<ID Reference>

**MEDIUM/LARGE SCALE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT**

**STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE (SOP)**

This procedure is an accompaniment to the attached Service Improvement Process Visio and is intended to guide you through the process and double as an overarching plan document

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document Version** | 0.1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Status** | Draft |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Document author:** | Michael Watts |
|  | **Approved by** |  |
|  | **Date approved:** |  |
|  | **Review date:** |  |

**TŶ GLAN-YR-AFON** 21 Heol Ddwyreiniol Y Bont-Faen, Caerdydd CF11 9AD

**TŶ GLAN-YR-AFON** 21 Cowbridge Road East, Cardiff CF11 9AD

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE** | Choose an item. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS ACT**](https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-08/well-being-of-future-generations-wales-act-2015-the-essentials.pdf) | A prosperous Wales |
| If more than one standard applies, please list below: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**DHCW QUALITY STANDARDS**](https://informatics.wales.nhs.uk/FinBus/Qual/SitePages/Home.aspx) | ISO 20000 |
| If more than one standard applies, please list below: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**HEALTH CARE STANDARD**](http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/documents/1064/24729_Health%20Standards%20Framework_2015_E1.pdf) | Governance, leadership and acccountability |
| If more than one standard applies, please list below: | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT STATEMENT**](https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/equality-impact-assessment-in-wales-practice-hub/equality-impact-assessment/) | Date of submission: | |
| No, (detail included below as to reasoning) | | Outcome: |
| Statement: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPROVAL/SCRUTINY ROUTE:** Person/Committee/Group who have received or considered this | | |
| COMMITTEE OR GROUP | DATE | OUTCOME |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IMPACT ASSESSMENT** | |
| **QUALITY AND SAFETY** IMPLICATIONS/IMPACT | No, there are no specific quality and safety implications related to the activity outlined in this report. |
|  |
| **LEGAL**  IMPLICATIONS/IMPACT | No, there are no specific legal implications related to the activity outlined in this report. |
|  |
| **FINANCIAL**  IMPLICATION/IMPACT | No, there are no specific financial implication related to the activity outlined in this report |
|  |
| **WORKFORCE** IMPLICATION/IMPACT | No, there is no direct impact on resources as a result of the activity outlined in this report. |
|  |
| [**SOCIO ECONOMIC**](https://gov.wales/socio-economic-duty-overview#:~:text=The%20overall%20aim%20of%20the%20duty%20is%20to%20deliver%20better,that%20those%20taking%20strategic%20decisions%3A&text=drive%20a%20change%20in%20the,way%20that%20decision%20makers%20operate)IMPLICATION/IMPACT | No. there are no specific socio-economic implications related to the activity outlined in this report |
|  |
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**PURPOSE**

The purpose is to provide structured guidance in order to give any subsequent improvement recommendations the best chance of succeeding by following a logical process of collation, analysis, recommendation and overarching governance.

This document will detail the approach to be taken to create an overarching plan for implementing medium to large scale service improvements. The following sections will document a step by step process which will guide you through identification through to completion of a Service Improvement Plan. (SIP)

**SCOPE**

This procedure/plan is intended to provide guidance and a template for the completion of a medium to large scale Service Improvement plan and can be used by all members of DHCW when embarking on a structured Service Improvement initiative.

The likelihood is that this guidance will be of most value to the DHCW Service Management department given their focus on quality and improvement.

**PROCEDURE/PLAN START**

(Guidance text in ***italics****)*

# SIP Triggers

*Give the background to how the need for a SIP was triggered (Check SIP trigger examples on the attached process Visio) and what the initial intention of the SIP is e.g. reduce numbers of breached calls with a brief prediction of the areas thought to be at fault.*

# Baseline score(s)

*Detail what the current baseline starting point is. e.g. average SLA score of 72% over the last 3 months.*

*The aim is the eventual outcome required e.g. Improve SLA score to 90%+ and the scope is limited to this one service area. The aim can be decided later through discussion with the SIP team.*

# Data Sample & Analysis Methodology

*Summarise data samples being analysed such as time period under review e.g. 2018-20 Breached Incidents and refer to embedded data analysis templates for full details.*

*Detail the analysis methodology adopted to inform the recommendations in the report along the lines of: Consisted of a structured approach using qualitative\* and quantitative\* data (\*delete as appropriate). This included: (Examples below)*

* Baseline of existing processes and data:
* Average call closure data per day as a percentage of daily active users, with a comparison to other ‘Clinical Critical’ national services.
* Team responsible for breach and reasons for breach
* Resolved calls by team and call type.
* Average number of calls resolved by individual team members.
* Anecdotal testimonies from team members.
* Analysis of baseline information:
* Pareto analysis of call findings.
* Logged and resolved call comparison.
* Process mapping of complicated workflows from breached calls.
* High-level improvement proposals scored using ‘Ease/Benefit’ methodology.

# Analysis 1 (Rename as appropriate)

***This is where you interpret the data findings and provide an analysis of each one to start building up your conclusions and recommendations.***

***Here is a recent example: -***

*The National \*\*\*\* Support Team field more Incidents than any other national service in terms of average numbers of daily users next to average numbers of calls received. (650 average daily active users with an average of 25 daily calls logged—4% of users calling for assistance daily). As a comparison, \*\*\*\* service averages a similar number of calls—a daily average of 26. The service sees 4000 daily users and fields calls from 0.7% of daily active \*\*\*\* users. The most likely reasons for the disparity are:*

* *A complex support model resulting in large numbers of ‘bounced’ calls.*
* *Complicated workflows for certain scenarios (multiple teams required to work on simple requests, such as password resets).*
* *Lack of understanding of support roles and responsibilities for each team in the support model.*
* *Lack of business knowledge resulting in repeat calls and breaches.*
* *Lack of automated support tools.*

*The following table provides the average call data for 2019 and supports the above findings: (Insert table below)*

# Analysis 2 (Rename as appropriate)

*Insert summary of findings*

# Analysis 3 (Rename as appropriate)

*Insert summary of findings*

*Add/delete sections if required.*

# Anecdotal Evidence

*Anecdotal evidence is important as it can help to validate the data analysis. Ensure you engage with as many relevant stakeholders as possible including system users, support staff, service desk etc*

*Here are some recent examples: -*

* Some merges and casenote amendments can take days or weeks to complete.
* Whilst a vast majority of calls are prioritised as P6s, within this priority there are calls which need to be dealt first based on clinical priority, resulting in less clinically important calls moved to the bottom of the list.
* Call volumes are high and there is insufficient bandwidth in the team to deal with calls within SLA timeframes.
* A recent reduction in long-serving experienced team members has meant that junior members are having to wait for assistant to resolve calls which subsequently breach in a lot of cases, as these individuals have other priorities. This is validated by data which showed that of the 33 calls resolved by a long-serving experienced member of the team, 80% (29) of calls breached and this was likely due to the individual only being available on a part-time basis due to other responsibilities.
* Multi-step workflows for certain call scenarios causes calls to bounce in and out of local/national support teams, introducing delays.

# Summary & interpretation of the Data Analysis exercise

*Include key findings and initial recommendations drawn from the data analysis exercise which will help to inform what Changes could possibly be taken forward to improve the situation*

# Change candidates for ‘Ease/Benefit’ scoring

*Following all the previous analysis, you should now be in a position to discuss change candidates with the SIP team and score them using the ‘Ease/Benefit’ matrix. Ease/Benefit looks at a combination of how easy it would be to get a change over the line, both from a technical and organisational standpoint and what potential benefit to the user/organisation etc would be felt if successful*

* *Insert Change Candidate*
* *Insert Change Candidate*
* *Insert Change Candidate*

# Change proposals to submit to governance group for a final decision

*The following recommendations for change have been approved by the SIP Team for submission to the governance group for a final decision following a review of the findings and completion of the ‘Ease/Benefit’ scoring exercise. Change candidates with both high benefit and high difficulty and high benefit and easy implementation should be considered.*

*Changes that would be of low benefit and are difficult to implement should be discarded.*

* *Insert Change proposal*
* *Insert Change proposal*
* *Insert Change proposal*

# Approved Changes inc. baseline scores

*Changes approved for implementation by the Governance group should be detailed here along with implementation start and end dates and review intervals.*

*• Example approved change 1*

*• Example approved change 2*

*• Example approved change 3*

# Final Conclusions and Lessons to learn from

*Include details of what went well and what didn’t, how many changes were required to achieve the aim/new service level and anything else deemed relevant*

# REFERENCES

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DOCUMENT** | **VERSION** |
|  |  |

# DEFINITIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TERM** | **DEFINITION** |
| SIP | Service Improvement Plan |
| Ease/Benefit | Difficulty level of proposed changes/benefit to the user/organisation if achieved |
| Pareto Analysis | A technique used for business decision making based on the 80/20 rule. Pareto analysis is based on the idea that 80% of a project's benefit can be achieved by doing 20% of the work or conversely 80% of problems are traced to 20% of the causes |
| Baseline | Current position/score etc prior to the implementation of any approved changes |

# ATTACHMENTS

