

# Briefing for MPs on the Independent Safeguarding Authority

## 1. Introduction

We are a group of Trade Unions and Professional Organisations who collectively represent **several million members** who will be affected by the proposed introduction of the new Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA).

All our organisations support the principle of safe and effective public protection and we welcome steps being taken by the Government to improve safeguarding and to protect children and vulnerable adults.

Our organisations share three main concerns surrounding the approach and implementation of the ISA scheme which are set out in this briefing. These are:

- The cost of ISA
- Duplication of registration
- A right to a fair hearing

It is vital that these issues are addressed before the implementation of the ISA scheme, to ensure that the most appropriate, fair, and workable system is put in place to protect the public.

In addition, given the severe delays that were encountered when the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) scheme was first introduced, we are concerned that similar delays will occur when ISA registration is introduced. This could lead to delays in applicants having their jobs confirmed and being able to commence work, as it will be dependant on a CRB & ISA check

**We are calling on Members of Parliament to raise these concerns with the relevant Ministers in the Home Office, the Department of Health, and the Department for Children, Schools and Families, all of whom will have a role in taking forward the implementation of the scheme.**

**In particular, we are calling for the Government to ensure the following:**

- **To make it mandatory for employers to pay for the registration fee for the scheme rather than it being borne by the applicant.**
- **That the ISA process does not duplicate registration and costs for those already on a relevant professional register.**
- **That everyone has the right to a fair hearing, appeal, and is provided with specific details about any charges.**

## 2. What is the Independent Safeguarding Authority?

The ISA was established in January 2008 after being created by the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006. It is a non departmental public body that was created following the recommendations of the Bichard Inquiry into the Soham murders.

Everyone working or volunteering with vulnerable adults or children will be required to register with ISA. These changes will therefore have an impact on over **11 million people** in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. A separate but aligned scheme is being set up in Scotland under the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007.

The scheme will replace existing lists such as the Protection of Vulnerable Adults (POVA) list, the Protection of Children Act (POCA) list and List 99 (a list of people considered unsuitable for work with children, held by the Department for Children, Schools and Families) and its remit will be expanded to include previously unregulated employment categories.

Current schemes only list those individuals who are barred from employment. In contrast, the new ISA scheme will be a positive list in that everyone working or volunteering in the relevant areas will have to be on the ISA register to gain employment and work. Applicants who are found to be unsuitable will be placed on an ISA barred list.

From **July 2010**, new entrants to the workforce and those moving jobs will be required to join the scheme before starting that role. Members of the existing workforce will be phased into the scheme over a five year period.

### **3. Cost**

Individuals in paid employment will be required to pay **£64** in England and Wales, and we are led to believe they will pay **£100** in Scotland and **£58** in Northern Ireland, when applying for registration with the ISA scheme. We are concerned that these figures are significantly higher than the original estimated costs of £20 which were predicted in the government's public consultation document

Under existing arrangements, it is the responsibility of the employer to undertake criminal record checks and ensure an individual is professionally registered, where appropriate. It is usually included in the employer's recruitment processes and costs. However, the ISA proposals will alter this and move the cost on to the prospective individual employee.

We have particular concerns that the registration fee proposed for ISA will have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on the low-paid and part-time workers, most of whom are women; a school cleaner or a healthcare assistant will be expected to pay the same amount as a head teacher or chief executive. We believe that the ISA fee is likely to impact on the recruitment. It could also influence whether or not an individual chooses to work in public services if working in schools and hospitals costs more than working in other organisations. We have seen no evidence that this has been considered by the architects of ISA, nor seen their equality impact assessment.

We are concerned about the impact this could have on the support and services provided to vulnerable groups, if people choose not to apply. It is vital that the system that is put in place does not have a negative impact on public sector service delivery.

We welcome the fact that volunteers do not have to pay to register with ISA. However the cost has been developed based on 11 million people, in effect those on a salary are funding the registration costs of volunteers. Those who register as volunteers will be required to pay the registration fee if they subsequently take up paid employment where ISA registration is required. This could deter individuals from taking up paid employment. Our view is that there should be no retrospective obligation to pay the registration fee.

ISA has stated that this is a one-off registration fee. They also anticipate savings, for example as a result of the fact that on-going CRB checks will not be necessary. There is therefore no reason why the state or employers should not pay for an individual's registration fee.

**We are calling on the Government to make it mandatory for employers to pay for the registration fee for the scheme rather than it being borne by the applicant**

#### **4. Duplication of registration**

Many individuals who will be subject to the new ISA scheme are already included on a professional register and pay an annual fee. The new ISA scheme will duplicate the existing regulation of public protection for almost **4 million public sector workers**.

We believe that individuals who are already on a professional register should not also have to register with ISA.

Currently there are no arrangements in place for co-operation between the existing professional regulators and the ISA scheme. The Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence the overarching regulator for health professions, shares many of our concerns regarding the operation of ISA. We believe that those individuals registered with an existing professional regulator should not in addition be subject to ISA. We believe that this duplication over complicates matters and could have a detrimental effect on public protection.

It is possible to establish a system of co-operation with existing regulatory bodies which would enable ISA to continue to fulfill its statutory function but recognise the existing structures for public protection. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this and our ideas with government.

Removing this duplication would also bring the overall cost of the scheme down and ensure a more proportionate approach which would be in the best interest of public protection.

**We are calling on the Government to ensure that the ISA process does not duplicate existing registration and costs for those already on a**

#### **5. The process and right to a fair hearing**

Our organisations have significant concerns that there are currently no public standards for how the ISA will make judgements on when an individual should be placed on the barred list (those prevented from working with vulnerable individuals). From what we know of the process so far, we believe it to be unfair and in breach of the Human Rights Act. This is because it will be a paper exercise and an individual's only opportunity to defend themselves and cross examine the evidence will be in a submitted statement. Unsubstantiated allegations could lead to someone having their livelihood taken from them. There is a risk that this process could lead to unnecessary and costly legal challenges.

Every other regulator hears cases in public (excluding ill health cases). ISA will not operate in a similar manner and seems at odds with other government requirements which seek patient and public engagement, openness, transparency and adherence to Human Rights legislation.

Whilst we respect the principle that members of the public should be able to refer their concerns to the ISA or another agency, it's important that they have also made their concerns known locally for example with an employer or social services. So that these organisations can conduct their own investigation and try to resolve any concerns. Whilst ISA has a role to play it cannot become burdened with inappropriate or malicious complaints which prevent them from undertaking their statutory function. We believe that clear guidance should be produced to explain fully what should and should not be referred to ISA.

We agree that those individuals who pose a risk to vulnerable groups should be prevented from working in these environments. However, it is vital that everyone has the right to a fair hearing, and that any new systems or processes comply with existing best practice and with all legislation, including the Human Rights Act.

**We are calling on the Government to ensure that everyone has the right to a fair hearing, appeal, and is provided with specific details about any**

## **6. Conclusion**

Our organisations are committed to public protection; every day our members care for the most vulnerable in society and are committed to public services. We hope that you will support us in ensuring this untested scheme does not have an unforeseen detrimental impact on staff or on public safety. We are committed to working with Government to deliver effective public protection. However we believe ISA in its current form will not achieve this; it will be burdened down in case work, as the system is based on the false belief that everyone is a risk.

As organisations representing those who will be most affected by the introduction of the ISA scheme, we are calling on MPs to:

- Write to the Home Office, Department of Health and the Department for Children, Schools and Families to raise these concerns.
- Raise this issue in Parliament with the relevant Ministers. We would be happy to provide suggestions of possible Parliamentary Questions, and to provide any supplementary information for debates and questions in the Houses of Parliament.
- Support our joint principles which are detailed in annex 2
- Sign EDM 1875 on the Independent Safeguarding Authority.

## **INDEPENDENT SAFEGUARDING AUTHORITY**

Hopkins, Kelvin

That this House supports the steps being taken by the Government to protect children and vulnerable adults; notes the establishment of the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA); expresses its concern that the registration fee for the ISA will have a disproportionate impact on low-paid, female, and part-time workers; believes it is vital in the current economic climate that these groups are not financially penalised; further believes that employers should pay the registration fee for the scheme rather than it being

borne by the applicant; and calls on the Government to ensure that the ISA process does not duplicate registration and costs for those already on a relevant professional register.

**For further information, or to arrange for a meeting to discuss this issue, please contact:**

Gail Adams  
Head of Nursing, UNISON  
Tel: 0207 551 1317  
E-mail: [gail.adams@unison.co.uk](mailto:gail.adams@unison.co.uk)

#### **Annex 1**

**Full list of the TUC coalition on Independent Safeguarding Authority – this list needs amending when we attach the principles don't use the logos as we have more organisations signed up now than are on the principles**

Association of Managers in Education  
Association of Teachers and Lecturers  
Chartered Society of Physiotherapists  
FBU  
GMB  
Royal College of Midwives  
Royal College of Nursing  
Society of Radiographers  
Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists  
National Union of Teachers  
NASUWT  
TUC  
UNISON  
Unite