

# Report

Report to:	<b>Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>9 December 2019</b>
Report by:	<b>Chair of Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group</b>

Subject:	<b>Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Evaluation of Promoting Positive Behaviour Programme</b>
----------	---

## **1. Purpose of Report**

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ inform the Joint Committee that the first independent evaluation of the Promoting Positive Behaviour (PPB) Programme has been completed

## **2. Recommendation(s)**

2.1. The Joint Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that it be noted that a comprehensive and rigorous evaluation of the PPB Programme has been commissioned and delivered;
- (2) that it be noted that the conclusions from the independent report indicate that each of the original objectives set out at the inception of the Programme have been achieved and, in some cases, exceeded; and
- (3) that it be noted that the recommendations contained within the report suggesting potential improvements in practice would be considered through the relevant levels of programme governance and acted upon where appropriate.

## **3. Background**

3.1. The first PPB pilot programme was run in June 2013, with the first transition programme delivered in November of the same year. Thereafter the programme has been rolled out across each of the eight Clyde Valley Councils in a mixture of Adult Services and Children and Family Services.

3.2. The generally accepted evaluation model used in the context of learning and development is the Kirkpatrick four levels model. Each level seeks to measure a different dimension for evaluation. The four levels are:-

- ◆ immediate reaction
- ◆ achievement of learning outcomes
- ◆ impact on practice
- ◆ service delivery outcomes and benefits

- 3.3. First and second level evaluation data has been gathered at every programme run since the programme's launch. This has been achieved through a combination of feedback responses from participants, knowledge and competence testing post course and gathering additional learner feedback through focus groups conducted at the annual development seminars run by the Clyde Valley Social Care Group.
- 3.4. Evaluation responses have been consistently positive, with over 90% of responses indicating that the course fulfilled learner expectations and met the agreed learning outcomes.
- 3.5. In a report presented to the Joint Committee (10 December 2018), it was noted that the next stage was to complete the evaluation cycle through the engagement of an independent external consultant. The remit for the consultant chosen was to gather evidence of levels 3 and 4 evaluation in order to measure the impact of the programme on practice in the field and on the levels of service delivery achieved.

#### **4. Selection of Evaluation Criteria**

- 4.1. In all evaluation programmes it is a significant challenge to set out the intended objectives in terms of improvements to service delivery and practitioner performance in the field. This is particularly true of learning and development interventions focusing on behaviours (such as PPB), and where multiple other factors can have a bearing on the outcomes achieved.
- 4.2. In order to address this issue and maximise the likelihood of delivering an effective evaluation exercise, some significant time was taken at the outset to agree the objectives to be used as the yardstick for success. Following a consultation between members of the Social Care Group and the consultant, a broad consensus was reached on the outcomes that the Social Care Group had set out to achieve in creating the PPB programme.
- 4.3. The intentions were to establish a learning programme which:-
  - ◆ Staff could apply in practice, over a range of social care settings, to keep both the children and adults they supported safe and themselves safe
  - ◆ Gave staff knowledge and confidence to:-
    - ◆ Practice within an ethos focused on promoting positive behaviour through prevention and early intervention
    - ◆ Have behaviour support strategies and interventions to help children or adults to get their needs met in positive ways, using positive behaviours
    - ◆ Understand the importance of staff demonstrating positive behaviour
  - ◆ Contained physical interventions, where required to keep people safe from harm that:-
    - ◆ Allowed the least restrictive intervention to be used by having a graduated range of interventions
    - ◆ Minimised the risk of harm, acknowledging that physical interventions have potential physical risks
    - ◆ Enabled staff to learn and correctly apply physical interventions appropriate to the individuals they supported and their setting
    - ◆ Were set within the legal and good practice guidance under which physical interventions should be used, including physical interventions being a last resort for keeping people safe from harm

- ◆ Was both efficient and sustainable by:-
  - ◆ Increasing the number of staff trained in a single programme to promote consistency and transferrable knowledge and skills within and across partner authorities
  - ◆ Reducing costs
  - ◆ Being practical in terms of staff release and delivery

4.4. It was on the basis of this consensus that the evaluation was commissioned, with the report detailing the evidence found as to whether these goals were achieved.

## **5. The Evaluation Process**

- 5.1. The complexities of gathering evidence from eight different organisations, geographically spread out; from multiple services in each establishment (e.g. children's, adult, older people and homelessness services) had the potential to limit the scope of evaluation, particularly given the constraints of the allocated budget.
- 5.2. The process was firstly discussed with representatives from South Lanarkshire Council's Procurement and Finance Services to establish how the selection might proceed. The proposal was to engage with the Social Care Local Learning Network (LLN) who were identified as independent brokers with experience of commissioning similar work (evaluation of Practice Learning) for a similar client group.
- 5.3. Although the LLN's recommended choice of consultant was interviewed on more than one occasion and submitted an initial proposal, it was deemed unsuitable to address the complexities of this project.
- 5.4. This exercise highlighted that the evaluation of PPB was sufficiently complex to warrant choosing a known supplier. Following further consultation with the Clyde Valley Social Care Group and thereafter with the PPB Strategic Governance Group, an appropriate individual was identified. This decision was formally approved by the latter Group
- 5.5. The rationale for this approach was that a suitable individual was known to both Groups who had a working knowledge of local government, the practice of social work/social care and in this case also an in-depth knowledge of the PPB programme and its predecessors gained during an extensive career in Social Work Services.
- 5.6. Because of the individual's background and experience the specification for the task was able to be reduced. This was because there was no requirement to allocate additional time and resources to bring the candidate up to speed with information on the nature, history and usage of the programme.
- 5.7. The evaluation took place over a period of four months, during which time evidence was gathered from all eight Councils using the PPB programme. On the guidance of the PPB Strategic Governance Group, an early decision was taken that the views of children and adults who used services would not be gathered directly for the evaluation.
- 5.8. This was partly due to the complexity of meeting the differing policy requirements for involving service users across the eight Councils. Amongst other considerations was the challenge of involving these stakeholders in a meaningful way within this subject area.

- 5.9. It was further decided that the evaluation of cost savings would not be in scope for this project and that it was more appropriate that this be covered in a separate report by the CVLDG Project Manager (see following report).

## **6. Data Capture and Analysis**

- 6.1. In order to achieve a set of reliable and robust conclusions, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data was gathered. This approach provided information on the scope and magnitude of coverage for the programme, alongside responses and evidence of cumulative learning and service outcomes.
- 6.2. Quantitative data was obtained relating to the location and services where the programme was in use, the numbers of trained trainers, practitioners and course participants. Comparisons were also drawn between previous programmes used before the development of PPB.
- 6.3. Qualitative data was captured through several different means to gauge the experiences and views from those involved in the programme, the impact of the programme in service locations was considered by accessing Care Inspectorate reports as well as additional anecdotal evidence relating to the programme and its delivery.
- 6.4. The independent report and analysis carried out by Robert Gordon University to validate and assess the risks of the physical interventions was also used as a source of information, and to prompt further questioning.
- 6.5. The methods and sources of data gathered was as follows:-
- ◆ Types of Services using the PPB programme within the eight Councils
  - ◆ Numbers trained on PPB courses between 1 April 2018 and 31 March 2019
  - ◆ Experiences and views gathered from 44 current PPB trainers
  - ◆ Information and documents related to the course content and its delivery
  - ◆ Number of current PPB trainers and documents related to trainers
  - ◆ Number of behaviour support programmes used prior to PPB and now
  - ◆ Experiences and views gathered from 150 practitioners and managers
  - ◆ A sample of 50 Care Inspectorate Reports for registered services using PPB
  - ◆ Documents relating to the risk assessment of the physical interventions

## **7. Principal Findings**

- 7.1. **Has the PPB programme been used by Clyde Valley Authorities across a range of social care services as their principal behaviour support programme?**
- ◆ All eight of the original Clyde Valley Authorities have adopted PPB and are using it across a range of different services and is now their programme of choice
  - ◆ One of the benefits of a single programme is that staff may move within services or between authorities, without needing to be retrained
  - ◆ Now a shared knowledge and skills base for practice across teams, services and authorities
- 7.2. **Has PPB met the learning outcome of having an ethos of promoting positive behaviour through prevention and early intervention?**
- ◆ Most practitioners believed that the programme had helped them to successfully use prevention and early interventions within their care and support of service users. This was an aspect of the programme that everyone involved noted as being highly valued

- ◆ This was the primary focus for participants, and has resulted in effective strategies which supported their ability to demonstrate positive behaviour

**7.3. Do PPB's physical Interventions provide a graduated range of interventions which minimise the risk of harm?**

- ◆ The physical intervention guide provided on the course allows for appropriate choices to be made to select the least restrictive method required to avoid harm
- ◆ The physical interventions within the PPB programme have been professionally assessed by staff with expertise in this area and using specialised equipment
- ◆ There was consistent evidence that when applied, the physical interventions had kept the individual involved safe and to a lesser extent themselves or other people safe

**7.4. Does PPB enable staff to learn and correctly apply the physical interventions in a way that is consistent with legal and good practice guidance?**

- ◆ Physical interventions by their nature contain potential risks. Legal and good practice guidance state that any physical intervention should be proportionate, with the least restrictive method used and only as a last resort to prevent harm
- ◆ There is evidence that the physical interventions are being used by staff where appropriate, with greater usage in children's services than in adult services
- ◆ Critically there is evidence that the use of physical interventions has reduced since the programme has been introduced
- ◆ Participants' competence to correctly perform the physical interventions is tested on each course, along with participants' understanding of health and safety and other legal considerations related to their use
- ◆ PPB has added to participants' confidence to use interventions correctly and had increased their understanding of the associated legal and good practice guidance

**7.5. Is PPB practical and sustainable in terms of delivery and staff release?**

- ◆ The fact that the programme has now been running for over six years, and can train over 2,000 staff within a single year, is an indicator that the programme has achieved this objective both over time and for a large number of staff
- ◆ The ratio of trainers to participants seems to be viable and the arrangements for the training of trainers are well organised. The criteria set for trainers includes qualifications and experience which is consistent with the minimum for a supervisory post within social care, and is appropriate for this programme
- ◆ It is acknowledged that for most authorities the difficulty in releasing staff for training is very real and this a theme which has been present across social care services for a number of years. However, PPB core courses are shorter than most of the programmes used previously and thus require less staff release
- ◆ The fact that the programme is delivered across authorities also offers additional benefits. Both trainers and managers spoke of collaborative arrangements which enabled staff to attend courses run by another authority

**7.6. Does the programme have the capacity to develop further?**

- ◆ All learning programmes require to be kept updated in order to be relevant and sustainable. During the years that the programme has existed, both the e-learning module and core course learning materials have been kept under review and updated as appropriate
- ◆ A review of the core course programme is currently being undertaken by Principal Trainers. It is a recommendation that to be consistent with the review cycle of physical interventions a similar review cycle should be established for the review of the theoretical part of the course

- ◆ This will build in a structure for ensuring the programme continues to reflect current knowledge and practice. Any important alterations to the statutory or practice framework can alter this frequency as necessary
- ◆ It will be essential that the PPB programme remains up to date on reviews and developments regarding behaviour support programmes (e.g. the Scottish Government's national learning disability strategy for Scotland "Keys for Life")
- ◆ This will ensure that PPB can continue to be based on current knowledge and good practice guidance moving forwards into the future

## **8. Evaluation Conclusions**

- 8.1. The purpose of evaluation for any learning and development programme is to gauge the effectiveness of the programme and to establish where possible that it has an impact on changing people and services for the better.
- 8.2. It is clear from the evaluation findings that the outcomes anticipated at the outset of the programme have been met and, in many cases, exceeded.
- 8.3. There is strong evidence from the examination of the programme that it has been beneficial to both service providers (the Councils) and course participants.
- 8.4. The physical components of the programme have been rigorously tested and therefore able to be used with confidence. The theoretical elements have provided a consistent approach to behaviour support across the Clyde Valley Councils and there are many examples of the benefits of this approach for the children and adults supported.
- 8.5. The aim of producing a course owned entirely by the Clyde Valley Learning and Development Group (CVLDG), which delivers efficiency and sustainability opportunities through collaborative working has clearly been demonstrated. A few recommendations have been included for future consideration, but overall this evaluation has shown that on balance the programme has met the original expectations intended and, in many aspects, has exceeded these expectations.

## **9. Employee Implications**

- 9.1. The continued commitment of all Clyde Valley Councils to provide trainers and practitioners to deliver PPB across the partnership remains critical to the ongoing success of the programme. It is through this commitment that the successful outcomes have been achieved to date and where the long term sustainability of PPB rests.

## **10. Financial Implications**

- 10.1. A comparison of the cost savings in delivering this programme is contained in a separate report.

## **11. Other Implications (Including Environmental and Risk Issues)**

- 11.1. No specific risks have been identified beyond maintaining the commitment and application of members of the Group.
- 11.2. The sustainability of the programme is contingent on the continuation of the CVLDG and the ongoing commitment of its members.

## **12. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements**

- 12.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore no impact assessment is required.
- 12.2. Consultation with stakeholders representing all participating Councils has been fundamental to the evaluation process and has been carried out systematically and through a broad range of approaches.

**Gill Bhatti**

**Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group**

11 November 2019

### **Previous References**

- ◆ 5 December 2016 - Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Governance of the Promoting Positive Behaviour Programme
- ◆ 10 December 2018 - Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Update on Social Care Group Projects

### **List of Background Papers**

- ◆ Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee Minute of Agreement

### **Contact for Further Information**

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Gill Bhatti, Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group

Ext: 5604 (Tel: 01698 455604)

E-mail: [gill.bhatti@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:gill.bhatti@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

Gerry Farrell, Project Manager, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Group

Ext: 4240 (Tel: 01698 454240)

E-mail: [gerry.farrell@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:gerry.farrell@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)