

Independent Living Partnership Service Review - 2009.

The ILP aims to get annual feedback about the service it offers – information gathered is used to develop and improve the service to maximise its efficiency and meet the expectations of people who use it.

Three methods were used to gather this information:

- Feedback Meetings
- Anonymously written feedback forms
- Use of a clinical outcome measure tool – the Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (COPM)

239 people were seen during this six week period and this included people seen at satellite clinics and also Manual Handling advice/assessments.

Feedback Meeting and Anonymous feedback:

140 (59%) Clients who contacted and visited the Independent Living Centre (ILC) between 1st September and 8th October were written to and invited to attend feedback meetings. They were given the option of giving anonymous written feedback and a form was enclosed for this purpose (Appendix 1).

5 Professionals who made use of the service were written to and 2 responded:-

Both gave positive comment-

“An experience of extremely effective joint working across agencies” (NESIT)

“I have found the staff extremely helpful, informative and accommodating and always willing to contact a carer if necessary – thank you very much and keep up the good work” (Shropshire Service for Younger people with Dementia)

- Manual handling advice/assessment:
- 30 people were seen – 20 letters were sent and 7 (37%) responded:-
- 5 rated their intervention as excellent
- 2 rated their intervention as good
- 0 rated poor.
- Comments received included –
- Quick response – *“thanks for phoning me back promptly (same morning)”*
- Most of the clients had been seen on more than one occasion and noted appreciation for their ongoing support – *“Advice and support has been helpful on each occasion, she is always very pleasant and encouraging me to be independent where I can.”*
- Independent Living Centre:
- 209 people used the service 115 letters sent and
- 37 (32%) responded
- 33 rated their intervention as excellent

- 4 rated their intervention as good
- 0 rated poor
- Comments received included – how helpful and informative people’s experience had been - *“sound and important information given, very impressed”*.
- Appreciation of ‘understanding’ and ‘listening’ was referred to specifically by eight people.
- Informed choice – people felt that information given was valuable.
- Reassurance that the service is available - *“I will certainly use your service again if required”*- *“I would be happy to contact again for any help or information”*.
-
- One person commented on having to wait 6 weeks for an appointment – less of a wait was preferred.

One person commented on the possibility of being offered a cancellation appointment.

ILC Feedback meeting:

Written feedback was included and shared in discussion in the Feedback Meeting.

8 people agreed to attend the feedback meeting – 1 person attended.

Feedback from the meeting was generally positive.

Questions asked were:

Was the ILC service what you expected?

Yes – similar service had been experienced in Cambridgeshire.

Which part did you think was less impressive?

The ethos of needing to be “assessed” – *“it’s as if people don’t believe me”*

Did you feel that the service was accessible?

Accessibility was good - described as *“not a battle”*

3-4 week wait for an appointment was seen as acceptable.

How important do you find having a consultation copy?

Appreciated and valued.

Is there any way that you feel the service could be improved? How do you feel we could add to the service?

Advertising and raising the ILC service profile was seen to be important.

Do you think that a drop in service would be more valuable than an appointment?

Drop in service was not preferred – dedicated appointment time valued.

COPM Outcome and Telephone Enquiry

COPM

The outcome measure tool – COPM (Appendix 2) was used with 36 people during this period to give an indication of whether people felt that following intervention their experienced problem was improved – they were telephoned 6 weeks after their visit and asked for a second measure to enable us to establish whether their performance/satisfaction had improved following ILC intervention.

18 (50%) completed a full reading - all gave a positive improvement in either performance satisfaction or both.

18 (50%) did not have a second reading recorded.

Summary:

The Meeting gave us very positive feedback and ideas for future development which included:

- Offering people the opportunity to take up cancellations.
- Further consideration of a drop in service.

2010 review plan will aim to include more of the people who received advice/information only.

More effective outcome measurement tools will be explored.