



PA CHECKLIST – A Tool for Assessing Personal Assistance Schemes

Authors: Teodor Mladenov, Yvo Pokern and Ines Bulic Cojocariu

Design and layout: Marieta Vasileva

© European Network on Independent Living (ENIL), February 2019

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to thank the experts who participated in the assessment for the time and energy they have dedicated to sharing their expertise on personal assistance. We would also like to thank Zara Todd for her suggestions on 'easy read' and accessibility.

Funding statement

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 747027. This document reflects only the authors' view. The Research Executive Agency of the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.



European Union

If you would like to receive this document in Word, please contact secretariat@enil.eu.
An easy read summary of the findings is included in the report.

Table of Contents

About the authors	2
Easy read summary	3
Introduction	6
Development of the PA Checklist – a process of co-production.....	8
Preliminary reflections on the results and limitations of the PA Checklist.....	10
PA Checklist – raw data.....	12
APPENDIX: Personal Assistance Checklist	32

List of tables

Table 1: PA Checklist – summary	7
Table 2: PA Checklist – results	13
Table 3: PA Checklist – comments	27

About the authors

Dr Teodor Mladenov is currently Marie Curie Individual Fellow at ENIL and was formerly Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the Centre for Public Policy Research, King's College London. Teodor is author of *Critical Theory and Disability: A Phenomenological Approach* (2015, Bloomsbury) and *Disability and Postsocialism* (2018, Routledge). In the period 2000-2009, Teodor was involved in disabled people's advocacy for independent living and social justice in Bulgaria. Email: teodor.mladenov@enil.eu.

Dr Yvo Pokern is currently associate professor at the Department of Statistical Science, University College London. His research is on computational and methodological Bayesian statistics but he has also supervised a large number of small applied research projects in a diverse range of areas of statistical science.

Ms Ines Bulic Cojocariu is the Deputy Director at the European Network on Independent Living (ENIL). Since 2005, when she was appointed the Coordinator of the European Coalition for Community Living (ECCL), her work has focused on the right to independent living, deinstitutionalisation and the use of EU funds. She has written or contributed to a number of publications, policy papers and manuals on these topics. E-mail: ines.bulic@enil.eu.

Easy read summary

This report is about personal assistance.



Personal assistance: this is support provided to disabled people by specially trained workers.

Personal assistance helps disabled people to live according to their wishes.

This means that personal assistance helps disabled people to eat, get out of bed, take a shower, go to work, or go to a concert as they wish.

This report is written by 3 people: Teodor Mladenov, Yvo Pokern and Ines Bulic.

This report is published by the European Network on Independent Living.



European Network on Independent Living: this is an organisation of disabled people. It is also briefly called ENIL.

ENIL argues that disabled people should be able to make all decisions about their lives.

ENIL also argues that disabled people should be given personal assistance if they need it.

Personal assistance is organised differently in different countries.

The people who wrote this report created a way to study these differences called Personal Assistance Checklist.



Personal Assistance Checklist: this is a way to check how personal assistance helps disabled people to live according to their wishes.

The Personal Assistance Checklist was created with the help of disabled people who use personal assistance.

The Personal Assistance Checklist was used to describe how personal assistance works in 8 different countries in Europe.

These countries are: Belgium, Bulgaria, Ireland, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

The results show that in Sweden, people who use personal assistance can make most decisions about their lives.

The results also show that in Bulgaria, people who use personal assistance can make very few decisions about their lives.

The results also show that in many countries, people are getting less personal assistance because of cuts.



Cuts to personal assistance: this means that governments give less money for personal assistance.

Cuts leave disabled people without support and force them to live in residential institutions or to ask family members to help them.

The people who wrote this report are asking disability activists and politicians to complain about cuts to personal assistance.

In the future, ENIL will use the Personal Assistance Checklist to describe and compare personal assistance in more countries.

We will send this information to governments, so they can improve the situation for disabled people.

Introduction

In November and December 2018, the European Network on Independent Living (ENIL) piloted the PA Checklist – a new tool designed for assessing personal assistance (PA) schemes from the perspective of independent living. The checklist was created by ENIL to help advocates around the world to fight for better PA and to monitor the implementation of Article 19 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

The tool has several distinctive features:

- it was co-produced with PA users and independent living advocates;
- it measures the degree to which PA schemes support independent living;
- it enables international comparisons.

Independent living experts and PA users from eight European countries responded to the invitation to apply the checklist to PA schemes they use and/or know well. Based on these assessments and an earlier survey conducted by ENIL, each PA scheme achieved an overall mean score, indicating the degree to which the scheme enables or hinders users' choice and control. A scale from +3 to -3 was used, where +3 means that the scheme enables choice and control to maximum extent, whereas -3 means maximum hindrance of choice and control. In addition to the overall score, mean scores were calculated for five different dimensions of PA. Table 1 presents the results at a glance.

Table 1: PA Checklist – summary

Country, region	PA scheme (in local language in brackets)	Coverage ¹	Overall mean score	Mean score by dimension				
				Context	Funding	Needs assessment	Provision	Working conditions
Belgium, Flanders	Personal Following Budget (PVB Persoonvolgende budget)	regional	0.30	-0.23	1.05	0.89	-0.94	0.73
Bulgaria, Sofia ²	Assistant for Independent Living (Асистент за независим живот)	local	-0.71 / -0.91	-0.69 / -1.30	-1.87 / -1.87	0.23 / 0.20	-0.05 / -0.24	-1.19 / -1.33
Ireland	Health Service Executive Scheme	national	-0.61	-1.60	0.06	-1.32	-0.18	-0.03
Serbia	Personal Assistance Service (Usluga personalne asistencije)	national	1.13	1.98	-1.14	1.41	1.43	1.97
Slovenia	Independent Living (Neodvisno življenje)	national	1.03	0.88	-1.14	1.73	2.05	1.64
Spain, Andalucía	Pilot Project of Independent Living (Proyecto piloto Vida Independiente)	regional	0.03	0.76	-1.87	0.52	0.98	-0.23
Sweden	Personal Assistance Direct Payment (Assistansersättning)	national	1.34	0.64	1.87	0.18	2.08	1.96
United Kingdom ³	Direct Payment – Personal Budget	national (local funding)	-0.42	-1.33	-0.43	-0.43	-0.02	0.10

Notes

- 1 All of the PA schemes included in the sample are publicly funded, although levels (national, regional, local) and forms of funding vary (i.e., they can be annual, project-based, social insurance based, requiring users' contributions, including charity contributions).
- 2 Two assessments were completed in Bulgaria by two experts who assessed the same PA scheme independently of each other. Therefore, the corresponding cells of the table contain two values for mean score each.
- 3 The UK assessment concerns the national policy of providing 'direct payments' for PA as a whole, rather than any particular version of the policy implemented by a particular local authority.

Development of the PA Checklist – a process of co-production

The PA Checklist was developed as part of the project ‘User-Led Personal Assistance in the European Union: A Critical Comparative Analysis’, led by Dr Teodor Mladenov, Marie Curie Individual Fellow at ENIL, and supervised by Ines Bulic Cojocariu, ENIL’s Deputy Director. Support with quantitative methods has been provided by Dr Yvo Pokern, Associate Professor in Statistics at University College London.

The PA Checklist consists of 61 statements describing typical characteristics of PA which either enable or hinder the choice and control of PA users in their everyday lives. These characteristics were selected on the basis of a survey conducted among ENIL’s members and subscribers of ENIL’s newsletter during the initial stage of the research, in the period January – March 2018. The survey asked the participants to assign scores to a longer list of 138 characteristics of PA, formulated by the project leader based on literature review and consultations with colleagues at ENIL.

The 138 characteristics were grouped into five categories which emerged in the process of formulating the statements as five major dimensions of a typical PA scheme: ‘context’, ‘funding’, ‘needs assessment’, ‘provision’ and ‘working conditions’ of the assistants. To assess each characteristic, the participants used the scale from +3 (maximum enabling) to -3 (maximum hindrance), presented above. The survey and its outcomes are described in more detail in a March 2018 issue of ENIL’s newsletter available here: <http://enil.eu/news/what-is-good-personal-assistance-made-of-first-look-at-the-answers/>.

Of the original 138 characteristics, only those 61 characteristics which achieved a mean score in the survey larger than +0.8 or smaller than -0.8 on the enabling/hindrance scale of -3 to +3 at the 95% confidence level were retained. Allowance was made for multiple confidence intervals using the Bonferroni correction. The mean score being particularly large or particularly small in the original survey was felt to indicate that the participants in the survey considered the characteristic in question as an important enabler or disabler, hence its inclusion in the PA Checklist. The threshold of 0.8 was chosen by balancing considerations of content and practicability – the checklist had to be comprehensive enough to cover important characteristics in all major dimensions of PA, while also being short enough and therefore easier to apply and less time consuming.

The PA Checklist was piloted in the period November – December 2018. A total of 17 independent living experts and PA users from 11 European countries were purposively selected based on their expertise in PA. They were invited to apply the checklist to PA schemes

they use and/or know well. The target countries for the pilot were chosen by considering the availability of PA and whether there were independent living activists on the ground, drawing on ENIL's previous studies and existing contacts. The countries included in the pilot were: Belgium (including Flanders and Wallonia), Bulgaria, Croatia, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Ten completed checklists were returned and one was later withdrawn by the expert because an assessment done by another expert from the same country was judged by the first expert to be more informative. All of the independent living experts who responded are also users of the schemes they assessed, with the exception of one of the two Bulgarian experts. The assessment of the Slovenian scheme has been completed by a team of experts which included PA users. All of the assessors are members of ENIL. The full (anonymised) results in the form of 'raw data' are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, at the end of this report. The PA Checklist is also included, as an appendix, following the two tables with the raw data.

Preliminary reflections on the results and limitations of the PA Checklist

Let us begin with limitations. In their comments, one of the assessors criticised the PA Checklist for using language and format which may not be accessible for some people: ‘there was no consideration for this material being “easy to read”. Far simpler language could have been used to ask the same questions’ (see Table 3). We recognise these concerns and we have taken this critique on board in the present report by including an ‘easy read’ summary and by utilising a more accessible format. Depending on available resources, we intend to translate the checklist into different languages, acknowledging that English language is itself a communication barrier for many people.

It would also be possible to simplify the wording of the PA Checklist, although this would compromise the process of co-production which underpinned the development of the tool. As already pointed out, the characteristics of PA included in the checklist were selected on the basis of a survey conducted among ENIL’s members and subscribers of ENIL’s newsletter. If we changed the wording of these characteristics, this would mean that the participants in the original survey voted for different items. Nevertheless, it would be possible to derive a simplified checklist from the original one through a consultative process which would reassert the principles of co-production, albeit in a new way.

Another limitation is the unavoidable element of subjectivity in the application of the PA Checklist. Differences in opinion, experience and criticality among assessors may lead to divergences in assessments. This is apparent in the Bulgarian case, even though the inter-assessor difference is small compared to the differences observed between different PA schemes. The latter also suggests that one way to test the validity of the PA Checklist is by approaching pools of assessors with requests to apply the checklist to a single scheme. Resultant scores could then be investigated to assess inter-assessor agreement on the scheme, which could further be used to make confidence statements about the ranking of the schemes.

Subjective bias means that the scores (both overall and in different dimensions) achieved by the PA schemes which have been assessed by using the checklist should be used as rough approximations rather than as exact measures. Nevertheless, they highlight current issues and suggest possible policy interventions in each individual case and across schemes, at national and international levels. Such interventions could help make PA less restrictive and more conducive to disabled people’s independent living.

For example, the Swedish national PA scheme achieved the highest overall mean score (1.34) of all schemes included in the sample, which corresponds to its reputation as an international standard for user-led PA. However, the relatively low score (0.18) achieved by the Swedish scheme in the dimension of ‘needs assessment’ reflects the impact of recent auster-

ity measures which have restricted the access to PA in Sweden by tightening eligibility criteria and redefining 'basic needs' (see: <https://enil.eu/news/independent-living-under-threat-in-europe-sweden/>). In their comments, the Swedish expert has pointed out that '80% of new applications [for PA under the scheme in Sweden] are currently turned down' (see Table 3).

At the other end of the spectrum, the Bulgarian PA scheme achieved the lowest overall mean scores in the sample (-0.71 and -0.91 respectively in its two assessments). The specific concerns shared by the two Bulgarian independent living experts are that 'the rate of payment (less than €2 per hour) does not allow the users to hire assistants on the labour market', and that '[i]n 95 % of the cases parents or relatives of people with disabilities become their PA which prevents them to have free choice and to live independently' (see Table 3). Accordingly, the Bulgarian scheme is the only one in the sample for which the statement '10. The scheme "frees" family members from "caring" obligations, enabling them to undertake other activities' has been assessed as 'false' (see Table 2). Another issue highlighted by both experts in their checklist answers and in their comments, is that the Bulgarian scheme does not provide any training or peer support for PA users and their assistants.

Such an analysis highlights the need to (a) liberalise the needs assessment in the Swedish case and make it more user-centred (or restore its user-centredness), and (b) increase the hourly rate and introduce user-led trainings and peer support in the Bulgarian case. Policy interventions like these, identified by considering the results from the application of the PA Checklist, could improve PA delivery to better support independent living.

In all the assessments, the statement '5. The scheme is subjected to cuts (e.g., eligibility is tightened, 'assistance hours' are reduced, conditionality is introduced, etc.)' has been identified as 'true', except for the Serbian assessment which has remained indeterminate by choosing 'neither' (see Table 2). Deterioration of PA 'by incorporating measures that restrict the choice and control of the users' has also been identified as 'true' for six of the eight schemes (see statement 6. in Table 2). These results reflect a widespread, pan-European concern of assistance users and independent living advocates. Cuts to PA have been part of austerity measures which have intensified in the aftermath of 2007/2008 financial crisis. Austerity has become a major barrier to independent living, forcing disabled people out of community life and work, and confining them to their homes or to residential institutions for social care. The results from the PA Checklist pilot confirm that reversing the cuts to PA is an urgent policy priority at the European level.

The results from this pilot would benefit from a more in-depth analysis. In addition, depending on available resource, more experts could be contacted from the countries which were included in the pilot to get more accurate assessments of the schemes. In a longer-term perspective, ENIL may revise the tool and/or apply it more widely by translating it into different languages and including other countries, eventually covering PA schemes throughout Europe and beyond. Both the PA Checklist and the preceding survey which helped to co-produce it were pilot studies which would benefit from being refined and then replicated at a larger scale, with improved response rate, randomization and accessibility.

PA Checklist – raw data

Table 2 and Table 3 below present the raw data from the pilot application of the PA Checklist. Table 2 contains the answers to the individual items of the checklist and Table 3 contains the anonymised but otherwise unedited comments made by the experts on different items and the checklist as a whole.

The first column of Table 2 contains the 61 characteristics of PA included in the checklist, grouped into the five dimensions of PA. The second column includes the mean scores achieved by each characteristic in the earlier survey (<http://enil.eu/news/what-is-good-personal-assistance-made-of-first-look-at-the-answers/>). The following nine columns contain expert assessments of eight PA schemes from eight countries: Belgium (Flanders), Bulgaria (assessed twice by two independent experts), Ireland, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The expert assessments in Table 2 are represented in the following way: 'T' indicates that the respective characteristic is assessed as 'true' when applied to the PA scheme under assessment, 'F' indicates that the characteristic is assessed as 'false', and 'N' means 'neither' true nor false and indicates that the characteristic is assessed as inapplicable, that its description is incomprehensible, or that the expert does not have enough information to provide a definitive answer. Lack of answer is denoted with 'N/A', i.e., 'not available'. Scores for each characteristic are calculated by using the values from the second column of Table 2 which contains the estimated mean enabling/hindrance score for the characteristic obtained in the earlier survey. When the characteristic is assessed as 'true' ('T'), the score from column 2 is added to the total score, while 'false' ('F') leads to it being subtracted – the resultant values are given in brackets beneath the letter indicating the assessment. 'Neither' ('N') marks the characteristic as inapplicable and its mean score is not counted when means are calculated for each of the five dimensions and overall. The same applies to 'not available' ('N/A').

Table 2: PA Checklist – results

Characteristics of PA	Mean score	Scheme 1 Belgium	Scheme 2/1 Bulgaria	Scheme 2/2 Bulgaria	Scheme 3 Ireland	Scheme 4 Serbia	Scheme 5 Slovenia	Scheme 6 Spain	Scheme 7 Sweden	Scheme 8 UK
Dimension 1: CONTEXT										
1. The scheme was introduced as a result of disabled people’s advocacy (‘bottom up’ origin).	2.11	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)
2. The scheme is underpinned by the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.	2.19	T (2.19)	N	F (-2.19)	F (-2.19)	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	F (-2.19)
3. The scheme is underpinned by national and/or international human rights concepts and instruments (e.g., the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).	1.89	T (1.89)	N	F (-1.89)	F (-1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	F (-1.89)
4. The provision of personal assistance under the scheme is recognised as a (human, civil, social) right.	2.17	F (-2.17)	T (2.17)	F (-2.17)	F (-2.17)	T (2.17)	T (2.17)	F (-2.17)	T (2.17)	F (-2.17)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
5. The scheme is subjected to cuts (e.g., eligibility is tightened, 'assistance hours' are reduced, conditionality is introduced, etc.).	-1.80	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)	N	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)	T (-1.80)
6. The scheme deteriorates by incorporating measures that restrict the choice and control of the users.	-2.15	T (-2.15)	T (-2.15)	T (-2.15)	T (-2.15)	F (2.15)	T (-2.15)	N	T (-2.15)	T (-2.15)
7. Policy makers and other stakeholders (e.g., the media) misunderstand, misuse or misrepresent the scheme.	-1.98	T (-1.98)	T (-1.98)	T (-1.98)	T (-1.98)	F (1.98)	N	T (-1.98)	T (-1.98)	T (-1.98)
8. The evolution of the scheme is monitored by user-led organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.	1.80	N	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)	F (-1.80)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
9. The scheme empowers users (e.g., to be assertive, to work, study, set up user-led organisations, create co-operatives, engage in advocacy, etc.).	1.93	N	F (-1.93)	F (-1.93)	F (-1.93)	T (1.93)	T (1.93)	T (1.93)	T (1.93)	F (-1.93)
10. The scheme 'frees' family members from 'caring' obligations, enabling them to undertake other activities.	1.69	N	F (-1.69)	F (-1.69)	N	T (1.69)	T (1.69)	T (1.69)	T (1.69)	T (1.69)
11. The scheme is used as an excuse for cutting expenses for 'social care'.	-2.00	T (-2.00)	F (2.00)	T (-2.00)	T (-2.00)	F (2.00)	T (-2.00)	F (2.00)	T (-2.00)	T (-2.00)
12. The scheme has a positive impact on public perceptions of disabled people.	1.85	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)	T (1.85)	T (1.85)	N	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)
Sub-score		-0.23	-0.69	-1.30	-1.60	1.98	0.88	0.76	0.64	-1.33

1	1/2	2/2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Belgium	Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Ireland	Serbia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK

Dimension 2: FUNDING

13. The scheme is funded by the state, out of the state budget (centralised funding).	1.83	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)	F (-1.83)	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)	F (-1.83)	F (-1.83)	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)
14. The scheme is available on the national level (i.e., every eligible citizen or resident of the country has access to the scheme).	2.06	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)	T (2.06)	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)	T (2.06)	F (-2.06)
15. The users of the scheme (can choose to) receive direct payments or personal budgets instead of services in kind.	1.80	T (1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)
16. The scheme covers additional employment costs such as employer's contributions, payroll work and other administrative costs.	1.81	T (1.81)	F (-1.81)	F (-1.81)	N/A	T (1.81)	T (1.81)	F (-1.81)	T (1.81)	T (1.81)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
17. The scheme covers additional costs for the assistants such as tickets for events, travel, accommodation and food.	1.85	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)	F (-1.85)	F (-1.85)	F (-1.85)	F (-1.85)	F (-1.85)	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)
Sub-score		1.05	-1.87	-1.87	0.06	-1.14	-1.14	-1.87	1.87	-0.43
Dimension 3: NEEDS ASSESSMENT										
18. The needs assessment is led by the user, possibly aided by peers.	2.06	N	T (2.06)	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)	T (2.06)	T (2.06)	T (2.06)	F (-2.06)	F (-2.06)
19. The training of the assessors includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.	1.94	F (-1.94)	F (-1.94)	F (-1.94)	F (-1.94)	T (1.94)	T (1.94)	N	N	F (-1.94)
20. The training of the assessors includes modules on relationship management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).	1.69	F (-1.69)	F (-1.69)	F (-1.69)	N/A	T (1.69)	T (1.69)	N	N	F (-1.69)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
21. The scheme is limited by a 'cost ceiling' and users whose support costs more are directed towards traditional services (e.g., residential institutions).	-2.13	F (2.13)	T (-2.13)	F (2.13)	T (-2.13)	T (-2.13)	F (2.13)	T (-2.13)	F (2.13)	T (-2.13)
22. The scheme is provided irrespective of age.	2.04	F (-2.04)	F (-2.04)	F (-2.04)	F (-2.04)	T (2.04)	F (-2.04)	T (2.04)	F (-2.04)	T (2.04)
23. The scheme is provided irrespective of individual or family income.	1.87	T (1.87)	T (1.87)	T (1.87)	F (-1.87)	T (1.87)	T (1.87)	T (1.87)	T (1.87)	F (-1.87)
24. The scheme is provided irrespective of family (including marital) situation.	2.22	T (2.22)	T (2.22)	T (2.22)	F (-2.22)	T (2.22)	T (2.22)	T (2.22)	T (2.22)	T (2.22)
25. The scheme is provided irrespective of insurance status.	2.02	T (2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)	N/A	F (-2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
26. The assessment covers the needs for assistance in all areas of life, including family, intimacy, education, employment, leisure, etc.	2.15	T (2.15)	T (2.15)	T (2.15)	F (-2.15)	T (2.15)	T (2.15)	T (2.15)	F (-2.15)	F (-2.15)
27. The assessment procedure is straightforward and transparent.	2.00	T (2.00)	F (-2.00)	F (-2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	F (-2.00)	F (-2.00)
28. The assessment is repeated upon the request of the user.	2.02	N	F (-2.02)	T (2.02)	F (-2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)	F (-2.02)	T (2.02)	T (2.02)
29. The users of the scheme have the opportunity to appeal the outcome of their assessments.	2.20	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	F (-2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)
30. The appeal procedure is straightforward, transparent and does not entail additional expenses for the user.	2.28	N	T (2.28)	F (-2.28)	F (-2.28)	T (2.28)	T (2.28)	F (-2.28)	F (-2.28)	F (-2.28)
Sub-score		0.89	0.23	0.20	-1.32	1.41	1.73	0.52	0.18	-0.43

1	1/2	2/2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Belgium	Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Ireland	Serbia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK

Dimension 4: PROVISION										
31. The users can employ and manage their personal assistants themselves.	2.13	T (-2.13)	F (-2.13)	F (-2.13)	F (-2.13)	T (2.13)	T (2.13)	F (-2.13)	T (2.13)	T (2.13)
32. The quality of provision is monitored and assessed by the users and/or users' organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.	1.85	F (-1.85)	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)	T (1.85)	T (1.85)	T (1.85)	T (1.85)	T (1.85)	F (-1.85)
33. The users can keep their assistance when moving to another region or local authority within the country.	2.22	F (-2.22)	F (-2.22)	F (-2.22)	F (-2.22)	F (-2.22)	T (2.22)	F (-2.22)	T (2.22)	F (-2.22)
34. The users can choose their personal assistants.	2.41	T (2.41)	T (2.41)	T (2.41)	F (-2.41)	T (2.41)	T (2.41)	T (2.41)	T (2.41)	T (2.41)
35. The assistants are appointed by the provider, without the involvement of the user.	-2.31	N	F (2.31)	F (2.31)	T (-2.31)	F (2.31)	F (2.31)	F (2.31)	F (2.31)	F (2.31)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
36. The users can dismiss their personal assistants.	2.19	N	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	F (-2.19)	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	T (2.19)	N	T (2.19)
37. Under the scheme, assistants work fixed hours (e.g., from 9:00 AM till 5:00 PM).	-1.83	F (1.83)	F (1.83)	F (1.83)	T (-1.83)	F (1.83)	F (1.83)	F (1.83)	N	F (1.83)
38. Under the scheme, the user determines the times when assistance will be provided, including during nights, weekends, holidays, etc.	2.20	N	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	F (-2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)	T (2.20)
39. The users of the scheme can save and transfer 'assistance hours'.	1.81	N	F (-1.81)	F (-1.81)	F (-1.81)	F (-1.81)	T (1.81)	T (1.81)	N	F (-1.81)
40. Assistance tasks are determined by the user, without restrictions.	1.98	N	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	F (-1.98)	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	N	T (1.98)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
41. Assistants are not allowed to perform tasks related to health care (even after delegation or approval by medical professionals).	-1.91	T (-1.91)	F (1.91)	F (1.91)	N/A	F (1.91)	F (1.91)	F (1.91)	F (1.91)	F (1.91)
42. Under the scheme, assistance is bound to a location (for example, it is provided only at the user's home).	-2.30	N	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)	F (2.30)
43. The users of the scheme have access to peer support, i.e., support provided by users of personal assistance.	1.98	F (-1.98)	F (-1.98)	F (-1.98)	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	T (1.98)	N	F (-1.98)
44. Peer support for the users is organised by user-led organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.	2.07	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	F (-2.07)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
45. The users have access to training on using personal assistance.	2.07	N (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	F (-2.07)	N (-2.07)	F (-2.07)
46. The training of the users is provided by other assistance users.	1.80	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	N (-1.80)	F (-1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)	T (1.80)	F (-1.80)
47. The training of the users includes modules on recruitment and management of personal assistants.	1.78	F (-1.78)	F (-1.78)	F (-1.78)	T (1.78)	T (1.78)	T (1.78)	F (-1.78)	T (1.78)	F (-1.78)
48. The training of the users includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.	2.07	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	F (-2.07)
49. The training of the users includes modules on relationships management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).	1.94	F (-1.94)	F (-1.94)	F (-1.94)	T (1.94)	T (1.94)	T (1.94)	F (-1.94)	T (1.94)	F (-1.94)
Sub-score		-0.94	-0.05	-0.24	-0.18	1.43	2.05	0.98	2.08	-0.02

1	1/2	2/2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Belgium	Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Ireland	Serbia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK

Dimension 5: WORKING CONDITIONS

50. The wages of the assistants are protected by minimum wage regulations.	2.11	T (2.11)	F (-2.11)	F (-2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)
51. The assistants are entitled to benefits such as social security and paid leave (annual, sick and parental).	2.11	T (2.11)	F (-2.11)	F (-2.11)	F (-2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)	T (2.11)
52. The assistants are protected by health and safety provisions.	2.30	T (2.30)	F (-2.30)	F (-2.30)	T (2.30)	T (2.30)	T (2.30)	T (2.30)	T (2.30)	T (2.30)
53. The assistants are protected by anti-discrimination provisions.	1.89	T (1.89)	F (-1.89)	F (-1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)	T (1.89)
54. The requirements about the qualifications of the assistants are formulated by the users (rather than by the scheme, the provider, etc.).	2.00	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	F (-2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)	T (2.00)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
55. The work of the assistants is considered valuable by the wider society.	1.93	N	N	F (-1.93)	N	T (1.93)	N	F (-1.93)	T (1.93)	F (-1.93)
56. Personal assistance is recognised as a profession by the wider society.	1.83	N	N	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)	F (-1.83)	T (1.83)	F (-1.83)
57. The assistants have access to training on providing personal assistance.	1.72	N	F (-1.72)	F (-1.72)	T (1.72)	T (1.72)	T (1.72)	F (-1.72)	T (1.72)	F (-1.72)
58. The training of the assistants is provided by assistance users.	1.98	F (-1.98)	T (1.98)	F (-1.98)	F (-1.98)	N	T (1.98)	F (-1.98)	N	T (1.98)
59. The training of the assistants includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.	2.07	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	F (-2.07)	T (2.07)	T (2.07)	F (-2.07)	N	F (-2.07)

		1 Belgium	1/2 Bulgaria	2/2 Bulgaria	3 Ireland	4 Serbia	5 Slovenia	6 Spain	7 Sweden	8 UK
60. The training of the assistants includes modules on relationships management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).	1.96	T (1.96)	F (-1.96)	F (-1.96)	N	T (1.96)	T (1.96)	F (-1.96)	N	F (-1.96)
61. The training of the assistants includes modules on health and safety.	1.72	F (-1.72)	F (-1.72)	F (-1.72)	T (1.72)	T (1.72)	T (1.72)	F (-1.72)	T (1.72)	F (-1.72)
Sub-score		0.73	-1.19	-1.33	-0.03	1.97	1.64	-0.23	1.96	0.10
Mean score (weighting all five dimensions equally)		0.30	-0.71	-0.91	-0.61	1.13	1.03	0.03	1.34	-0.42

Table 3: PA Checklist – comments

IMPORTANT! The comments in Table 3 are given as they were provided by the assessors. To preserve the integrity of the raw data, to comply with research ethics, and to ensure maximum transparency, the comments were not edited but only anonymised. Therefore, readers may encounter spelling and grammar inaccuracies, as well as unclear formulations. The meaning of the comments becomes clearer when they are juxtaposed to the statements in the respective dimension of the PA Checklist.

Scheme 1 (Belgium, Flanders) – Personal Following Budget (PVB Persoonvolgende budget)	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to lack of budgets, people are on waiting lists, there's no legal right to support, there's one for health-care. • There's also a "stand still principle", that no one can regress in care and support, except when common interest is priming..... • No direct payments to institutions anymore since 2017, people can change easier but also change voucher to cash payments, as there are no transition services this opportunity is not used .
Dimension 2: Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of cost (taxes, social secretary, patronal charges) received by users of cash payment is around 11,94% while the institutions receive 25% of the voucher-value for the costs. • There's a forfeit amount we can use for tickets and extra charges for the PA'S, 1800€/year if the budget is below 35.000€ I think and 3.600€ to spend freely if your budget is higher then 35.000€
Dimension 3: Needs assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There're a lot off buts, if you fill in your support plan yourself, your plan will be controlled on quality, while if a service does it for you, it's not controlled. • As there's a lack of budget, re-assessment can lead to increase or decrease the budget! • So few people do! And even if it's higher people stays with their demand on the waiting list.
Dimension 4: Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F people have a cash budget, they can decide whatever with their assistants • Those having Pa IN INSTITUTIONS or trough services, are limited. • New budget-holders receive a voucher for an information-session on how to prove their costs by "assistance-organisations".

Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The job is unknown. When explaining yes, positive. • There are training on PA organised by employment-offices to help low-schooled people on a job, or organised for special services like protected living, institio,s who offer PA_services etc...
---	---

Scheme 2/1 (Bulgaria, Sofia) – Assistant for Independent Living (Асистент за независим живот)	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme was developed by CIL-Sofia and dramatically distorted by the local government (administration). Initially access to the scheme was conditional upon the status of employment or study, which was ruled out by the Supreme Administrative Court last year. Legal framework does not require relatives to be assistants, still the rate of payment (less than €2 per hour) does not allow the users to hire assistants on the labour market.
Dimension 2: Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme serves as additional disability welfare allowance and extra income for the household.
Dimension 4: Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no training involved <u>at all</u>.
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no training <u>at all</u>.

Scheme 2/2 (Bulgaria, Sofia) – Assistant for Independent Living (Асистент за независим живот)	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 95 % of the cases parents or relatives of people with disabilities become their PA which prevents them to have free choice and to live independently.
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no any training under this scheme, neither for PA nor for PA users.

Scheme 3 (Ireland) – Health Service Executive Scheme	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CIL's as organisation empower and advocate for users, however without budgets and P.A support what can be done is limited.

Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication is part of P.A. training however I do not believe conflict resolution is.
Comments on Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really disappointed on completing this survey for ENIL. I understand that you are trying to gather complex data, however there was no consideration for this material being “easy to read”. Far simpler language could have been used to ask the same questions. “E.G. 61. Do assistants get health and safety training?” • Whilst it is in word so can be manipulated, I would have thought ENIL would have policies regarding suitable fonts, sizing etc. Sans serif fonts are more accessible.

Scheme 4 (Serbia) – Personal Assistance Service (Usluga personalne asistencije)

Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5. There are restrictions regarding number of hours (40 hours per week) and request to participate in funding of the service in 20% of the disability allowance
Dimension 3: Needs assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22. It includes persons above 18 years of age.
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58. CIL has the training team which consist both by assistance users and not disabled persons.

Scheme 5 (Slovenia) – Independent Living (Neodvisno življenje)

Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slovenia adopted the Personal Assistance Act and the provisions from this act are going to be implemented at 1st of Jan 2019. The biggest difference is that all the people who will be eligible for pa will get it. They will than choose their service provider for personal assistance and sign the contract with the chosen service provider to receive personal assistance hours that two members of needs assessment commission designate to him/her. The users have the right to choose their pa’s but the provision of personal assistance will be different – it will depend on personal assistance scheme that the service provider will adopt. Other big difference is in funding – the pa scheme will not be any more project based but it will be funded by national budget by hours of personal assistance delivered to the users of PA.

	<p>But as it is now (more than 30 different project based service providers of PA) it will be also in the future – we are an user led independent living organisation and we are providing the PA in consideration with independent living principles but other organisations are more medical oriented that means that also services that they are providing have different focus. Since the PA Law is based in many articles on our version of PA Law (which we prepared in 2015) there are also a lot of Independent living principles adopted in the accepted law. We have already translated and send to ENIL some parts of PA Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 – depends who
Dimension 3: Needs assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 – The scheme is limited by funding – that means that the users must have big social network to cover all their needs - there is no cover for pa's on sick leaf for example. In our project the people with more needs have priority from those who doesn't need so many hours. • 28,29, 30 – the users can appeal about the pa hours but since we are limited with funds the appeal can be taken in consideration only if another user leaves the project or dies.
Dimension 4: Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 – But we as service provider sign the work contract with the pa's chosen by the users. • 36 – they must take in consideration the work contract and workers rights from the Employment Act • 40 – tasks are listed in the work contract of the pa's and also in the agreement that user sign with service providers
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55 – Depends who again? • 56 – people usually mix up some care professions and pa; also experts still do; they don't know the distinctions between them

Scheme 6 (Spain, Andalucía) – Pilot Project of Independent Living (Proyecto piloto Vida Independiente)	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pilot project in which I am involved covers only the needs of 9 people. Our personal assistants are chosen by us but contracted through the association. The project is partially financed through money put by users (money that we have previously received from the state) and partly through regional money.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds are scarce and are renewed annually so that the training is not fully covered and the evaluation of all the factors is quite homemade. The authorities only give us the necessary money and ask for documentation to justify its use.
--	---

Scheme 7 (Sweden) – Personal Assistance Direct Payment (Assistansersättning)	
Dimensions	Comments
Dimension 1: Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • you could have made a distinction between policy and service delivery. Now, respondents' answers could refer to both
Dimension 2: Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks like you had the Swedish policy in mind in formulating the questions
Dimension 3: Needs assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessors used to have IL training. Not anymore. • 80% of new applications are currently turned down. • Appealing requires lawyers, medical statements that can be expensive
Dimension 4: Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You cannot simply dismiss assistants, their interests are protected by strong trade union. You can negotiate with your assistants most imaginable schedules - as long as they comply to the EU Working Time Law. • Assistance hours can be saved within a 6 months period. • The trade union and some providers sometimes promote medical model related tasks. Mainly IL cooperatives as providers offer peer support.
Dimension 5: Working conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • training can be provided by all types of organizations, IL organizations, private companies, medical model based organizations. Not always use the instructors personal assistance themselves.

Scheme 8 (UK) – Direct Payment – Personal Budget	
Dimensions	Comments
	The expert has not provided any comments.

Appendix:

Personal Assistance Checklist

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this assessment of personal assistance (PA) schemes in Europe, conducted by the European Network on Independent Living (ENIL). By sharing your expertise, you will help independent living activists in Europe and beyond in their advocacy for better PA services.

The assessment is a pilot and you will be the first to apply the tool. At this stage, we are in contact with potential assessors in several European countries, including Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK. If the assessment tool works, ENIL plans to use it more widely by translating it in different languages and including other countries, eventually covering PA schemes throughout Europe.

The assessment uses a checklist consisting of 61 statements. Each statement describes a specific characteristic of PA that either enables or hinders the choice and control of PA users in their everyday lives. These characteristics were selected after a consultation with ENIL's members and subscribers of ENIL's newsletter (for more information see <http://enil.eu/news/what-is-good-personal-assistance-made-of-first-look-at-the-answers/>).

You are invited to **choose a PA scheme you know well and to apply the checklist to it**. An option has also been provided to make comments, including comments about the checklist itself. You may complete the checklist alone or in consultation with colleagues or peers. You may also disseminate the assessment tool to other people with experience and expertise in the scheme you will be assessing.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and will be kept anonymous. During their processing and dissemination, **the results will be thoroughly anonymised and your name will not appear in any reports**. Refusal to participate will not incur any disadvantage and you may decide to withdraw your participation at any stage without giving a reason.

The results of the assessment will be disseminated by ENIL through its website and newsletter. They may also be written up and published in academic reports and journal articles.

The assessment is part of the research project 'User-Led Personal Assistance in the European Union: A Critical Comparative Analysis' led by Teodor Mladenov and supervised by Ines Bulic at ENIL (for more details see <http://enil.eu/best-practices/meet-teodor-mladenov-enils-marie-curie-research-fellow/>).

Please **return the completed checklist by 10 November 2018 to Teodor** at teodor.mladenov@enil.eu. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Teodor at teodor.mladenov@enil.eu, or Ines at ines.bulic@enil.eu.



European Union



This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 747027. This document reflects only the author’s view. The Research Executive Agency of the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Informed consent	check to confirm
I confirm that I have read and understood the information about the assessment provided by the researcher.	
I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason.	
I understand that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained and it will not be possible to identify me in any future publications.	
I understand that the information I have submitted will be published as a report and I wish to have access to it.	
I agree that the researcher may use the information provided by me for future research, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity.	

Please confirm your consent to participate by also signing this form (print name):

Before you begin...

Please select a PA scheme currently provided in your country on local, regional or national level. This could be a scheme you are involved with (as a founder, user or in some other respect), or just a scheme you are familiar with.

Technical information

Country	
Name of the PA scheme (in local language and in English)	
Coverage of the PA scheme (local, regional, national, other)	
Source(s) of funding	
Form of funding (public, private, project-based, other)	
The scheme has been provided since... (if known)	
Your name (optional)	
Your organisation (optional)	
Are you using PA provided by the scheme? (Yes/No)	
Are you a member of ENIL? (Yes/No)	

Checklist

Complete the checklist by considering each statement and indicating with an X whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE when applied to the PA scheme that you are assessing. You may also indicate that the characteristic is inapplicable, that its description is incomprehensible, or that you do not have enough information to answer by choosing NEITHER. However, **we strongly encourage you to choose either TRUE or FALSE, even if the characteristic applies only partially to the scheme or you have only partial information.** This will enhance the comparability of results across different schemes, making the outcomes more useful for advocacy purposes. You may also make comments at the end of each section to explain your choices, add information, or comment on the items in the checklist.

Characteristics regarding CONTEXT	True	False	Neither
1. The scheme was introduced as a result of disabled people's advocacy ('bottom up' origin).			
2. The scheme is underpinned by the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.			
3. The scheme is underpinned by national and/or international human rights concepts and instruments (e.g., the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).			
4. The provision of personal assistance under the scheme is recognised as a (human, civil, social) right.			
5. The scheme is subjected to cuts (e.g., eligibility is tightened, 'assistance hours' are reduced, conditionality is introduced, etc.).			
6. The scheme deteriorates by incorporating measures that restrict the choice and control of the users.			
7. Policy makers and other stakeholders (e.g., the media) misunderstand, misuse or misrepresent the scheme.			
8. The evolution of the scheme is monitored by user-led organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.			

9. The scheme empowers users (e.g., to be assertive, to work, study, set up user-led organisations, create cooperatives, engage in advocacy, etc.).			
10. The scheme 'frees' family members from 'caring' obligations, enabling them to undertake other activities.			
11. The scheme is used as an excuse for cutting expenses for 'social care'.			
12. The scheme has a positive impact on public perceptions of disabled people.			
Comments and additional information:			

Characteristics regarding FUNDING	True	False	Neither
13. The scheme is funded by the state, out of the state budget (centralised funding).			
14. The scheme is available on the national level (i.e., every eligible citizen or resident of the country has access to the scheme).			
15. The users of the scheme (can choose to) receive direct payments or personal budgets instead of services in kind.			
16. The scheme covers additional employment costs such as employer's contributions, payroll work and other administrative costs.			
17. The scheme covers additional costs for the assistants such as tickets for events, travel, accommodation and food.			
Comments and additional information:			

Characteristics regarding NEEDS ASSESSMENT	True	False	Neither
18. The needs assessment is led by the user, possibly aided by peers.			
19. The training of the assessors includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.			
20. The training of the assessors includes modules on relationship management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).			
21. The scheme is limited by a 'cost ceiling' and users whose support costs more are directed towards traditional services (e.g., residential institutions).			
22. The scheme is provided irrespective of age.			
23. The scheme is provided irrespective of individual or family income.			
24. The scheme is provided irrespective of family (including marital) situation.			
25. The scheme is provided irrespective of insurance status.			
26. The assessment covers the needs for assistance in all areas of life, including family, intimacy, education, employment, leisure, etc.			
27. The assessment procedure is straightforward and transparent.			
28. The assessment is repeated upon the request of the user.			
29. The users of the scheme have the opportunity to appeal the outcome of their assessments.			
30. The appeal procedure is straightforward, transparent and does not entail additional expenses for the user.			
Comments and additional information:			

Characteristics regarding PROVISION	True	False	Neither
31. The users can employ and manage their personal assistants themselves.			
32. The quality of provision is monitored and assessed by the users and/or users' organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.			
33. The users can keep their assistance when moving to another region or local authority within the country.			
34. The users can choose their personal assistants.			
35. The assistants are appointed by the provider, without the involvement of the user.			
36. The users can dismiss their personal assistants.			
37. Under the scheme, assistants work fixed hours (e.g., from 9:00 AM till 5:00 PM).			
38. Under the scheme, the user determines the times when assistance will be provided, including during nights, weekends, holidays, etc.			
39. The users of the scheme can save and transfer 'assistance hours'.			
40. Assistance tasks are determined by the user, without restrictions.			
41. Assistants are not allowed to perform tasks related to health care (even after delegation or approval by medical professionals).			
42. Under the scheme, assistance is bound to a location (for example, it is provided only at the user's home).			
43. The users of the scheme have access to peer support, i.e., support provided by users of personal assistance.			
44. Peer support for the users is organised by user-led organisations, including Centres for Independent Living.			
45. The users have access to training on using personal assistance.			
46. The training of the users is provided by other assistance users.			

47. The training of the users includes modules on recruitment and management of personal assistants.			
48. The training of the users includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.			
49. The training of the users includes modules on relationships management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).			
Comments and additional information:			

Characteristics regarding WORKING CONDITIONS	True	False	Neither
50. The wages of the assistants are protected by minimum wage regulations.			
51. The assistants are entitled to benefits such as social security and paid leave (annual, sick and parental).			
52. The assistants are protected by health and safety provisions.			
53. The assistants are protected by anti-discrimination provisions.			
54. The requirements about the qualifications of the assistants are formulated by the users (rather than by the scheme, the provider, etc.).			
55. The work of the assistants is considered valuable by the wider society.			
56. Personal assistance is recognised as a profession by the wider society.			
57. The assistants have access to training on providing personal assistance.			
58. The training of the assistants is provided by assistance users.			
59. The training of the assistants includes modules on the Independent Living philosophy and/or the social model of disability.			

60. The training of the assistants includes modules on relationships management (e.g., conflicts, communication, confidentiality, emotions, etc.).			
61. The training of the assistants includes modules on health and safety.			
Comments and additional information:			

Thank you for sharing your expertise!

About the European Network on Independent Living

The European Network on Independent Living (ENIL) is a Europe-wide network of disabled people, with members throughout Europe. ENIL is a forum for all disabled people, Independent Living organizations and their non-disabled allies on the issues of Independent Living. ENIL's mission is to advocate and lobby for Independent Living values, principles and practices, namely for a barrier-free environment, provision of personal assistance support and adequate technical aids, together making full citizenship of disabled people possible.

Contact us

European Network on Independent Living (ENIL)
7th Floor – Mundo J
Rue de l'Industrie 10
1000 Brussels
Belgium
E-mail: secretariat@enil.eu
Website: www.enil.eu

www.enil.eu



PA CHECKLIST – A Tool for Assessing Personal Assistance Schemes