MENTAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT (MCA) CHECKLIST

by Alison Harrison

By completing this checklist and answering 'Yes' to all questions (where applicable) you are complying with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

PART A: CHECKLIST BEFORE CARRYNG OUT FUNCTIONAL MENTAL	
CAPACITY TEST	
DIAGNOSTIC TEST	
Was it ensured that a presumption of capacity* was not made on age, appearance, condition, diagnosis or behaviour?	YES/NO
Was there evidence that there might be some sort of impairment of, or	YES/NO
disturbance in functioning of, the person's mind or brain? (If No, you do	
not need to carry out a Mental Capacity Assessment). If yes, then tick	
below, which one applies:-	
(REMEMBER YOU SHOULD NOT BE CARRYNG OUT A MCA ONLY ON THE	
BASIS SOMEONE IS MAKING AN UNWISE DECISION)	
Dementia	
Delirium	
Confusion	
Behaviour unusual to patient	
(Was this behaviour observed by you)	
(Was this behaviour observed by others)	
Mental health issues	
Neurological condition	
Changes caused by prescriptive drugs	
Changes caused by influence of illegal drugs	
Changes caused by influence of alcohol	
Changes caused by dehydration	
Changes caused by malnutrition	
Changes caused by metabolic disorder	
Patient is unconscious	
Changes caused by a brain injury	
Learning disability	
Autism	
Personality Disorder	
Other? (Please give details)	VEC /NO
Is the impairment permanent? (If temporary, you may wish to defer the	YES/NO
MCA test until the patient has recovered OR if you feel that the person may	
regain capacity)	VEC/NO
If fluctuating, is this the most suitable time to carry out the assessment?	YES/NO
Do you have reasonable belief, that the impairment is severe enough, therefore may hinder the person from making a decision? (If No then the	YES/NO
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
MCA does not apply).	
PART B: CHECKLIST FOR YOU AS THE ASSESSOR (Setting the scene for the	
MCA Functional Test)	
Have you identified clearly and specifically the decision needed to be	YES/NO
made?	VEC /110
Have you been identified as the decision maker, either alone, or in	YES/NO
partnership with Social Services, or as part of a Multi-disciplinary team?	\(\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} =
Have you allowed enough time to carry out the assessment depending on	YES/NO
the complexity of the decision needed to be made?	

Did you give a comprehensive explanation as to why a Mental Capacity	YES/NO
Assessment was needed to the person being assessed and try to gain	113/110
consent?	
Are you satisfied that as the assessor, you have had adequate training and	YES/NO
have sufficient knowledge of the Mental Capacity Act, to carry out the	TES/NO
assessment?	
	VEC/NO
Are you satisfied that as the assessor, you fully understand the process and	YES/NO
implications; if you conclude the person does/does not have capacity?	V50/N0
Do you have the necessary detailed information to hand to ensure that the	YES/NO
patient is sufficiently supported with their decision making and you are	
able to adequately explain options and consequences of decisions? For	
example, have you ensured that the person has all the relevant	
information to make the decision ie: re: medical condition/prognosis;	
effects of medication; activities of daily living assessments,; details of care	
home; risks in returning home; care options etc?	_
As the assessor have you consulted with the necessary health care and	YES/NO
other professionals, also involved with the decision, and that they are in	
agreement of a Mental Capacity assessment?	
Have you considered whether or not the decision could be deferred to a	YES/NO
later date/time?	
Have you prepared a list of core questions to be asked, relating to the	YES/NO
decision to be made, in order to secure evidence?	
Are you able to explain the information in a way suitable for the person to	YES/NO
process it sufficiently enough, depending on the threshold of	
understanding needed to make the decision?	
Are you aware of any communication issues that the person may have, that	YES/NO
might make it difficult for them to communicate during making the	
decision? If so, have you taken the necessary steps to assist them with	
their communication needs? (For example, a speech therapist may need to	
be involved or interpreter; are visual aids present; pen and paper needed)	
PART C: CHECKLIST FOR THE PERSON BEING ASSESSED	
Is the test of capacity being carried out at the best possible time for the	YES/NO
individual, ie: taking into account effects of medication, whether person is	
more lucid at certain times of the day etc?	
Is the environment suitable for supporting/enabling the person to be	YES/NO
involved in the decision making process without undue distractions?	
Have any sensory deficits been minimised, for example, if the patient wears	YES/NO
a hearing aid, are they wearing one and if they wear glasses, are they to	
hand?	
Did you check if there were any cultural, ethnic or religious factors, which	YES/NO
should be taken into account in the decision making?	
If appropriate and you felt that somebody was needed/requested to be	YES/NO
present, in order to help the person make the decision (who could tell you	
how to best communicate with the person; ie:	
relative/friend/neighbour/advocate), were they invited to attend the	
assessment?	
Have steps been taken to ensure that the person being assessed has not	YES/NO
unduly been influenced or coerced into making their decision?	
Have you checked to see if there exists a statement or advanced decision of	YES/NO
the person's choices, related to the decision needed?	,
Have you sought to find out about the person's wishes, views, beliefs, prior	
, and the state of the period of the trop centers, prior	

Is there is a Lasting Power of Attorney or Deputy? Have you contacted them with regards to the decision? PART D: FUNCTIONAL TEST OF CAPACITY Were you able to engage the person and put them at their ease to make the decision? Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to compl	to conscitu, with responds to the decision to be made?	
Have you contacted them with regards to the decision? PART D: FUNCTIONAL TEST OF CAPACITY Were you able to engage the person and put them at their ease to make the decision? Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you	to capacity, with regards to the decision to be made?	VEC/NO
PART D: FUNCTIONAL TEST OF CAPACITY Were you able to engage the person and put them at their ease to make the decision? Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKUST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? VES/NC Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all po		1
Were you able to engage the person and put them at their ease to make the decision? Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the	Have you contacted them with regards to the decision?	YES/NO
the decision? Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKUST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the deci	PART D: FUNCTIONAL TEST OF CAPACITY	
Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the information; information given in bite size pieces if needed? Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHET) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making pr		YES/NO
Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision and why the decision needed to be taken at that point in time? Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLI	Did you explain the information in a way that was easy for the person to understand? For example, allowing them time to assimilate the	YES/NO
Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was only for a short time and they forget if afterwards)? Were you satisfied that the person could use or weigh up the information (eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CH	Were you satisfied that the person understood the nature of the decision	YES/NO
(eg: pros and cons) as part of the decision making process? Could the person communicate their decision in any way (ie: verbally, non-verbally or in their behaviour or actions)? PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	Were you satisfied that the person could retain the information, about the decision long enough to use it to make the decision, (even if this was	YES/NO
PART E: CHECKLIST AFTER MENTAL CAPACITY TEST Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	,	YES/NO
Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?		YES/NO
Did you reach a conclusion, whether the person had capacity or not, to make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?		
make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**, having examined the evidence given in their statements? Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?		\/EC/\/
Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties involved? Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented? Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	make that particular decision, based on the 'balance of probability'**,	YES/NO
Did you record your conclusion as the assessor, in a comprehensive, legible and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NO	Did you communicate the decision to the necessary persons/parties	YES/NO
and logical way? (using the recognised MCA form on Rio for BHFT) Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	Is the reason for testing capacity clearly documented?	YES/NO
Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else records the decision, you retain the responsibility for the decision made? Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	YES/NO
Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into consideration, especially in context of motive to make such a decision? Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	Do you understand that as the 'decision-maker', even if somebody else	YES/NO
Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person that the decision will affect? Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NO	Was the right to make an unwise or eccentric decision taken into	YES/NO
Have all the relevant parties been involved in the decision making and their views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's welfare? If you are unsure of the conclusion, relating to the decision which needs to be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties?	Have you considered the least restrictive options available with the person	YES/NO
be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or psychiatrist/consultant, has this been done? As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NO	views identified and considered, including those involved in the person's	YES/NO
As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision making process? Are you satisfied that your Mental Capacity Assessment would stand up to legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NO	be made, and there is a need to refer on to a psychologist; or	YES/NO
legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be settled? PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NO	As far as you aware, have all possible steps been taken to comply with the Mental Capacity Act and there has been no breach of the act in the decision	YES/NO
Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the relevant parties? YES/NC	legal scrutiny in The Court of Protection, were a dispute needed to be	YES/NO
relevant parties?	PART F: CHECKLIST IF CONCLUSION IS THE PERSON LACKS CAPACITY	
	Have you considered calling a 'Best Interests' meeting and inviting all the	YES/NO
	Have you considered the person's wishes and feelings?	YES/NO

Have you considered the least restrictive option?	YES/NO
Have you considered referring to an IMCA if the person has no close	YES/NO
relatives, friends or next of kin?	
If appropriate, have you considered applying for an authorisation for a	YES/NO
DOLs within a reasonable time span?	
Have all parties concerned agreed a plan forward?	YES/NO
Has a plan forward, next step, been documented?	YES/NO
Are there recommendations to empower and protect the person, through	YES/NO
the next stages of the process?	

^{*} Until the assessment is complete, you should always assume that the person has capacity to make the decision.

^{** &#}x27;Balance of Probability' - if a fact is to be proved, for example, whether a person does or does not have capacity, then on examination of the 'evidence presented' a conclusion should be reached and weighted accordingly, one way or the other, whether the person is more likely to have capacity than not have capacity to make that particular decision.