SAMS - Position Statements - July 2013

Background

Key Events Directly Associated with Evaluation and Monitoring in New Zealand

Date	Event	Impact
1979	Standards and Monitoring Services Board (SAMS) formed	First international example where disabled persons and families have key roles in the development and monitoring of service standards. Quality of life focus – developmental evaluation approach
1991	SAMS became independent Charitable Trust	SAMS involved in the evaluation of range of disability and mental health services – disabled persons and family/whanau have key roles in a developmental process
	Registration of community services under the Disabled Persons Community Welfare Act 1975	A minimally intrusive process for organizations to be assessed as "safe" and "appropriate" to deliver disability supports
2001	The Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act	Introduction of "Certification"
2001	Concern regarding the potential impact of "Certification"	Some organizations choose NOT to apply to be a designated audit agency because of a belief that the "Certification" process would not benefit disabled persons, families or general sector development
2001	New Zealand Disability Strategy was published.	The Strategy presented a vision for changing New Zealand from a disabling to an inclusive society.
2001-2008	Multiple examples of a conflict of priorities and perspectives between "Certification" and "Developmental Evaluation"	In 2002, Ministry of Social Development contracts developmental evaluation in 160 disability organizations

Ministry of Health funded services are involved in a parallel process i.e. developmental evaluation and Certification |

2006	The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol was adopted	A signal regarding the paradigm shift in attitudes and approaches to disabled people reaffirming the human rights and fundamental freedoms for people with all types of disabilities.
2008	Social Services Select Committee report "Inquiry into the quality of care and service provision for people with disabilities, September 2008	" that evaluations and audits of disability services focus on the quality of life and the opportunities for people with disabilities. Evaluations and audits should focus on development and satisfactory outcomes for people with disabilities and not compliance with minimum standards… " "We recommend to the Government that it give people with disabilities and their families a key role in the monitoring process, to ensure that quality of life is measured and valued" "Consideration should be given to requiring all providers to meet similar standards (we note our preference for developmental evaluations), and to ensuring people with disabilities and their families have a key role in the monitoring process"
2008	SAMS attempts to work in partnership with designated audit agencies to minimize disruption to providers	Initiative abandoned as key information was not shared.
2008	"Coalition" Priorities for Action includes statements related to "quality" Note: The "Coalition" was an alliance of disabled persons and family organisations	"Expanding quality frameworks from minimum compliance to a focus on personal outcomes, Quality of Life, developmental evaluation and partnership approaches (removal of certification and compliance audit from community services)"

		"Policies and practices that ensure disabled people and families have key roles in the development and implementation of sector and service monitoring"
2009	The Government response to the Social Services Select Committee Inquiry into the quality of care and service provision for person with disabilities.	"The Government agrees that monitoring of disability services should focus on quality of life outcomes for disabled people, rather than a "tick box" approach". "disabled people and families have central roles in the monitoring processes".
October 2010	New Zealand Disability Support Network (NZDSN) and Standards and Monitoring Services (SAMS) meet with Ministry of Health officials and request that consideration is given to community disability services being removed from the 'Certification' process.	An unsuccessful attempt is made to ensure monitoring and evaluation processes are aligned with sector values and aspiration
October 2010	Ministry of Health convenes reference group to explore the integration of "Certification" and Developmental Evaluation	No representation of national disabled persons and/or family/whanau organisations. The eventual outcome (2013) of this process was to: 1) Identify that certification and developmental evaluation were distinct processes that could not be blended together 2) Locate developmental evaluation within the 'Certification' framework i.e. using developmental evaluation as a replacement for "mid-point surveillance audits"

August 2011	Enabling Good Lives Report i.e. an Independent Working Group report presented the Minister for Disability Issues	The transformation described involves increased individualisation of supports, increased flexibility, choice and control for disabled people over their lives, and genuine inclusion of disabled people in their community – people doing ordinary things in ordinary places.
September 2012	The Ministerial Committee on Disability Issues approves a framework for sector change	The agreed "long term change direction" includes the following statements related to monitoring and evaluation: • Changing government systems and processes: to support the system redesign e.g. integrated, outcomes-focussed contracting, individualised funding, funding pooled from across Votes and involving disabled people and families in governance, system and service design and monitoring. • Changes to service provision: to align service governance, delivery models, workforce capability, accountability measures, monitoring and evaluation with the vision and principles of the transformed system.
2013	Ministry of Health alignment	The Ministry of Health agrees that "New Model" work will be aligned to the Enabling Good Lives approach
2013	An "External Review of the National Services Purchasing Disability Support Services performance and quality management processes for purchased provider services"	

Background – The Two Processes Associated with Ministry of Health Funded Services

1. Certification under the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act, 2001

2. Contract Audit that became Developmental Evaluation

	Certification Audit – as per the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act, 2001	Developmental Evaluation
Purpose	Promote **safe** provision	Promote **service excellence and innovation**
	Enable the establishment of **consistent and reasonable standards**	Enable individuals to **improve their quality of life** (QoL). Comment and improvement based on QoL individual outcome measures
	Encourage providers to take **responsibility** for providing those services to the public safely	Encourage providers to **establish model coherency** i.e. ensure values, principles, processes, procedures and practices align
	Encourage providers to **continuously improve**	Encourage the **continual development of relevant and effective services based** on a **partnership approach**
Key Concepts	Safety, responsibility and improvement – according to consistent and reasonable standards	Excellence, innovation, quality of life, individual outcomes, effectiveness and partnership.

SAMS Position Statements

1. General - Audit and Evaluation

The Ministry of Health currently commissions a range of different audit and evaluation approaches. These include "Certification", Developmental Evaluation and Issues Based Audits. <u>SAMS supports Developmental Evaluation.</u>

It is extremely concerning that Certification through Designated Audit Agencies, a process intended to provide "safety" in the sector, is not achieving this objective. Our concerns about the effectiveness of Certification have been raised directly with the Ministry of Health since 2001.

We are concerned the 'Certification' process:

a. hasn't worked for community based disability services i.e. can not ensure safety – its primary purpose
b. can divert attention from building good practice to bureaucratic systems i.e. paper not people
c. has created confusion because it has gone beyond its scope i.e. basic safety
d. is not congruent with current initiatives to increase choice and control for disabled persons and families

We also note that other jurisdictions are currently exploring approaches other than accreditation/certification models e.g. officials in Australia and British Columbia are considering developmental evaluation approaches

2. Demonstrated History of Developmental Evaluation

"A developmental approach to evaluation of disability services in New Zealand has a history that spans over three decades. Although the origins of developmental evaluation in disability services can be traced back to 1979, publications and conference presentations detailing this developmental approach began to emerge in the 1990s.

By 1991, evaluation was occurring in a range of community-based disability and mental health services. Disabled people and family had key roles in this developmental process as evaluators and contributors to evaluation. By 2002, over 160 organisations were routinely participating in government funded "developmental evaluations". Extract from the "Mid-Point" Developmental Evaluation Handbook, Ministry of Health, July 2013

3. Developmental Evaluation process are aligned with:

A. **The Social Services Select Committee report "Inquiry into the quality of care and service provision for people with disabilities, September 2008**".

This report clearly suggests developmental evaluation approaches influence other monitoring approaches. For example:

- "We have been told the developmental evaluation approach is preferable to Ministry of Health auditing under the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act because it addresses quality of life issues. We consider Disability Services' recent introduction of developmental evaluations to be a step in the right direction, but wish to see this change extended to other monitoring and audit processes...",

- "Consideration should be given to requiring all providers to meet similar standards (we note our preference for developmental evaluations), and to ensuring people with disabilities and their families have a key role in the monitoring process..." and

- " ... develop disability standards for community services, with appropriate outcomes focused evaluation processes, and require the lead disability agency to ensure that duplication is avoided and that best practice is followed"

B. **The Government's response to the Social Services Select Committee** "Inquiry into the quality of care and service provision for person with disabilities".

This included the following:

- "The Government agrees that monitoring of disability services should focus on quality of life outcomes for disabled people, rather than a "tick-box" approach. This applies to both contract-based monitoring by the Ministry of Health and other agencies, and monitoring under the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act 2001...."

- "The Government will review the desirability and feasibility of, and the requirements for implementing, quality of life monitoring of residential disability care under the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act 2001. This review will also consider the role of disabled people and their families in the monitoring process (recommendations 13 and 15)......"

4. Independent Evaluation and Monitoring

We believe it is appropriate to explore whether the evaluation and monitoring resource is shifted to a body external to the Ministry of Health – creating genuinely independent evaluation and monitoring. This would be consistent with the "Enabling Good Lives" approach. We note current examples where officials from the Ministries of Health, Education and Social Development have partnered with disabled persons/DPOs and families to form a "Community Board" type arrangement to oversee across Ministry initiatives.

5. **Align Evaluation and Monitoring with Current Sector Aspiration**

   We believe it is desirable for evaluation and monitoring to be aligned with the principles and vision statement agreed by the Ministerial Committee on 11th September 2012

6. **Explore an Approach to Evaluation and Monitoring that Creates Clarity and Cohesion**

   We consider it is appropriate to explore, an "across ministries" approach to independent external evaluation (remove duplication while increasing clarity and congruence)

7. **Ensure Evaluation and Monitoring Approaches are Current**

   We believe it is desirable for evaluation and monitoring approaches to be consistent with a move towards flexible and personalised services e.g. Individualised Funding, Enabling Good Lives approaches and Enhanced Individualised Funding

8. **Evaluation and Monitoring Approaches Must Demonstrate Collaboration**

   Evaluation approaches ensure key roles for disabled persons and families

9. **Multiple "Safeguards"**

   Independent external evaluation is seen as one of a number of "safeguards". Other safeguards are encouraged and supported e.g. personalised safeguards, local networks, internal monitoring by disabled persons and families

10. **Evaluation and Monitoring Must Contribute to Efficient and Effective Processes to Address Concerns**

    External evaluation and monitoring must have the ability to act in a timely and direct way with the small number of services where there are completely unacceptable practices.

11. **Evaluation and Monitoring Approaches are Congruent with Sector Development**

    Evaluation and monitoring must overtly support current initiatives that have the objective of increasing choice and control for disabled persons and their families

12. Evaluation and Monitoring Approaches Actively Contribute to Development

External evaluation and monitoring is not just considered to be a safeguard – but evaluation and monitoring provides valuable support to the great majority of services who are trying to do the right thing within the disability sector

Definitions of Developmental Evaluation

The definition of developmental evaluation is of considerable relevance considering the Social Services Select Committee in its Inquiry into the Quality of Care and Service Provision for People with Disabilities (2008) stated a "preference for developmental evaluations".

"Developmental Evaluation is a process of gathering information, determining value and identifying areas for potential improvement. The primary focus of ... developmental evaluation is to influence positive change, raise awareness and cultivate innovation. Developmental evaluation is indented to assist services to improve and is firmly grounded in collaborative and inclusive practices. A core belief of developmental evaluation is that the most certain and sustainable form of development is founded on increased awareness and partnership" SAMS (Standards and Monitoring Services)

"Developmental evaluation: Evaluation processes and activities that support programme, project, product, personnel and/or organisational development (usually the latter). The evaluator is part of a team whose members collaborate to conceptualise, design, and test new approaches in a long-term, on-going process of continuous improvement, adaptation and intentional change. The evaluators primary function is to elucidate team discussions with evaluative data and logic, and to facilitate data based decision making in the developmental process" Michael Quinn Patton, 1994.

Note: the definition and practice of developmental evaluation in New Zealand, over the past two decades, has positioned the evaluator/s as independent/external/autonomous – with the task of creating and maintaining a trusting partnership with service providers.

Traditional Evaluation	Complexity-based, Developmental Evaluations .....
Render definitive judgements of success or failure.	Provide feedback, generate learnings, support direction or affirm changes in direction.
Measure success against predetermined goals.	Develop new measures and monitoring mechanisms as goals emerge and evolve.
Position the evaluator outside to ensure independence and objectivity	Position evaluation as internal, team function integrated into action and on-going interpretive processes (Note: : the definition and practice of developmental evaluation in New Zealand has positioned evaluator/s as

	independent/external/autonomous – with the task of creating and maintaining a trusting partnership with service providers).
Design the evaluation based on linear cause-effect logic models.	Design the evaluation to capture system dynamics, interdependencies, and emergent interconnections.
Aim to produce generalizable findings across time and space	Aim to produce concept specific understandings that inform ongoing innovation
Accountability focused on and directed to external authorities and funders	Accountability centred on the innovators' deep sense of fundamental values and commitments.
Accountability to control and locate blame for failures.	Learning to respond to lack of control and stay in touch with what's unfolding and thereby respond strategically.
Evaluator controls the evaluation and determines the design based on the evaluators perspective of what is important	Evaluator collaborates in the change effort to design a process that matches philosophically and organisationally.
Evaluation engenders fear of failure	Evaluation supports hunger for learning

Michael Quinn Patton, 2006

SAMS - DEFINITIONS RELATED TO AN "OUTCOMES" APPROACH

Aim

The direction you are heading in, anticipated destination or what you want to achieve

Objective

How you imagine you will achieve the aim (often medium term – can be parallel or sequential)

Inputs

The resources used to achieve the objectives e.g. time, specific service types, defined activities, finances

Outputs

What is actually delivered by the service, programme and can be quantified e.g. number of people supported into employment, the number of counseling sessions held, the number of courses held

Outcomes

The **results** of supports/services/outputs i.e. what has happened because of what you have done (the difference made). Often subjective and qualitative e.g. increased confidence, stronger identity

Indicators (Outcome Indicators)

Things that show progress towards outcomes, clues that desired outcomes are occurring or something that may signify an outcome is being met

Impact

The bigger/wider effect or change.