



Strathprints Institutional Repository

Hawthorn, Moyra and Kendrick, Andrew (2011) *Time to be heard pilot forum evaluation : a chance to say more*. Scottish Institute for Residential Child Care.

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to Strathprints administrator: <mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk>



Time to Be Heard Pilot Forum Evaluation:

A Chance to Say More

January 2011

**Moyra Hawthorn and Andrew Kendrick
Scottish Institute for Residential Child Care**

1) Introduction

This report was commissioned by Scottish Government in order to gain an in-depth perspective of participants in the Time to Be Heard Pilot Forum (TTBH). The evaluation was carried out by Ms. Moyra Hawthorn and Prof. Andrew Kendrick of the Scottish Institute of Residential Child Care.

This evaluation focuses solely on the experience of participants in the Time to Be Heard pilot, although some respondents commented on wider issues concerning their experience in residential care, and the Government's response to historic abuse more generally.

A questionnaire was sent out to ninety-six participants in Time to Be Heard some three weeks after they had participated in the Pilot Forum. This questionnaire included an

invitation to take part in a follow up face-to-face interview with the researchers. Forty-four participants expressed an interest in taking part in this 'Opportunity to say More'.

2) Methods

Ethical Considerations

Given the sensitive nature of this research, full ethical approval was gained from the University Ethics Committee of the University of Strathclyde. This addressed issues of informed consent, confidentiality, storage and usage of data, and ethical issues related to data collection methods, and selection of participants.

The issue of participants' involvement in legal proceedings related to the subject of the study was raised by the Ethics Committee, and initially those participants who were, or intended to be, involved in legal proceedings in respect of the abuse they had experienced were excluded. It soon became apparent that this was overly restrictive and was excluding a large number of potential participants. Following further consideration of the issue, the chair of the Ethics Committee allowed this clause to be withdrawn.

Although the interview focused on the process of the Time to Be Heard Pilot Forum, given the potential for sensitive and upsetting issues to be raised in the interview, all participants were offered the support of the In Care Survivor Service Scotland (ICSSS).

Recognising the sensitivity of the information being collected, interview recordings were password protected and other interview details were locked away securely. Quotations from interviews are anonymised.

Participant Profile

From the list of forty-four people who expressed an interest, a sample was selected which took account of gender, age and time spent in Quarriers. Twelve participants were interviewed in total: six men and six women. The average age of participants was 58 and they ranged in age from 38 to 73. They had been placed in Quarriers over a wide period of time – from 1939 to 1982: one participant had been placed there in 1939, four in the 1940s,

two in the 1950s, two in the 1960s and three in the 1970s. The average length of their stay in Quarriers was 9 years, with the longest placement being 16 years and the shortest 3 years. One participant had been placed in Quarriers twice.

Interview Schedule

A semi-structured interview schedule was completed (see Appendix 1). Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour 10 minutes. The venue was agreed with participants. Some chose to be interviewed at home, some in mutually agreed venues which offered privacy. In one case, a telephone interview was carried out because of distance. Although the interview schedule was specifically about Time to Be Heard, most participants chose to share some of their in care experiences and their life experiences since then in order to put Time to Be Heard in context.

All but two interviews were recorded and partial transcription was undertaken, identifying key points. In the two interviews which were not recorded, detailed notes were taken during the interview. A content analysis framework was agreed which focused on four key areas:

- The process before attending Time to Be Heard
- Attending Time to Be Heard
- Experience after Time to Be Heard
- Reflections of Time to Be Heard overall.

There were however some other valuable insights offered by participants. These have therefore been included in an additional section. However, it must be acknowledged that these were raised by individuals themselves, and not all participants were asked about these issues.

3) Findings

Before taking part in the Pilot Forum

Finding out about TTBH

Participants found out about Time to Be Heard in a variety of ways, and sometimes from more than one source. Participants who had recent contact with Quarriers (for example, in order to gain access to their records) were informed of Time to Be Heard by Quarriers. Half of the participants found out about Time to Be Heard in this way.

‘I received a letter from Quarriers. And I wanted to take part. I think the reason I received a letter was that I went down to look at the files.’

(Participant 11)

One found out about it solely from the media, although five had seen it in the papers as well as having found out about it from another source.

‘I got a letter in the post. And also my friend had seen the advert in the Herald, and she had seen it and mailed it to me.’ (Participant 10)

Two found out about it from relatives who knew they had spent part of their childhood in Quarriers and had alerted them to the Pilot Forum having seen the advert in the media, and one participant was alerted by another person who had been in Quarriers. One participant was told by a professional involved in her care, and one participant had attended a conference and had asked to be involved.

Issues of the stigma of being in care, and the stress on confidentiality regarding Time to Be Heard, could possibly impact on people finding out about the Pilot Forum. For example, one participant who had found out about Time to Be Heard from extended family, commented that ‘I don’t normally tell people I was in care. It’s the stigma of it’ (Participant 1). Five participants raised the issue of confidentiality in respect of telling other people. One

participant said that he had been considering passing on information to someone he knew had been in Quarriers, but decided not to because of the emphasis on confidentiality. Another, while discussing how to heighten awareness of Time to Be Heard for prospective participants, observed:

‘We are supposed to keep it fairly private. I never mentioned it to anybody. And I have only told one person since, no-one with real connections to Quarriers... I’ve kept it under wraps, very secret.’ (Participant 11)

Deciding to apply

Participants were not specifically asked their reason for taking part in Time to Be Heard but most referred to this. All appeared to have put a lot of thought into applying. One commented:

‘I did wrestle with it for a wee while before, and I thought, “No, I’ll go and say my piece.”’ (Participant 1)

Another stated that it was not just about his own experience of abuse but the experience of all those who had been in Quarriers.

‘... I felt it was important that I had that opportunity to speak about it. But I also felt it was important that other people were given the chance’
(Participant 6)

Similarly, a third participant related it to what could be done for other people.

‘The reason I came along, I wanted it to be made better for other people. And I wanted it also, the people who were important to me, especially the staff and kids... There are a lot of good people in the profession out there and they are working really hard, and there are a lot of bad people but they can be filtered now. But to acknowledge a lot of people put time and effort into Quarriers.’ (Participant 2)

Some, particularly those who considered they had had positive or mixed experiences in care, wondered if Time to Be Heard was relevant to them, but did get in touch. Afterwards they felt that their participation had been welcomed by those involved in the process, and that they had benefitted from the experience. One participant stated:

‘I went in case all they were going to get was abuse and I thought, “Oh dear me, I’ll tell them a nice story so that is the real reason I went.”’ (Participant 3)

Contact with SurvivorScotland team

Almost all the participants had a positive experience in making contact with the SurvivorScotland team to obtain more information and in respect of any follow up issues. One participant commented on the importance of having someone to talk to when she made contact for an information pack as she found it ‘quite nerve wracking’ making the initial phone call. Particular credit was given to the team by two participants who had to rearrange their appointments at the Pilot Forum. Another described the team as ‘very helpful’. One participant, however, stated that making contact to obtain information was ‘dreadful’ because there was no-one there who could help, and she had to ring back.

Information Pack

There were some mixed responses about the Information Pack. Half the participants considered that it provided full information and that it was easy to understand. Descriptions of the Information Pack from these participants included: ‘very well done,’ ‘very clear,’ and ‘straightforward’.

‘There was no problem. As I recall there was no difficulty. If there were forms to be filled in, I filled them in and sent them back.’ (Participant 10)

Other participants, however, drew attention to particular aspects of the Information Pack. One participant found the Information Pack quite difficult to understand.

'I didn't quite understand it completely, what I was to fill in and that. So my wife helped me to do that, so I made sure I understood it properly – before I signed it and sent it back.' (Participant 6)

Three participants raised the issue of the focus in the Pack about experiences of abuse and support. They acknowledged that this may have been more relevant to those who had had negative experiences.

'All these support groups... And maybe this is an exaggeration, pages about how to inform the police, and what about us who weren't abused. I thought there was far too much about that. I don't think it was an encouragement for people to come when they are so on about that. I can speak because I wasn't abused.' (Participant 3)

An alternative view, however, welcomed this information, even if the participant did not need to make use of it.

'I looked through the [Information Pack] and it was fine... I just thought if I could speak to Tom and could speak with my family, I didn't think I needed any further help... they sent you the pamphlets if you wanted help after the meeting, a few phone numbers, if you were wanting to talk to somebody else. There was a 24-hour call line, but I never used any of them really.'

(Participant 7)

Attending the Pilot Forum

The Pilot Forum itself was particularly positively evaluated by all, even though most admitted feeling some level of anxiety or nervousness beforehand.

'I was quite, not so much nervous, a bit anxious, a bit up-tight. Would I have anything worthwhile to say? Because it is kind of an unknown, you don't

know quite what will be required of you, going into a situation like that.’
(Participant 10)

Venue

Some of the participants commented on the location of the Pilot Forum venue, and when they did it was in a positive way.

‘It was better you were away. If it had been nearer here it might have been too close, if you know what I mean. Whereas sometimes you can walk away and leave it once it is done’ (Participant 1).

Another who had to travel some distance commented that she enjoyed having a day out. The Commissioners had offered to meet one participant who had family commitments nearer home, but she too regarded it as ‘a day out’. Another participant linked it to other business which he had to do in Glasgow.

The issue of keeping the venue confidential was also taken to be important by participants.

‘Obviously, I didn’t say where the location was, and I still haven’t. I won’t tell anybody though it’s done now. I did agree and I keep my word.’ (Participant 6)

Pilot Forum Facilities

There was unanimous endorsement of the facilities at the Pilot Forum, although one participant did not like the layout of the room in which the meeting was held. The facilities were described as ‘comfortable’, ‘nice and light and airy’, and ‘nicely set up’. One participant felt that the fact that there was round table made it feel less formal.

‘[The room] was just a nice size. It was a comfortable feeling - you didn’t think you were in a big, big room...I liked it the way it was’ (Participant 4)

However, one participant felt that the room was too formal and that it was too much like 'a police interview room'.

'I would certainly have comfortable seats rather than sitting at a desk... Somewhere just a comfortable room. They could have a two-seater with a table between them for their machine, more like a sitting room than an office.' (Participant 3)

Reception

The reception process at the venue was very highly commended, particularly the fact that the person receiving participants came down to meet them. She was described as 'very welcoming', and one participant commented:

'They want to just pin a medal on her, that lassie that met me. Because you are up to hi-doh, and you are all tense and you... I don't think, personally, there is... any other way they could handle it.' (Participant 8)

Participants found it reassuring that the person who met them made sure that they were comfortable, stayed with them until they met one of the Commissioners and let participants take the lead in talking rather than asking questions.

'I went to the location and rang the bell, and the lady came down and took you up the stairs to a room. And she made me a cup of tea, she explained that we would go into a room with Mr Shaw – can't remember the other person. And just to take my own time, and if I needed to stop for any reason, I could stop if I wanted... that was helpful. You weren't just going straight into the room when you came into the building. You had time to sit down, get yourself together before you actually went in to speak to them. And I think that was important.' (Participant 6)

Two participants also commented on the fact that she was able to look after their children, and one commented that this 'freed me up' to focus on the process of the meeting.

Meeting the Chair and Commissioners

The first contact with the Chair and Commissioners was generally at the Pilot Forum while waiting in the reception area. Participants were very appreciative that the Chair and the Commissioner who was going to be present came to introduce themselves first. One stated:

'Tom Shaw and Anne they both came in [to the waiting room] to introduce themselves before going into the meeting... Coming to meet you at the start was very nice because it takes the fear away, not knowing them.' (Participant 1)

Another commented:

'[Tom] came through and gave me a solid handshake, the nicest handshake and that speaks volumes. He was very appreciative and welcoming, appreciative. He was happy that I was up there to spill the beans on my life. It was helpful him coming in. It put me at ease.' (Participant 5)

Because of specific circumstances, one of the Commissioners had to contact one participant at home. While this was not the norm, the participant found this contact prior to going to the Pilot Forum particularly supportive:

'Anyone going to an interview is apprehensive and I was more so and I was terribly nervous. I managed to ask her things that were bothering me and it was a great help. Everybody should be phoned.' (Participant 3)

All the participants were positive about their experience at TTBH and the way the process had been handled by the Chair and the Commissioners. In the view of interviewees, the Chair and Commissioners seemed to be particularly skilled in finding different ways to help people talk about their experiences. This is a selection of comments:

'I thought they [Tom and Kathleen] were absolutely magnificent and I'll tell you why, I worried that my input would not be enough and I wasn't really half through my Quarriers Home story when Tom said, "You have given us information that was marvellous." He made me feel I was doing something good and I came out of there happy as Larry, I could sit and talk and there was nobody to dispute what I was saying, no-one to contradict what I was saying. I came out of there [with] lightness of heart, happy beyond belief and I thought it was a great experience and I really felt the better of it. It was brilliant. They were so lovely, I can't praise them enough.' (Participant 3)

'I can't stress enough how appreciative they were whether it was good, bad, ugly, whatever. They were just delighted I was there to express myself.' (Participant 5)

'They were very patient, because sometimes I was babbling... I broke down, I babbled, I don't know, a lot of nonsense, ready to punch the table, pent up.' (Participant 7)

'They were very helpful. Well, they started speaking and then you just... They were good at bringing it out. It just come out... So it was good that way. They just let you speak about other things, and then you'd remember other things. In fact, sometimes you'd speak and they were going to ask you anyway. They said, "We were just going to ask you about that." So it was quite good that way.' (Participant 8)

'We thought he [Tom] was very, very good. He asked questions and we could answer. Really, really good. Because Tom said to me, "You were very helpful to us." So it was like we worked like a team.' (Participant 9)

‘Absolutely super. I said at the start, “I don’t know if I have enough to say but I will answer you as best I can...” And they were just great, and I was just so at ease with them. Tom is a delightful person.’ (Participant 10)

One participant commented on the different roles that the Chair and the Commissioner took:

‘Anne sat back a bit... And it would only be occasionally you would be asked something, so you didn’t feel as if you were being bombarded. It was very nice the way they done it... if you needed a break they kept telling you they stopped for five, so it’s not as if you were forced to keep talking.’ (Participant 1)

Two participants, although finding the overall experience very positive, expressed specific reservations about particular aspects of their experience of TTBH. One participant raised an issue regarding the way in which he experienced the process:

‘They did put you at your ease, Mr Shaw and the other person. They put you under no pressure. You could say what you wanted at your own pace. I think it was fine... They did ask questions. But one thing I did find after I had left – after I had left Time to Be Heard, I felt that they were leading you. They were wanting confirmation of what other people had already said. I felt that was part of the questioning, they just wanted confirmation of what other people had described to them.’ (Participant 6)

Another participant queried whether some women who had experienced abuse may have difficulty with a man taking the lead in the proceedings, ‘... even though he was a lovely man’. She wondered if this may deter some women coming forward.

Personal Preparation and Supports

Participants prepared for the Pilot Forum in different ways. Some thought that no preparation was necessary and relied on memory.

'Is seems as if it is all in here, as if it has been embedded into you. You were brain-washed. My husband said you were never allowed to take anything in, you were being brain-washed unknown to you and it became engrained in you and that's how it never left.' (Participant 4)

Two of the participants stated that they had prepared an agenda of notes or headings to take into the Pilot Forum. Both thought this had been particularly helpful. Even then, one who had taken headings of 'Good Practice and Bad Practice' to help focus her input found that the process itself triggered further thoughts. Three other participants thought in retrospect that it would have been helpful to have written ideas down as a focus when attending the Pilot Forum.

'I did say to Tom at one point, "I was intending to write it all down on the computer." But obviously I never got the time. But maybe writing it down helps you over the piece.' (Participant 7)

Four of the twelve participants took someone with them to the Pilot Forum (in two cases it was a family member, and in two cases it was a support worker). One of them acknowledged that, in retrospect she realised that she had in fact explained very little about her care experiences to her companion prior to the hearing. Others stated a preference to attend alone stating simply 'I find it much easier to do things myself', or 'I didn't want anyone to hear what I went through, the shame that hangs over me'.

None of the participants had used the In Care Survivor Service Scotland, preferring to use family, friends and existing support networks.

Moving On

Time to Be Heard had made a clear impact on those who had taken part. For one participant, Time to Be Heard was seen to be the end of a process.

‘The impact for me has been closure because there was good and there was bad and being able to talk about it and get it off, get it away, so for me it is closure. I don’t need to go back over it again.’ (Participant 1)

This participant also suggested that ‘closure’ would come a lot more quickly for those who spent part of their childhood in care if there was no stigma attached.

‘You are brought up feeling guilty and I couldn’t really tell you what for, it is always this guilt.’ (Participant 1)

For most participants it was part of an ongoing process, either for themselves as an individual, or as part of a larger process of acknowledgement and accountability. One participant was also taking part in the Restorative Justice project.

‘Everybody has a different experience, everybody’s story is not the same. It is how you take it. It has left me with terrible hurt and pain. I don’t think it will ever go away.’ (Participant 4)

A number of participants reflected on the fact that the TTBH process had generated other thoughts and memories which they felt it were important to have recorded, and which could be addressed in the future. One participant stated that:

‘The process is not over for you when you walk out the door, you are still left with your thoughts and you might want to add these thoughts so to be able to add to the process. You might want to send a letter.... Telephone and say this is really important to me I really wanted to say this but I forgot about it.’ (Participant 2)

She did in fact send a letter to the Commissioners with further thoughts and thought that it should be emphasised to participants that they could e-mail, write or speak to one of the support workers over the phone after attending the Pilot Forum. Other participants raised

the issue of follow-on meetings in order to address points which they had remembered subsequently.

‘And then after you start opening your mind, other things come into it, things you’ve forgotten about, it triggers the lot open. And now you’re willing to talk about it, a lot more comes into your mind... I think if there was anything, if they had the resources and the time, even just a wee meeting after, because you do forget.’ (Participant 7)

The question of time was raised by another participant who wondered how long would be long enough.

‘I did feel after I left that two hours wasn’t long enough. I’d so much to say, and I feel that I just didn’t have the chance to say everything. I’d have to have sat basically all day to talk about it, to be honest with you.’ (Participant 6)

While one participant felt that she had been able to put across her experiences in the Pilot Forum and in a follow up letter, she suggested some creative ways to support participants. She was still in contact with some former residents and pointed out that some she knew may have difficulty sitting down and using words to give their testimony. She suggested some may be more comfortable being able to move around the room, or having a flip chart available for them to write ideas lest they forget, or the opportunity to work creatively:

‘For some people it may be a photograph or a moment in time, one of these sort of things.’ (Participant 2)

The Information Pack had indicated that participants could bring items such as photos or letters along to the Pilot Forum.

Some participants were taken aback at the emotional impact of taking part in Time to Be Heard.

'It took a few days to settle back down. Because you are talking about it memories come back and maybe you don't want those memories. It just made you more thoughtful because you had been talking about it, whereas for years I just never spoke about it so I didn't have to think about it, like it was a lot more emotional than I thought it was going to be. (Participant 1)

Participants also felt that it had a longer term impact on how they felt in themselves.

'I've felt more relaxed, that there are things I can talk about that I couldn't talk about before.' (Participant 9)

"It made me try to think really clearly, with the benefit of hindsight, about things. It helped me to understand... I consider it a very worthwhile thing to have done.' (Participant 10)

'Well, in a way I've felt relieved.' (Participant 12)

Finally, one participant who was in his 60s and who had not spoken about his experience in Quarriers to his wife and children before Time to Be Heard, discussed it openly with them. He said:

'Since I went I feel more at peace. I don't go in to moods. I took mood swings... But since then, I've noticed it. That was just discussing it. Maybe it was wrong all these years keeping it bottled up but I really couldn't discuss it, even with my wife... and actually Time to Be Heard helped me greatly even at my age... It was I pity I never discussed it with anybody years ago...'
(Participant 7)

Wider Issues

Participants raised wider issues following their involvement in Time to Be Heard. Some thought that it was essential that Time to Be Heard was part of a wider process which addressed issues of acknowledgement and accountability, 'because people are getting fed

up with this hanging on and on and on' (Participant 9). In the context of the need for changes wider than TTBH, another participant stated:

'We need people to listen to us and believe us. For all these years we weren't believed, nobody would listen to us. It was in the past, forget about it, these things that had happened. It is important to me and other people, that people actually listen to you and acknowledge you. And that's important.'
(Participant 6)

Another participant focused on Quarriers and linked this to their desire for an explicit apology for what had gone on in the past.

'Quarriers actually telling the truth... I feel they have covered up and they know they have covered up. Even if they were to say sorry, just saying sorry might help a lot of people.' (Participant 1)

The issue of access to records was raised by a number of participants and experiences were mixed. One participant described her experience as very positive and she described the person involved at Quarriers as 'very helpful'. Others were less positive and raised issues such as the length of time to access records, being given excuses as to why they could not gain access, parts of the records being missing, and the way in which access was given.

'Well they gave me photographs of them and when they gave me them, they sat in a room and this woman sat there as well while you were going through them, and it wasn't very nice the way it was done. She sat there and kind of, "How dare you come and ask for these." It was that kind of way but it was better once I took them and went home, and you could go through them yourself.' (Participant 1)

A broader issue raised by some participants was that it was important to make sure that 'lessons would be learned' to inform future practice. One participant was now employed in social care and stated.

'It was cathartic in some ways, it brought up a lot in relation to talking about me being brought up in care, things I have forgotten about, what was good practice what was bad practice, and about things you are aware about in community care about accountability...' (Participant 5)

Drawing on her experience, she went on to argue strongly for the improvement of the support offered when young people leave care.

'You don't just turn 16, 17 18... I definitely think there should be supports up to 25. Whether it is needed to that point is an individual thing. I think each child should have that. There are so many things can go wrong. Just to have a safety net.' (Participant 5)

4) **Conclusion**

This evaluation heard, in detail, the perspectives of twelve participants who had described their experiences in Quarriers as children to the Time to Be Heard Pilot Forum. There was an overwhelming consensus about the importance of the Pilot Forum and the overall, positive experience of participants. Some participants did have suggestions for the way in which aspects of the proceedings could be improved. These participants also offered a wide variety of experiences of Quarriers, and their reactions to their time in care. Their perspective was affected by their experience of the Time to Be Heard Pilot Forum and TTBH had a significant impact. Participants were clear in their advice to others that they recognised that describing their experience could be an emotional experience, but they were clear in their encouragement.

'I would say to them, "You might think you won't get upset but it might upset you. But just be prepared for that."' (Participant 8)

'I'd tell them to go, you get very good help.' (Participant 9)

‘I would say, “Go for it, if you are not afraid to look back and think what it was like. And think what it was like and what it meant to you over the years. Go and do it.”’ (Participant 10)

‘Go for it. If you are strong-willed, go for it.’ (Participant 12)

Some final words:

‘The most important thing that I take was them listening to you talking about your time, and being understanding of your situation... I couldn’t see any other way. Because it was handled with the greatest amount of respect, that was the most important thing – respect, listening, sympathetic and understanding. I actually found them excellent.’ (Participant 7)

SIRCC is a partnership of the University of Strathclyde, The Robert Gordon University, Who Cares? Scotland and Langside College.
www.sircc.org.uk

First published in 2011
Scottish Institute for Residential Child Care
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, G13 1PP

Copyright © SIRCC 2011

Appendix 1 - Time To Be Heard Pilot Forum Evaluation Questions

GENERAL

- 1. Can you tell us generally about your experience of going to the Time To Be Heard Pilot Forum? What aspects worked well and what do you think could improve it for people taking part in future?**

FINDING OUT ABOUT TIME TO BE HEARD

- 2. How did you find out about Time To Be Heard?**
 - (a) How easy or difficult was it to find out about it?**
 - (b) Do you have any suggestions about how it could be easier for people to find out about it?**

INFORMATION PACKS etc.

- 3. How easy did you find it to get the Information Pack?**
 - (b) Was there anything that would have made it easier?**
- 4. Having been through the process, is there any way in which the Information Pack could be improved?**

SUPPORT TEAM AT THE FORUM

- 5. What contact did you have with the support team when you arrived at the Forum?**
 - (a) How helpful was this?**
- 6. Having been through the process, is there anything which could be arranged differently to help people with the experience when they arrive at the Forum?**

EXPERIENCE OF THE FORUM

- 7. What did you think of the facilities and practical arrangements in the room where you were describing your experiences?**
 - (b) Were there any improvements which could be made to the practical arrangements at the Forum?**

8. What support did you have at the Forum apart from the people who welcomed you?
 - (a) Is there anything which would have made it easier to describe your experiences in care?
9. The Chair and the Commissioner were the two people who listened when you described your experiences at the Forum.
10. How helpful did you find them when you were describing your experiences?
 - (a) Was there anything which they could have done better?

SUPPORT BEFORE AND AFTER

11. Did you use any support before during or after the Forum (e.g. family, friends, In Care Survivors)?
 - (a) Having been through the process, would you use the same or different supports?
 - (b) Why is that?
 - (c) Do you think that there is any information or help which would have been helpful for your support person to have had?
12. Can you tell me about the impact of:
 - (a) Having the *opportunity* to take part in Time To Be Heard?
 - (b) Taking part in the Time to be Heard forum itself?

FINAL THOUGHTS

13. Is there anything else which you would have liked from the Time to be Heard Forum?
14. What would you tell someone thinking about taking part in the Time to be Heard Forum?
 - (a) What advice you would give them?
15. Are there any final thoughts which you would like to share which would inform the future of the Acknowledgement and Accountability process in Scotland?

Thank you very much for sharing your experiences