

Independent Living Centre Service review  
Carried out by ILP Ltd  
Sept/Oct 2011.

**Introduction:**

The Independent Living Centre (ILC) Service is currently led by Health Profession Council registered Occupational Therapists who provide the service alongside regularly supervised Trusted Assessors – the service is mainly used by people living with long term conditions, carers supporting people with dementia and older people experiencing mobility loss.

Our aim is to: -

- A) Provide an excellent quality service that meets the needs of the people it serves.
- B) Meet the requirements of service level provision standards at a Local and National level.

**Background:**

The Independent Living Partnership has annually reviewed its ILC service for the past 5 years, methods used have included; drop in sessions, focus groups, questionnaires and the use of a standardised Occupational Performance Measure. The most successful response rate and useful feedback has proven to be with questionnaire use; information received has been consistent regarding client satisfaction, accessibility and value of the service. **(Appendix A)**

A newly designed questionnaire was used in 2011 to get feedback and gain information on specific service delivery aspects.

**Questionnaire used: (Appendix B)**

Participants were given the opportunity to respond as either 'a client' or carer 'on behalf of a client'

Five areas were explored:-

Question 1:

Five options regarding 'ease of making an appointment' were given ranging from Extremely Dissatisfied to Extremely Satisfied.

Question 2:

In this section seven statement choices were offered for random selection: Three choices were given to establish whether visiting the ILC had made any difference to a person managing what they perceived to be their initial difficulty.

The fourth choice aimed to establish whether information giving and signposting were significantly received.

Fifth choice, aimed to get feedback regarding the Direct Payment Option.

The final two choices asked whether a person felt that their independence level or quality of life has improved.

Question 3:

Five options regarding 'satisfaction with ILC visit' were given ranging from Extremely Satisfied to Extremely Dissatisfied.

Question 4:

A qualitative data section requesting reasoning for 'satisfaction with ILC visit' score was also available.

Question 5:

The final option considered aspects of Social Return and what actual differences the ILC visit had made in a persons life.

**Review Process:**

The Questionnaire was sent out to each person, 14 days after his or her consultation from 14<sup>th</sup> September 2011 – 12<sup>th</sup> October 2011. A stamped addressed envelope was included for return.

A letter explaining the questionnaire and informing of anonymity was included (**Appendix C**)

**Review Findings: (Appendix D)**

75 questionnaires sent – 39 returned = 52% response

90% responses from Client

10% responses on behalf of Client

Question 1:

'Ease of making an appointment'

Most clients were extremely satisfied with the ease of making their appointment. (Figure 1)

Some people felt that they were fairly satisfied with their appointment making; neither satisfied nor satisfied and extreme dissatisfaction were also experienced.

Question 2:

Whether ILC visit has made a difference (Questions - a,b,c)

(Figure 2)

No person chose that the ILC visit was 'no benefit at all'.

People who felt that their difficulty remained 'the same' were identified as waiting for adaptation OT contact or not eligible for provision using Fair Access to Care (FACS) eligibility criteria therefore considering financing solutions privately.

57% of the people who responded to this statement were satisfied with their ILC visit, 29% were neither satisfied nor satisfied, 14% were dissatisfied.

People who had a 'clear plan to resolve their difficulty' were considered to have been either referred on to adaptation OT service or not eligible for equipment/adaptation provision or again, considering financing solutions privately.

100% of the respondents who chose this statement were satisfied with their ILC visit.

'Was information giving and signposting relevant?' (Question – d)

74% responded – this was the most commonly chosen statement – information giving and signposting are clearly significantly received.

'Was direct payment option valued?' (Question – e)

26% response indicated that this was important to ILC visitors, for some people this would not have been discussed i.e. if equipment not being considered a solution, if not FACS eligible.

Increase in independence and or quality of life? (Question – f)

59% felt that managing more independently was a significant statement for them.

'Quality of life improvement?' (Question – g)

38% felt that improved quality of life was significant for them.

### Question 3:

Satisfied/dissatisfied with visit?

(Figure 3)

The majority of ILP clients were extremely satisfied with their visit. (Figure 3)

One person commented on the length of time they had to wait for an appointment, which was considered long.

### Question 4:

Why satisfied/dissatisfied?

Comments related to being extremely satisfied mostly included 'helpfulness' of the staff. One person felt extremely satisfied because they were more aware of services and products that are available for support.

Comments related to being fairly satisfied were that the visit was 'useful', one person stated that "It s too soon to say more, It may be better when I know what a can/can't afford".

People who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied commented on their ineligibility for provision of seating and uncertainties around self purchase affordability, one person was waiting for 'First Point of Contact' to phone back and take referral for a home visit.

One person who was fairly dissatisfied made no comment as to why.

### Question 5:

Considering aspects of Social Return and what actual difference the ILP visit had made in a persons life, resulted in a 67% response rate. The majority related to people being able to:

- walk around their environments without fear of falling 35%
- manage their personal care 35%
- manage kitchen tasks 8%
- manage sleeping 4%

8% stated that having knowledge of products and services was significantly different for them.

12% seemed to anticipate change as they waited for a community OT visit and possible adaptation.

**Conclusion:**

Specific question responses gave good insight into clients' perception of the Independent Living Partnership's ILC service. Many people made specific comment that they were reassured by the fact that they knew who to contact should further difficulties arise.

Information giving and signposting were clearly significantly received– ILC procedures link with statutory and voluntary services; relevant referrals are made and people are informed of support that is available to them.

Increased independence was also significantly identified – ILC assessment focus is on identifying and enabling a person to achieve their aim.

100% of the respondents who felt that 'quality of life' was significantly improved also chose the statement regarding 'managing more independently'.

**Actions planned:**

ILP plans to explore variations in the experience of satisfaction with appointment making to establish why some people feel only 'fairly satisfied' whilst others are 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied' and some extremely 'dissatisfied'.

People who make an appointment with the ILC are offered the opportunity to take up cancellations if they demonstrate dissatisfaction with the length of time they need to wait before their appointment – reducing waiting time is an area that ILP would like to address, at present resource limitations are an influence.

Exploration of what people's pre conceived expectations of the ILC service may be and how this translates into satisfaction with the service is planned for the next annual review.