

DAT Support Staff – Training & Development Programme

1. Reviewing Drug/Alcohol Services – “Context & Practice”

Report of Event Held on

18th December 2001

Stirling Royal Infirmary

Introduction

This event, the first in what will hopefully become a series of Training & Development Days arose out of a need for DAT Support Staff across Scotland to meet up and discuss the difference experiences they had within the area of Reviewing Services.

Aims of the Event

The aims of the day were:

To establish a framework whereby reviewing services can take place

To identify the different methods available to review services in Action Team areas.

The Objectives were to enable participants to (have)

1. Clarified the role Action Teams have in commissioning and monitoring services
2. Have viewed and discussed a model of how all client-based services within an area can be structured.
3. Identified rationale for service review
4. Discussed the pros and cons of different methods of service review
5. Identified good practice in implementing service review mechanisms

The event was organised and facilitated by DAT Support Staff and comprised a mixture of presentations and workshops.

23 DAT Support Staff attended the event. After the presentations participants were split into one of three workshops to discuss two specific aspects of Service Review.

Presentation One

Elisabeth C. Hill
Strategy Co-ordinator
Tayside Drug & Alcohol Action Teams

We seem to have been involved in reviewing Tayside services from the dawn of time. I should make it clear from the outset that in Tayside terms all the reviews have included services provided by health, social work and the voluntary sector.

On the back of the work of drawing up the Mental Health Strategy a multi agency, multi disciplinary group undertook an internal review of alcohol services in late 1997 followed fairly swiftly with a similar exercise for drug services, both reports being published simultaneously in September 1999.

The internal review of alcohol services made 18 recommendations while the one for drug services ended up with 34. Of these, a fair number have been acted upon but over the 12 months that followed publication it became clear that little or no progress was being or, to my mind, would be made to implement the major changes that had been proposed.

These proposals included the move to more integrated working between Social Work and Health and between alcohol and drug services. In addition, the Drug Services Review had recommended the de-centralisation of the Tayside Drug Problems Service and an increase in the range of services then currently on offer to problem drug users in Tayside – both of which were effectively stonewalled by workers and left un-addressed by senior management.

In March 2001 the Tayside Alcohol and Drug Alliance, an inter-agency forum of strategic policy makers and commissioners, commissioned an external review of drug problems services in Tayside. The review was commissioned from Forth Valley Primary Care NHS Trust and carried out by a small, multi-disciplinary team comprising a consultant psychiatrist, a clinical services manager with a nursing background, a social worker and a GP.

Terms of Reference & Remit of Review Team

The Forth Valley Review Team will carry out a comprehensive review of drug treatment & intervention services in Tayside – including all 3 local authority areas – Dundee, Perth & Kinross and Angus.

The aim of the review will be to:

- Assess how effectively the current range of services delivers equitable and inclusive care and treatment services to drug users in Tayside, and how far these now meet the requirements set out in the internal review of services in 1999
- Examine progress in, and barriers to, implementing the recommendations of that review and explore options for overcoming these
- Make recommendations
- Report to the commissioners of the review by end 31st July 2001

The review will focus primarily on key services providing treatment and care – Tayside Drug Problem Service (TDPS) & its associated GP Shared Care scheme; 3 Social Work Department Drug Teams; Tayside Alcohol Service; Tayside Council on Alcohol.

A comprehensive list of relevant stakeholders has been supplied by Tayside Drug Co-ordinator. These will also be invited to participate in the Review process

The Review Team starts from the premise that individual services should not be considered in isolation but should be examined within the broad contextual framework within which they sit. This will include strategic & operational interfaces:

- Interfaces with the strategic planning process (e.g. DATs, Alliance)
- Interfaces with operational line management (e.g. TDPS/Trust/Health Board)
- Interfaces with other services (specialist & generic)

This review will incorporate:

1. Information Gathering – all current reviews/reports/figures

- ISD information & trends
- Tayside Corporate Action Plans
- Revisit the September 1999 internal review – especially the key issues & recommendations
 - ⇒ Determine to what extent that review has been realised
 - ⇒ Identify & explore those actions not realised
- Other sources of information as identified/required eg Harm Reduction Service review, Users' Survey

2. Information Gathering – Stakeholder interviews

- Views of all stakeholders regarding: what services do; who they see; how effective they are and whether there has been progress since the last internal review
 - ⇒ Examine supporting (or otherwise) documentation/figures
 - ⇒ Community & Users' views to be incorporated

3. Information Gathering - Local Service Profile & comparison with "standard"[e.g. MEL 1997(77)] /other DAT areas

- Range of local services
- Service gaps
- Interface arrangements

4. Service User Mapping & Matching of Services to Need (to be discussed/agreed)

- Examine sample from caseloads to determine care process/caseload management **OR**
- Examine process used locally to determine appropriateness of user in service & progress in dealing with drug problem

5. Collate information

6. Explore options for dealing with the issues identified & make recommendations

7. Report to commissioners by end June 2001

Progress to Date

The external review explored a number of sensitive issues with different stakeholders with the expectation that its publication would facilitate the an environment in which all stake holders could tackle these issues in a positive way in order to achieve the goal of providing accessible, comprehensive and cost-effective treatment and support services for drug users.

The review team visited Tayside on a number of occasions over the next five months, finally completing the preliminary work in the late summer. Their report, which recommended a major redesign of drug services in Tayside, was circulated to everyone who had contributed in any way to the review process and also to a wide circle of other interested groups and individuals with an interest in drug services.

Having given people time to consider the content of the report a stakeholder event was organised, which attracted around 90 representatives of drug services, including a number of service users. The purpose of the event was two-fold; in the formal presentation sessions it gave people the opportunity to hear at first-hand from all four members of the review team who presented and enlarged on their findings over the course of the previous six months and, in addition, the workshop sessions were the first steps in the process of addressing the recommendations that had been made.

A report of the stakeholder event was circulated to everyone who attended and formed the basis for a half-day development event designed to move the process of re-design of services forward. Two of the major criticisms to come out of the review were the lack of leadership and strategic vision for drug services locally and the lack of service user involvement at all levels.

The most important things that have emerged from the process to date has been the acknowledgement that the responsibility for service redesign will be in the hands of the three Alcohol and Drug Action Teams in Tayside and the identification of the need to put in place appropriate support to allow service users to participate fully in the work that lies ahead

Presentation Two

Iona Colvin
Principal Officer Addictions Glasgow City Council

GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL REVIEW OF ADDICTION SERVICES (PROVIDED)

Review Identifies

Current level of need
Service provision and uptake
Future core services required

What is the need ?

12,5000 -15,000 problematic drug misusers
95% concentration in areas of highest deprivation
85% of 1999 drug deaths in areas of highest deprivation

Restructuring

- Service have been developed:-
 - Piecemeal
 - North / South divide
 - structures within service vary

Addiction Services should

- Focus on Treatment & Care within communities
- Offering support,
 - to children & families
 - to criminal justice
 - to health

Core Services Functions

Direct Referrals (53% self-referral rate)
Assessment, care planning + management
Community involvement

Resources reallocated according to core functions & needs

Varies from 16.7% in North to 3.88% South East

- Target groups will include
 - drug misusers
 - alcohol misusers with complex needs
 - carers

ESHARA

Boundaries to be considered
Structure of service
Network of agencies

Financial Framework

- Fieldwork budget for staff £2.8m includes funding from:-
 - health (£750k)
 - SIP's (£162k)
 - Social Inclusion Budget (£417)

CONSULTATION

May - July 2000

Staff, service users, families, elected members, health & voluntary agencies

Briefings, meetings, SDF

SERVICE STRUCTURE

General agreement on structure

Re-distribution south to north based on current resources

Access to services (service users)

Addiction Teams

Linked to area services
Nine teams
Core functions
Range 10 - 20 staff
Managed through Community Care

Health Interface

GP Drug Misuse Clinic Scheme
WRHS, community & Rottenrow clinic
GDPS, developing practice
Alcohol and Drug Directorate
Link to North, South, South-west, North-west, East
Dual Diagnosis team - North

Reviews in Glasgow

Methadone review
Services to women & children
Integrated Service development
Purchased Services

Lessons

Clarity about process

Realistic about timescale - but not forever!

Resource allocation

Communication - takes time - but crucial

Workshop One

Local Context Setting

The purpose of the workshop is to enable participants to review whether they have the appropriate structures in place to undertake a review of services.

Questions asked to prompt discussion were:

- How many of you have undertaken a service review within past 18 months?
- If yes, to what extent were the recommendations implemented?
- Is the Action team viewed locally as having the collective responsibility for effective & efficient service provision?
- What bodies/groups inform the Action team as to its decision-making? Do these groups have the appropriate representation and ability to make the recommendations required?
- Is there a common understanding within the area, as to the range of interventions/services needed, to respond the impact drug use has locally? (this includes education, treatment, enforcement, rehabilitation etc)
- To what extent are the service providers involved in any of the above structures?

Participants were allocated to one of three groups and all were asked to discuss the questions above.

Each workshop was asked to summarise the discussion with **four** main points.

Feedback from Workshop 1

Workshop A

- People at different stages of development
- Vision – plan – goals – action (EIU evaluation)
- The need to be clear about what expect review to deliver
- Structures are subject to change
- User and community involvement, Scottish Enterprise, SPS, Employment Service

General Comments on Event and Organisation

- Achievable
 - Worthwhile
 - The need to focus Do-ables
 - Process
 - Coming together
 - Group work
 - Ongoing task requiring national context
- ↓
- Possible job for EIU/DAT Association
- Positive outcomes
 - Facility + lunch Balance talks/groups about right

Workshop B

- Some areas - service review of individual services
- DATs asked what should monies be spent on?
 - Mapping exercise of current provision required

Functioning of DATs can be influence by personalities of members
Some have more collective responsibilities than others.

Forums

- Variety of structures and functions of forums and reporting procedures to DATs
- Service providers feature heavily in some DAT structures, question of whether they are then always able to make impartial decisions.
- Service users are not as well represented.

Things gained

- *How others have experience/dealt with common problems*
- *Helpful to take a step back to look at things more objectively*

Workshop C

The local political circumstances within the DAT area and the effect this has on decision making. This raised further questions as to how elected members were involved and at what stage and the number of local authorities in the DAT area and the political differences between them.

Four Main Points:

1. Co-ordinating structure needs to meet requirements of the local area and national strategy.
2. Political accountability needs to be built into the structure.
3. Accept and embrace a bottom-up approach
4. Clear vision – clear, shared strategic vision within the action team structure

Realisation from workshop participants of the:

Commonality of problems

And suggestion made to

Share papers in future.

Feedback from Workshop 2

Internal, External or Some Other Beast!

The purpose of this workshop was to explore the advantages and disadvantages of the different approaches explained in the earlier presentations.

Questions to use as prompts

- What are the key features of each type of review
- Is there a third or fourth.... way ?
- How would you / your DAT decide which approach is most suitable for their purpose?
- What is the purpose of Service Review and how explicit can this be?
- Are there different outcomes for different parties/stakeholders?
- How can you ensure that the Service Review actually makes a difference?
- What can go wrong and how can you stop it?

Participants returned to the same groups they were in for Workshop One. All groups were asked to discuss the questions above.

Each workshop was asked to summarise the discussion with **four** main points.

Workshop A

- Clear specification – competencies (mandated) – based on need
- Context of review – “best fit”
- Inclusive of all stakeholders (objective)

Internal _____ External

The service review process can take place at a number of points along this line

Workshop B

Why conduct a Service Review? (answers suggested)

- If context has changed how has the service changed
- Stocktaking
- Make decisions that are better informed
- If identified problems – need to look at that
- Do services meet needs
- Reality check
- Identify good practice (what works)
- If a service is set up to do something – has their aims been met
- A rolling programme to continually improve and adapt services
- Look at what services do – is there overlap
- Prevent duplication in some areas and gaps in others
- Enable services to change service delivery to meet need
- Review should not be the end of the process

Workshop C

1. Involvement of service providers – clarification of commissioners roles and that of providers
2. Clear at outset of intended purpose and convey this purpose to all parties
3. Realistic timescale for process
4. Credibility of “review team” – check it with those being reviewed and other parties

The following topics have been agreed for future events –

Training 20th February & Corporate Action Planning 10th April

Have you any other suggestions for such events?

Suggestions for future events

- User participation
- Commissioning
- Joint Futures
- New Bill
- User involvement, forums, engaging with communities
- Working with children in drug misusing families following on from final 'Getting our Priorities Right' document
- Research and information issues
- How each DAT works in their area
- How will they implement alcohol
- Evaluation and monitoring
- Communications and media strategy

Conclusion

General Points

The participants clearly felt that events such as this one are a far more productive use of meeting time than more agenda lead meetings. One of the oft –mentioned advantages of more agenda driven meetings is that they allow for last minute changes to the content of the meeting.

However allowing such last minute changes (often coming under the ubiquitous heading AOB) can have a detrimental effect on the value of the meeting. The reasons for this are many.

- 1) Members are unprepared for the topics and therefore often feel unable to participate fully
- 2) AOB is usually taken at the end of the meeting when members are already thinking of leaving (particularly if the meeting is running late or they have along journey to embark on)
- 3) Too often it results in topics which should have been main agenda items being discussed in a hurried fashion due to inadequate planning of the agenda or the members inability to influence the agenda in time.

Specific to the topic

Service Review is clearly an area of work within the remit of DAT's. However the reason for wanting to conduct such a potentially lengthy, time-consuming and unpredictable piece of work are often not thought through.

The increased accountability of DAT's make it even more important the services supported by the DAT are functioning at their optimum ability. There is an increased and increasing need for stakeholders to understand what a service does. It is no longer adequate for it to be assumed that the service is providing the appropriate interventions to the appropriate people within a reasonable time-frame and cost. Likewise the sheer range of different services both specialist and generic make it even more important for the differences between them to be easily and readily understood by potential clients and professionals.

The most consistent observations made by participants were:

Each DAT area might have a different structure but they all have the same job to do. Therefore it is less important to understand structural differences but more important that DAT's and DAT members have a shred understanding as to their role and responsibilities.

It is very difficulty to conduct a service review without a clear service specification/ contract /service level agreement. This is an area that can be improved particularly with experiences of joint commissioning.

There is a need for commitment to see through the whole process, right to the monitoring of the implementation of recommendations. Failure to do so results in increased resistance to future attempts at service review. Reassessment of all stakeholders commitment to the process and outcomes should be reviewed at regular intervals.

The decision to use an internal or external review team/process is less important than the commitment of all stakeholders to see the process through.

Where an external team is used they need to command the respect of the service(s) being reviewed.

Regular feedback to all parties - service providers, review team, commissioners, DAT, forum etc is essential for on-going commitment to the process.

It is difficult to engage parties in the process if they do not perceive any personal benefit from participation.

No service funded from public money has the "right" to continue to exist if no benefit from its existence can be adequately demonstrated.

The process of arranging and conducting a service review can be a positive experience. Particularly when it is as inclusive as possible.

Delegates at DAT Meeting 18 Dec 2001

Name		DAT Region
Linda	Auchterlonie	Dundee City
Grace	Ball	Grampian
Tish	Carter	Moray
Iona	Colvin	Glasgow
Catherine	Evans	West Lothian
Brian	Gardner	Highland
Sharon	Hackney	Ayrshire & Arran
Marie	Hayes	Lanarkshire
Lis	Hill	Tayside
Rita	Keyte	Fife
Jennifer	Lee	Dumfries & Galloway
Marion	Logan	Forth Valley
Stevie	Lydon	Argyle & Clyde
Mike	McCarron	Glasgow
Hazel	Morrell	East Lothian
Julie	Murray	Borders
Mark	O'Donnell	West Lothian
Leona	Paget	Forth Valley
Alison	Patterson	Lanarkshire
Susan	Somerville	Perth & Kinross
Karyn	Tait	Orkney
Valerie	Tallon	Lanarkshire
Anita	Dufton	Forth Valley