the programme. It was recognised that this process should be repeated regularly to ensure that both trainers and practitioners continue to address the risks associated with each move.
- 3.3. A second analysis was completed by RGU in June 2018 with the resultant feedback report indicating no new risks to trainers, practitioners or service users.

- 3.4. It was agreed by the Social Care Group that this process should be carried out on a bi-annual basis from now on to maintain the currency of the analysis and quality assurance. This proposal was approved by the PPB Strategic Governance Group.
- 3.5. A third review was scheduled for 2020, however, due to the impact of the Covid pandemic this process was postponed indefinitely. The re-scheduled assessment took place on 18 November 2021.

#### **4. Assessment of a New Physical Intervention**

- 4.1. Although the PPB programme has contributed significantly to ensuring safe environments can be maintained in care settings for both practitioners and service users, it is an occupational reality that violent incidents may still occur from time to time.
- 4.2. It is for this reason that the PPB suite of physical interventions are constantly under review to ensure that they are fit for purpose and provide all parties with the tools to manage these challenging situations should they arise.
- 4.3. Following a significant violent incident in a children's house located in one of the Clyde Valley Councils, investigations took place into the circumstances and practices in place at the time. One of these investigations was carried out by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).
- 4.4. No criticism was apportioned to the content or practice of the PPB programme; however, the specific circumstances of the incident gave rise to a recommendation from the HSE that an additional physical intervention should be developed and introduced into the programme.
- 4.5. The specific recommendation was that a three-person safe hold should be developed. The PPB Strategic Governance Group approved this recommendation and following a period of research, a new intervention was developed by the Principal Trainers Group. The new intervention is known as "Two-person prone safehold with assistance".
- 4.6. As a matter of priority this new intervention was specifically included within the scope of the November 2021 RGU analysis and risk assessment. Feedback from this process will now be included in the training materials for future PPB programmes.

#### **5. Feedback Report from RGU**

- 5.1. The aim of this study was to perform biomechanical analysis and risk assessment of certain intervention techniques from the perspective of both the trainer and the individual service user.
- 5.2. Biomechanical data was collected in the Robert Gordon University Human Performance Laboratory, with subsequent analysis carried out by professional staff from the physiotherapy department in the School of Health Sciences and led by one of the department's biomechanical engineers. The team has appropriate expertise in professional assessment of risk together with biomechanics and physiology (relevant to child and adult anatomy).
- 5.3. At the time of writing only a draft report has been produced by RGU, however, analysis has taken place of all foreseeable risks associated with the techniques and feedback provided on the full range of physical interventions in the context of both Adult Care and Child Care.

5.4. The analysis concluded that of the 28 physical interventions in scope all but two were categorised as low or moderate risk to trainers and service users. Practice was still being delivered consistently and with good attention to detail as per previous RGU assessments.

5.5. Where the risks were categorised as anything other than low, specific advice was provided to mitigate the risks. These instructions will be incorporated into the training materials for further emphasis to practitioners to be able to mitigate any residual risks.

## **6. Feedback on Two Person Prone Safe Hold with Assistance (Three Person Hold)**

6.1. The nature of this safe hold carries an element of risk since it is to be used in the context of Child Care. However, the feedback provided from the analysis considers the intervention to be low risk to trainers and practitioners and low to moderate for service users. A detailed description of technique to be applied provides mitigation against the residual risk present.

6.2. On the basis of this analysis, a recommendation will be made to the PPB Strategic Governance Group that the Two Person Safe Hold with Assistance be integrated into the suite of physical interventions as a supplementary safe hold.

6.3. It should be noted that as a supplementary intervention, Member Councils using the PPB model are not obligated to use this new move. Adoption of this move is therefore discretionary and will be subject to a local governance decision in each Council.

## **6. Employee Implications**

6.1. Feedback from the report will be introduced into the PPB training materials as appropriate along with instruction on the new intervention. All employees attending both core and refresher training will benefit from the professional advice provided by the independent analysis of risk.

## **7. Financial Implications**

7.1. The cost of the external biomechanical assessment and risk assessment was agreed in advance and approved by the Social Care Group at their meeting on 3 November 2021. The charge for the laboratory analysis and feedback report is £1,250.

## **8. Climate Change, Sustainability and Environmental Implications**

8.1. There are no climate change, sustainability, or environmental implications within this report.

## **9. Other Implications**

9.1. The risks associated with the ongoing delivery and application of the PPB programme are mitigated by the quality assurance measures and technical instructions contained within the RGU report.

## **10. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements**

10.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore no impact assessment is required.

10.2. All Member Councils who co-own the Programme were consulted on the requirement to undertake a third-party risk assessment to be conducted by RGU, and also approved the introduction of an additional physical intervention.

**Gill Bhatti**  
**Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group**

24 January 2022

**Previous References**

- ◆ 10 December 2018 - Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Update on Social Care Group Projects

**List of Background Papers**

- ◆ Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee Minute of Agreement

**Contact for Further Information**

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Gill Bhatti, Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Implementation Steering Group

Ext: 5604 (Tel: 01698 455604)

E-mail: [gill.bhatti@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:gill.bhatti@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)