

Shropshire Independent Living Centre Service review

Carried out by ILP Ltd

2013

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 7 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 during this time has been consistent regarding client satisfaction, accessibility and value of the service.

The ILP questionnaire created in 2011 was modified slightly in 2012 to get feedback and gain information on specific service delivery aspects and again modified in 2013

Questionnaire used: (Appendix A)

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

Five areas were explored:-

- How people felt about the ILC service,

- Whether they were satisfied with the level of communication,
- If clients would be interested in electronic communication methods,
- Whether people valued having a copy of their consultation report and
- What comments/suggestions clients would offer in making improvements to the service.

Question 1:

In this section six statement choices were offered for random selection:

The first two 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 third choice aimed to establish whether people felt more aware of services and products available following their visit,

The fourth and fifth choice aimed to establish whether the quality of information received and signposting were good.

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

Question 2:

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

A second element offered space to add a reason for giving the chosen score.

Question 3:

Aimed to explore general attitudes and preferences regarding electronic communication methods.

Question 4:

Clearly asked if people found having a copy of the consultation report useful.

The fifth Question Invited comment or suggestions about how the service could be improved.

Review Process:

The Questionnaire was sent out to each person, 14 days after his or her consultation from 1st to the 31st November 2013. A stamped addressed envelope was included for return.

A letter explaining the questionnaire and informing of anonymity was included

(Appendix b)

Review Findings:

91 questionnaires were sent and 55 returned giving a response rate of 60%.

60% of the responses were from the Client 22% on behalf of a client and 18% did not complete the option section.

Question 1:- Six statements offered

A) The ILC visit was of no benefit - One person chose this response but the rest of their responses contradicted this: they were extremely satisfied and found the information/advice 'helpful' suggesting an error or misinterpretation of the question.

B) 44% felt that they now had a clear plan to resolve the experienced difficulties.

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 and therefore considering financing solutions privately.

C) 75% of the respondents felt that they were more aware of products and services available to them.

D) 87% felt that the quality of information they received was good.

E) 0% felt that the quality of information received was not helpful.

F) 45% felt that managing 'more independently' was a significant statement for them.

Question 2

85% of the respondents were extremely satisfied with communication between ILP and themselves.

97% of the extremely satisfied respondents gave reasons for giving this score and these mostly referred to staff being 'helpful', comments were made about staff being 'courteous', 'polite' and 'attentive' – one client stated that she was extremely satisfied because of the understanding way in which she was treated, another *"I was not made to feel inadequate because of my problem"* also *"The interviewer was very thoughtful and competent (taking notes)"*.

11% were fairly satisfied

67% of the fairly satisfied respondents commented on why they were fairly satisfied with communication;

Reference was made to staff being 'helpful', one respondent stated *'dealt with issues suggested by practice nurse, suggested I may ask for a home visit in future, sent no details of other products than this'* - another *'I already had insight into my problem'*

Possible problems with fulfilling client expectations may be evident and can be expected due to multiple factors – however all clients made positive statements relating to their visit in question 1 and would hopefully access the ILP service again.

0% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

0% were fairly dissatisfied and

4% were extremely dissatisfied.

One client who chose extremely dissatisfied gave the main reason for giving this score – *"she was very helpful"* the other – *"the main reason is that my disability is a draw back for myself"* - which indicates that the question may have been misinterpreted.

Question 3:

7% of the Clients who responded to the questionnaire communicated with ILP electronically

11% did not complete the question

82% did not communicate electronically.

Preferences:

5% would have preferred to communicate electronically

2% stated 'maybe' and 93% indicated that they did not wish to use this communication method.

7% preferred emailing, 15% preferred Face time - It was considered that people's interpretation of 'Face time' most likely indicated that they preferred Face to Face interviewing rather than IOS App which the questionnaire referred to.

Question 4:

18% did not have a consultation copy, 7% made no response to this question, 4% could not recall having a copy and 71% found having a copy of their consultation report useful.

Reports are sent to clients to clarify agreed outcomes and action plans.

Question 5:

Random comments or suggestions received to improve the service were varied – 64% of the respondents made a comment. Consistent statements included how the service was

excellent and needed no improvement, 'helpful' and 'informative' were words commonly used.

Comments made included being *"treated like a human being and not a statistic"*, one person was *"waiting for over 4 weeks for a rail"* which they felt did not reflect positively on the service, another person commented about their equipment delivery and how although the driver was 'helpful' and 'well-mannered' he *"seemed under some pressure due to his workload"*.

One person commented on how they were not previously aware of ILP and felt that they *"needed to speak to someone personally as they did not know what to ask on emails"*.

Suggestions included – having *"home visits"*, *"getting more money from central government to make the service more user friendly"*, and *"a larger car park"*.

Conclusion:

Considerations about whether ILP could develop or improve electronic communications with Shropshire clients indicates that consistent offering of this type of communication method would result in 10-15 % take up and there is anticipation that this may steadily increase in the future.

Regarding service improvement suggestions; ILP informs clients of services that offer home visits where eligible and specifically if people are unable to attend the ILC.

The concept of how an increase in funding would make the 'service more user friendly' would have been interesting to pursue and may contribute towards the development of a new question for 2014.

Car park problems are currently being addressed –Blue badge spaces are consistently available.