## Background

The Multi-Specialty Team initially planned to develop a service evaluation questionnaire for regular use in their service. After discussion with managers in other services across Health Psychology, it was agreed that it would be beneficial to create a universal questionnaire for service evaluation across Adult Health psychology.

| Aim |
| :--- |
| The aim of the project was to develop a service evalua- |
| tion questionnaire for use across Adult Health psycholo- |
| gy to gather patient feedback which can; |
| - Inform the running and development of services |
| - Capture the qualitative experience and self- |
| reported outcomes of patients using our service. |
| The questionnaire will be both a patient-reported expe- |
| rience measure (PREM) and a patient-reported outcome |
| measure (PROM). The intention is that it evaluates as- |
| pects of the service that are relevant to both patients |
| and staff, in a user-friendly and accessible format. |

## Methodology

The four-staged approach taken to develop the questionnaire will be summarised in the following sections.

## Step 1: Literature Search

A literature search for established service evaluation questionnaires used in mental health and psychology services was undertaken. This identified numerous questionnaires, but most were either: unsuitable (e.g. inpatient mental health settings); unavailable to view on the internet; and/or had cost implications. There were no questionnaires specific for health psychology services.

## Step 2: Analysis of current questionnaires

On the basis that Step 1 did not uncover a valid, reliable and established questionnaire, the measures currently used in the department were compiled to identify the common aspects of the patient experience being measured and the gaps where none of them assess. Current measures from 9 services were compiled and compared to those identified from the literature search. Although some themes overlapped, such as Accessibility of services and Overall Satisfaction, there were 9 areas identified which none of the current measures assessed, for example Continuity of Care and Practical Support.

## Step 3 \& 4: Staff and Patient Perspectives

To incorporate the aspects of care not covered by the current Adult Health service evaluation measures, while being mindful to maintain a user-friendly format, staff and patient perspectives were gathered to ascertain priorities. 25 clinicians and 4 patients gave their feedback on the top 8-10 aspects of care for evaluation.

|  |  | Results |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Priority | Staff | Patients |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Rights and dignity | Relationship with men- <br> tal health staff |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Views on services and <br> treatment received | Continuity of care |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Perceived care outcomes | Rights and dignity |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Relationship with mental <br> health staff | Information received |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Overall satisfaction | Accessibility of services |  |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Accessibility of services | Physical health |  |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Patients involvement in <br> care and decision making | Overall satisfaction |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | Staff skills | Practical support |  |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | Continuity of care | - |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Perceptions of tailored care | - |  |

## Conclusion \& Next Steps

Staff and patients agreed on five areas of service evaluation which should have priority inclusion in the new questionnaire. To get more detailed steer from our patients on the design and content, focus groups will be considered in the next stage.

