"Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts" ....
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We’ve come a long way ........

Since 1946!)......
NHS Newborn Hearing Screening Programme

TRIUMPH OVER DEAFNESS
A BRITISH COUNCIL FILM
We’ve come a long way
nurture…. grow…. enrich

Difficult and challenging times?

“The new enlightenment”

Sir Paul Nurse, President

The Royal Society

28/02/12
Sir Paul Nurse, 28.02.12

“...it is often in mixed up and chaotic circumstances that the most creative work is done. Remember Harry Lime in the Third Man who said, “In Italy for 30 years under the Borgias they had warfare, terror, murder and bloodshed, but they produced Michelangelo, Leonardo Da Vinci and the Renaissance. In Switzerland they had brotherly love – they had 500 years of democracy and peace, and what did that produce? . . .
……the cuckoo clock.”
Some background stats

Programme fully implemented since 2006

5 millionth baby screened (May 2012) - now over 5.5 million

England population 53.1m; births (2011) 675,000

115 local screening programmes

Local screening programme incorporates the whole care pathway – screen to early intervention

33 nationally defined quality standards relating to activity across the care pathway

QA Programme started in 2006 – 4 cycles
UK Support Context

• Hearing aids readily available and free at point of delivery

• Cochlear implant centres

• Health / Education / Social Care model of provision

• ToD (usually) as main deliverer of support in the home

• Provision (at least theoretically) of a range of communication options
The England NHSP….from the NHS to PHE

• From 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2013: Public Health England – a new government agency, “established to protect and improve the nation’s health and wellbeing and to reduce inequalities”

• All Screening Programmes sit within one of 8 directorates: “Health and Wellbeing”

• 8 non-cancer screening programmes re-organised into 3 groups (Adult AAA/DES; NHSP/NIPE/FASP; SCT/IDP/BS)

• Expanded cross-cutting functions and smaller core programme teams

• Opportunities and Challenges
NHSP Vision

“Improving outcomes for every child through a high quality screening programme, safe and effective assessments and family centred early intervention”
NHSP Strategic Aims

• To raise standards in service performance to achieve better outcomes in screening, assessment, diagnosis and habilitation.

• To ensure a robust evaluative culture of service provision locally, regionally and nationally.

• To promote and develop family friendly integrated services.

• To empower parents to make informed choices.

• To ensure an efficient and effective NHSP Programme Centre that delivers effective support for Local Programmes and delivers value for money.
NHSP Strategic Aims

• To ensure equality of access for all children and families thereby fulfilling the requirements of the programme to reduce health inequalities

• To work within PHE and with the NHS and Government framework to deliver an integrated approach to screening and follow-on services.

• To be recognised as a quality programme and to influence the development and delivery of high quality screening services, utilising the latest research, technology, best practice guidance and benchmarking.
A clear system and care pathways

- Manage population through the process
  - Pre-screen information and awareness
  - Universal offer
  - Effective systems

- Provide failsafe mechanisms
  - Ensure smooth pathway from screen through safe and effective assessment and rapid onward referral to intervention

- Monitor, evaluate & improve
  - Enable consistent reporting
  - Contribute to evidence base
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Early audiological assessment


This pathway has been freely developed and approved by the National Screening Committee for use in England & Wales.

Information
Primary care
Secondary care

Early audiological assessment

History and examination
Pre-testing considerations

Assess for hearing loss

Acceptable hearing in both ears
Risk factors present?

Yes - ongoing surveillance
No - discharge

Hearing loss is present

Investigate severity of hearing loss

Severe/profound hearing loss in both ears

Moderate hearing loss in both ears

Unilateral loss of any degree

Perform otoscopic examination (OAEs)

OAEs absent
OAEs present

Perform audiometric measurements (CMs)

CMs absent
CMs present

Further investigations of type and configuration of hearing loss

Possible diagnoses

Go to PCHI management

Go to diagnosis of CM with effusion

Further audiological assessment
Quality in Newborn Hearing Screening Programmes

What is Quality?
Definitions of quality

• “Nature, character, attribute, grade of goodness, excellence in skill and accomplishment”

• “The character of a proposition as affirmative or negative”

• Neutral quality markers

• Subjective markers - Perceptions of quality

• Outputs and outcomes
Outputs and outcomes

• An output is the product or service that derives from a process (e.g. steps in a care pathway or a changed pattern of service delivery in response to early identification)

• An outcome is what is achieved (e.g. the developmental progress of a deaf child; the level of parental confidence)
Outputs and outcomes

• In the delivery of a programme or service and in its monitoring and evaluation…...

• Outputs can too easily get regarded as outcomes

  – E.g. revising the model of early intervention to include a standard that says a family / child receives an assessment or input from any particular professional whether audiological, medical, social or educational is not an outcome.

• Keeping the distinction between outputs and outcomes is really important in planning and service development and in measuring quality.
"Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts"
What does our routine data (eSP) tell us?

• That for babies born up to Dec 2012:
  • 5,724,506 baby records are on the system
  • 5,631,502 screens have been offered (98.4% of births)
  • 16,709,420 screening tests have been carried out
  • 2.54% of babies are referred for audiological assessment
  • 10,523 babies have been identified through the Programme (6675 bilateral; 3848 unilateral)
  • Every week on average (Jan – Dec ‘12): 13,290 babies screened, 338 referred and 27 identified with PCHI
What does our routine data (eSP) tell us?

- A baby’s journey through the process

- That screen refer to assessment for well babies had gone down from an average of 29 days in 2006 to 16 days by 2011

- That the average age of amplification provision for well babies had gone from just under 6 months in 2006 to just over 8 weeks in 2011

- How services perform against (some of )…the national Programme Standards

- How well fail-safes operate and helps us to manage risk and reduce incidents.
What does the routine data not tell us?

The skills and competencies of the practitioners

How the professionals work together to deliver the pathway in an integrated way

Child developmental outcomes

Family experience

Family outcomes
Quality Assurance – from 2006 (4 cycles)

- Audit Data – both routine collection (eSP) and as part of QA process.
- Peer review – verification of self assessment; systems and professional competency focused.
- Cycle 4 – case study review
- Dissemination of learning, locally regionally and nationally to inform policy and practice
Areas of Focus and Governance

• Governance Structures and Strategic Partnerships

• Commissioned Services Meet the Needs of Children/Families

• Quality Improvement Culture in Place

• Services delivered in a Family Friendly manner
Quality Standard Targets Relating to:

• Service access and availability of interpreters.
• Information sharing about screen.
• Notification of birth to screen.
• Universal offer of screen.
• Screen commencement.
• Screen completion.
• Decline rates.
Quality Standard Targets Relating to:

- Timely confirmation of hearing loss
- Data entry onto eSP system.
- Timely explanation of results, support mechanisms etc.
- Timely referral to medical care / assessment.
- Timely referral and response for follow-up services.
- Co-ordination of family support / key professional contact.
- Hearing aid fitting.
Quality Standard Targets Relating to:

- Support for developing communication within a framework of Informed Choice
- Provision of ‘family care’ support.
- Identification and response for complex needs.
- Existence and functioning of ‘Children’s Hearing Services Working Group’ (CHSWG).
Quality Workshop: Como 2010

- Parents, Clinicians, Early Interventionists, Service Strategists / Public Health
- Shared and agreed vision and goals
- Some variation in definitions of outcomes
- DIFFERENCES IN PRIORITIES IN DEFINING QUALITY
Parental Assessment of Service Quality

- Parent satisfaction surveys

- Does satisfaction with a service mean that the service is a high quality service?
Parental Assessment of Service Quality

‘Positive Support’: A UK study about outcomes for young deaf children and their families

1Bamford J, 1Carr G, 1Davis A, 1Gascon-Ramos M, 1Keeble T, 1Lea R, 1McCracken W, 1Pattison E, 1Pickles A, 2Woll B, 2Woolfe T, 1Young A.

1: University of Manchester / 2: University College London
My Views on Services (MVOS)

• New parent report questionnaire (Young, Gascon-Ramos, Campbell and Bamford, 2009)

Four elements:

(i) a description of the structure of professional services evaluated according to *timeliness and availability*;

(ii) the content of intervention evaluated according to *quantity, relevance and satisfaction*;

(iii) the process of the intervention evaluated according to *extent and importance*;

(iii) the overall impact of the intervention.
## Which professionals work with you?

1. Have you, as a parent, had any direct contact with specialised services in the past 6 months regarding your deaf child?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiological physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational audiologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of the deaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support worker who is deaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf role model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Who have you and your child had contact with?**
- **If yes, how many hours of support per week, month or year do you and/or your child get from professionals?**
- **Please, tick if you were offered this service.**
- **Please, tick if you refused it at the time.**
- **Please, tick if you would like to have contact with this service.**
- **Please, tick if you feel it is/was hard to get this service.**
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To what extent are professional services...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a fairly great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important is this for you now?

1. Flexible in arranging meetings that take into account your family’s availability.

2. Adapting to your needs (e.g. reconsidering what they had planned to do with you on a particular meeting to meet your needs).

3. Trusting you as the ‘expert’ on your child.

4. Providing enough time to talk (so you don’t feel rushed)

5. Working together with you in designing and deciding the support you want for your child and family.

6. Taking into account your family’s culture and lifestyle when working out support plans.
Has the support made a difference?

Overall, how much have professional services made a difference for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your family (partner, siblings…)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself as a person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has this difference been positive for:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your child</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your family (partner, siblings…)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself as a person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction and Quality

- Positive Support concurrent with NHSP QA Cycle 2
- Parents expressing high levels of satisfaction on the MVOS……..
- QA showing levels of service not meeting quality standards
- How to reconcile?!
- Would parents feel differently looking back in light of outcomes for their child and family?
Areas of most dissatisfaction

• Professional Communication and information sharing………(gatekeeping, bias, not being given informed choice etc)

• Lack of cohesion and coherence in professional services co-ordination.
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Quality in... Information and Communication

Your Baby’s Hearing Screening Test
For babies who have received special or intensive care

Your Baby Has a Hearing Loss
Parent Information

Warning Deaf People
Seamless Services

• Families say that a major positive factor in their experience with professionals is when professionals work in a truly multi-disciplinary way, often referred to as ‘seamless services’

• What do we mean by seamless services?
“the procedures and the channels of communication between all these agencies, whether it’s the paediatricians or the audiologists, social services, physiotherapists, speech and language therapists – the channel of communication between them all varies between very poor to non-existent, and people look at one specific area and don’t link the box up. . . You wouldn’t criticise any individuals it’s just the structures that link them together – that’s the key thing. They do not talk to each other, and the paper chain must be hundreds of miles long. I am sure there must be a simpler way of people talking to each other”

[Complex Needs, Complex Challenges, NDCS 2011]
Improving Outcomes

• Early identification is not enough.

• All gains/advantages predicated on early identification PLUS quality early intervention

• One without the other is pointless and arguably unethical?

• But early identification has changed how we think about early intervention
Improving outcomes

• It’s not just early intervention but QUALITY early intervention that makes a difference.

• How do we define, develop and assess quality in early intervention?
Improving Outcomes

• Are early identified deaf children doing better?

• Yes, but……..

• Are we looking at desired outcomes that are too narrow? (Language, speech, vocabulary, quality of life indicators which relate primarily to audition, etc etc)

• Are we forgetting to look at children’s learning? (Kritzer, US; Nunes et al, UK)

• Pragmatics (Yoshinaga-Itano, 2012)
Improving outcomes

- Is early intervention being sufficiently informed by research and especially longitudinal studies?

- Are research study findings feeding through sufficiently to inform early intervention practice?

- New learning from LENA studies about the importance of quantity of conversational interactions

- Evidence that child outcomes are improved when families are ‘engaged with’ services (Calderon, Moeller, Yoshinaga-Itano)

- But what do we mean by that?
And what about Family Outcomes?

• A new look at patient outcomes within the NHS
• Mid Staffordshire public enquiry
• Francis report
• Children Young People and Family Forum report
• CYP and family; Government’s system wide response
• Redefining quality and outcomes
• Parents of deaf Children ahead of the game
What Parents Say They Want

- GPOD Position Statement (2009)
  
  http://www.gpodhh.org/

- ANZPOD Quality Standards for Newborn Hearing Screening Services Supporting Families
  
  www.users.on.net/~phisa/Standards%20final%200709.pdf
International consensus on FCEI
We’ve come a long way……

• But it’s not far enough!

• Maybe it’s time for a rethink………

• Definition of Outcomes?

• Models of service delivery?

• True partnerships at all levels with parents and families

• True partnership at all levels with ‘Experts Through Experience’ in both d/Deaf and cultural communities

• Celebrate our successes but never stop thinking it can get better still……..
"Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts"

….we need to make what matters to families count!
Thank You
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