IIII IIII IIII KING'S HEALTH PARTNERS

An Academic Health Sciences Centre for London

KING'S **IMPROVEMENT** SCIENCE

Sharing the patient's story: codesigning primary care discharge summaries for patients leaving the ICU

Dr Suzanne Bench

South London and Maudsley

NHS Foundation Trust











NHS Foundation Trust

Hippocrates (1849)

The physician "must not only be prepared to do what is right [himself] but also make the patient...cooperate"

Public and Patient Involvement (PPI)

 Research carried out 'with' or 'by' members of the public rather than 'to', 'about' or 'for' them (INVOLVE).

Denegri (2015)



Going the extra mile:

Improving the nation's health and wellbeing through public involvement in research

Project aims

To:

- Co-design an ICU-primary care transfer of care communication intervention and implementation strategy.
- Implement the behaviour change intervention, which requires ICU staff to provide GP staff and patients with a critical care discharge summary).
- Evaluate the implementation of the ICU staff behaviour change intervention.
- Evaluate the model of service user involvement utilised for the project.

Figure I: Overview of Project Design



Participatory Research and Quality improvement

- Geared towards planning and conducting projects with those people whose life-world is affected
- Comprises a range of methodological approaches and technique
- Moves beyond a model of service user consultation

Determining the research question and designing the study

- Use of previously collated experience data (Bench *et al*. 2014)
- National focus group study (Bench et al. 2016)
- Project steering group includes service users and providers
- Work with ICU steps Charity trustees
- INVOLVE advice



Evaluation of a critical care discharge information pack (Pilot study, V3) 29.03.2011

TE

An exploration of the information General Practitioner (GP) staff require to successfully coordinate the rehabilitation of critically ill patients after hospital discharge (Bench et al. 2016)



Co-designing the intervention and implementation strategy

- Draft prototype
- Service user and provider advisory groups and researchers will co-design
 - An ideal ICU-primary care transfer of care communication template
 - behaviour change techniques, which will support implementation of the intervention
- Personas-pretend users of discharge summary
- Scenario based development-mocked up narrative descriptions about people and experiences

- Co-design addresses the problem and a solution
- Co-production embeds the solution into reality
- Co-creation is identified as the way in which both of these are addressed





Source: new economics foundation

Experience-Based Co-design (King's Fund)

Observe clinical areas - gain an understanding of what is happening on a daily basis

Interview staff, patients and families - exploring niggles

Edit interviews into 25-30 minute film of themed chapters

Hold staff feedback event - agree areas staff are happy to share with patients

Hold patient feedback event - show the film to patients. Agree improvement areas

Hold joint patient-staff event to share experiences and agree areas for improvement

Run co-design groups to meet over 4-6 month period to work on improvements

Hold a celebration event



"shift the balance of power...transforming the role of the user from that of an informant to a legitimate and acknowledged participant in the design process"

(Donetto et al. 2013)

Challenges/Limitations

- Not everyone has the desire or capacity to be an active participant
- Not always possible nor desirable to share power and responsibility equitably
- Resistant healthcare culture

Batalten et al. (2015)

Other involvement activities

- Review of study documents
- Service users to facilitate a focus group discussion (after training) with the internal service user stakeholder advisory group at the end of the project
- Disseminating project findings through codelivered oral presentations and co-authored publications

The nature and extent of service user involvement in critical care research and service improvement; a scoping review of the literature

Bench S., Eassom E. & Poursanidou K. (2016b)



Research

- Locock et al. (2014a, 2014b): ethnographic evaluation of an Accelerated experience based co-design (AEBCD) project in 2 adult ICUs in the UK
- Trajkovski et al. (2015a, 2015b): Qualitative evaluation of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) in a neonatal ICU in Australia
- Nasenbeny et al. (2014) questionnaire survey evaluating impact of PPI on service improvement

Overview of findings

- Diverse projects- Most data related to service improvement rather than research and all designed by academics or service providers
- Limited data evaluating PPI, poor reporting of processes and inconsistent use of terminology
- Difficult to determine if projects outputs would have occurred without service user input or the extent of impact service users actually had
- Scarcity of information makes it difficult to fully understand and appreciate PPI in critical care service improvement and research projects and its likely impact

Levels of involvement (Denegri 2015)

- User-led/user-controlled: where research/SI is actively driven, directed and managed (controlled) by service users and/or family members
- Collaboration: when service users/carers are actively and collaboratively involved in research or service development as members of research or project implementation teams, as co-researchers, co-implementers and co-authors of academic publications
- Consultation: when service users are consulted, asked for advice, and/or provide information that is used to inform decision making by others in research or service development

Which service users to involve and how to do so?

- Huge variation in number of people involved in projects
- Limited details regarding
 demographic characteristics predominantly white British
- Involvement based on 'convenience'

"The hardest challenge for us has been finding people for individual projects"

Derbyshire (no date)

 Same people commonly involved in projects

Bench et al. (2016b)

Processes

- Time involved (1 day-15 months)
- Payment/incentives: often unpaid

"travel expenses were reimbursed, and lunch and refreshments were provided at meetings"

Locock et al. (2014b)

"given a xmas presenť"

Hamil & Heslop (2010)

"sample patients at different points in their journey, but...[not to] actively seek to reproduce our local demographics"

Wilcock et al. (2003)

Barriers & Facilitators

"we need to develop the skills to effectively work with families to get the best possible outcomes" "a physical and mental space that encouraged dialogue, built trust and created links between health professionals and parents..."

Trajkovski et al. (2015)

"conflict and tension often relating to issues of power..."

Robert et al. (2015)

Key points

- PPI is strongly endorsed by the DH
- Participatory approaches shift the balance of power, but their impact and the most effective methods are currently unclear
- Our project uses and evaluates a participatory approach adding to the limited body of improvement/implementation science knowledge

| | IIII IIII IIII KING'S HEALTH PARTNERS

KING'S **IMPROVEMENT SCIENCE**

An Academic Health Sciences Centre for London



Any questions? suzanne.bench@kcl.ac.uk



Guy's and St Thomas' NHS

NHS Foundation Trust







