

Quality Improvement: The Power of Behavioural Change in Involvement

Ms Geetika Singh, Dr Mehtab Ghazi Rahman*, Mr Isaac Obeng, Ms Lucy Palmer and Ms Janet Seale

Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.418

Aims.

Aim:

80% of Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWL) QI projects will have meaningful Service User & Carer involvement by August 2023 (baseline was 46%).

Background:

Service user and carer (SU&C) involvement is increasingly recognised as integral to healthcare improvement efforts. However, despite its many benefits, the meaningful involvement of service users and carers remains a challenge.

Thus, it is necessary to get an in-depth understanding of the barriers and enablers to embedding involvement in improvement practice at the individual, service and organisational levels. With this understanding and staff can then co-produce evidence-informed behaviour change interventions to improve SU&C involvement.

Patient representation and lived experience

This improvement work embraces a full and continuous partnership with SU&Cs.

SU&C worked with CNWL staff in the conception, execution, delivery and dissemination of this work including EbE Improvement Forum.

They, thus, serve as integral members of the project team where they provide valuable input based on their lived experiences and perspectives to help shape the direction of the work. As equal partners, it also helps foster a culture of mutual respect, collaboration, and trust between all the parties involved.

Methods. This work adopts the COM-B model. The approach to conduct semi-structured interviews (interview questions were based on COM-B model and behavioural change wheel) with frontline healthcare staff and SU&Cs. The interviews gave insights on the barriers and facilitators to SU&C involvement in healthcare improvement work.

This then generated operational-level and actionable change ideas to guide tailored strategies for enhancing involvement capabilities, widening involvement opportunities and enabling motivations using the model for Improvement. These change ideas were then co-tested with SU&C using the Model for Improvement approach.

This systematic approach enabled a cultural shift towards collaborative partnerships between healthcare staff and SU&C to contribute to the service improvement.

Measurement of improvement

1. Qualitative data to understand enablers and barriers to involvement in improvement work.
2. Percentage of all QI projects (registered on Life QI and scoring 1 or more on IHI Project Score) that have a SU&C involvement.

Results.

Effects of changes

Staff and SU&C interviews identified the key barriers as inadequate capability (lack of understanding and skills), limited opportunities (leadership, resources, access) and insufficient motivation (discomfort, inability, time limitations). Enablers included appreciating diverse perspectives, leadership support and buy-in, established processes, valuing insights and patient empowerment.

The outcome measure also showed an increase in the number of improvement projects at CNWL that have SU&C involvement from 46% to 80%.

Conclusion.

Lesson Learnt:

This work has shown that by bringing multi-disciplinary staff and SU&Cs together generates cognitive diversity to the learning to drive improvement and sustain the gains. Furthermore, partnership working helped to create and establish learning culture within the healthcare service.

Message to others:

1. Strong executive sponsorship helps to drive involvement across the organisation.
2. By bringing staff and SU&Cs together generates cognitive diversity to the learning to drive improvement.
3. Using well-known and established behavioural change model, such as COM-B model, helped to identify, design and synthesize behaviour change interventions.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

Managing Comorbid Eating Disorders and Autism Spectrum Conditions: An Eden Unit Quality Improvement Project

Dr Dharmesh Rai* and Ms Lily Davida

NHS Grampian, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.419

Aims. Currently, there is an absence of clear guidelines or recommendations for individuals with an eating disorder (ED) and comorbid autism spectrum conditions (ASC).

The Maudsley ED team has pioneered a tailored approach for comorbid ED and ASC called the PEACE pathway.

Our aim is to adapt and implement a similar pathway within the Eden Unit (NHS Grampian inpatient eating disorder service).

Methods. Questionnaires targeted two key stakeholders: patients and staff.

Patient questionnaires had 18 multiple-choice questions on a Likert scale, along with space for comments. The questions aimed to assess inpatient care adequacy in terms of care, routine, environment, mealtimes, and staff members. There were also specific questions related to ASC, examining whether sensory and communicative needs are being met and taken into account.

Staff questionnaires had 10 'yes-or-no' questions, along with space for comments, and gauged attitudes toward managing comorbid ED and ASC.

Results. 6/7 patient questionnaires were completed. 3 patients have comorbid ASC.

One patient found the ward overwhelming due to ASC, while others found it suitable. All experienced distress transitioning from outpatient to inpatient services, with subsequent admissions proving less challenging when they knew what to expect. They were allowed to have safe sensory items e.g comfort toys, headphones etc.

Generally, they felt well-supported during distress and felt their communication needs were met by nurses and HCSWs but not always by dietitians and clinicians due to a lack of availability. Some were frustrated with vague menu descriptions and there was some diagnostic overshadowing over dislike of certain foods.

13/20 staff questionnaires were completed. It showed most staff did not have formal training in managing comorbid ASC and ED, and confidence and skills varied in proportion to time and experience in the service. All staff members expressed they would like formal training, through sessions such as monthly training, weekly huddles, or psychoeducation.

Conclusion. A significant proportion of inpatients have comorbid ED and ASC. Therefore, awareness of potentially greater needs around communication, environment, and sensory hyper- or hyposensitivity is important. There is a risk of diagnostic overshadowing as both ED and ASC can mimic similar symptoms: cognitive rigidity, fixation on certain things etc. So while not straightforward it is important to differentiate which symptoms are due to ASC and which are due to ED. Leveraging resources from the PEACE pathway website, both staff and patients can enhance their understanding of this complex comorbidity.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

A Clinical Audit of the Assessment and Management for Those Diagnosed With Young Onset Dementia Within the Shepway CMHSOP

Dr Rachel Rice*

KMPT, Kent, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.420

Aims. To audit the Shepway CMHSOP against the NICE guidelines in dementia and the Royal College of Psychiatrists recommendations for service provision in young onset dementia.

Methods. Data was collected retrospectively for all patients open to CMHSOP within the last 2 years with a diagnosis listed as dementia under the age of 65 years old.

Results. The work up prior to diagnosis met some standards but improvements could be made in other areas. Mood was considered in all patients. The majority of patients (89%) had young onset blood tests if there was a clinical indication. However physical examination was only carried out in 43% of patients. In addition to this where physical examination was completed it was often limited to a brief note about the patient's gait and tremor.

Imaging standards were met within the Shepway CMHSOP with all patients having a scan, some patients being referred for additional specialist scans where indicated. There is also a neuroimaging MDT in which scans can be discussed with a neuro-radiologist.

The follow up care and support was an area that needs further development within Shepway CMHSOP. There is no named lead for those diagnosed with young onset dementia. Furthermore, only half of patients received a named practitioner to support their care. In addition to this only 79% were offered cognitive stimulation therapy and post diagnostic support which incorporate education for the carers. It is difficult to know if these options were discussed and declined by the patients, but if this is the case it would have been good practice to document.

Conclusion. The time from referral to diagnosis was similar in those with a dementia with a well established and clear subtype (Down syndrome) to those diagnosed with other types of young onset dementia, 6 months and 5.5 months respectively.

My audit identified areas for improvement in the workup to diagnosis and the aftercare to support those diagnosed and their carers in order to meet NICE guidelines and the Royal College of Psychiatrists recommendations for service provision in young onset dementia.

Shepway CMHSOP will develop a young onset dementia pathway to ensure those diagnosed are offered the appropriate investigations and support following their diagnosis in line with these guidelines.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

Outcome Measures in Mental Health – RCPsych Report and Working Group Survey

Dr Jonathan Richardson^{1*}, Dr Howard Ryland² and Dr Rahul Bhattacharya³

¹Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS FT, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom; ²Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, Oxford, United Kingdom and ³East London NHS FT, London, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.421

Aims. Outcome measurement is central to transforming mental health care by quantifying change, enabling comparison and driving improvement. In recognition of this, the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) has established a *working group on outcome measures*, led by an Associate Registrar.

To support routine outcome measurement capture in clinical services, RCPsych has developed the 'Outcome Measurement in Psychiatry' report.

The working group intends to launch a survey of Members to:

- 1) Understand psychiatrists' current use of outcome measures.
- 2) Understand psychiatrists' views on barriers and facilitators to the use of outcome measures.
- 3) Get feedback on the College Report.

Methods. The 'Outcome Measurement in Psychiatry' report was developed with input from all RCPsych Faculties and is scheduled for publication prior to the RCPsych International Congress.

Feedback will be sought on the 'Outcome Measurement in Psychiatry' report about whether the guiding principles are right, and if the College should be endorsing specific measures or advocating for the routine use of outcome measures. This will be used to guide future revisions of the report.

The working group believes the proposed survey will enable it to explore the facilitators and barriers to routine outcomes data capture both locally and nationally, including:

- how to consider organisational drivers and buy in of clinical staff
- digital enablement
- understanding time points in a chronic relapsing remitting condition in the community vs. episode of therapy or hospital admission
- clinical burden/benefit and buy in
- training.

An invitation to participate in the survey will be sent to all College members and advertised via social media, at the International Congress. Analysis will be via descriptive summary of quantitative data and a thematic summary of any free text data.

Results. The group intends to use the intelligence gather to inform, influence and shape policy that promotes routine outcome data capture and publish its findings for wider dissemination.

Conclusion. Outcome measurement is a top priority for the RCPsych. A new Associate Registrar and working group is