

April 2018

Response to review of the sexual harm crisis support service guidelines

Valuable feedback was received from 16 providers on the review of the sexual harm crisis support service guidelines. The guidelines have been in place for nearly a year so it was helpful for providers to let us know what's working and what's not.

We found that 75 percent of providers think the service requirements for sexual harm crisis support are clear.

In general the feedback indicated that clarity is still needed about some requirements including how the Ministry measures, audits and evaluates service delivery.

We will now work on updating the service guidelines based on the feedback we have gathered.

Below are general findings from the survey. A full breakdown of the findings is in [Appendix One](#).

Working well?

We received positive feedback with the main themes being about having clearer expectations and having a clear 'road map for success'. This was particularly helpful when setting up the service as new.

Providers commented that the service design and requirements increased community collaboration, engagement and networking.

Not working well?

Lack of specialist training in the sector was a theme in the feedback and so was a lack of specialist services for children and Māori. Work is underway outside of this review to look at how to address these gaps.

Providers told us that collecting data is challenging when someone is in crisis and there is a lack of clarity about collecting Individual Client Level Data. We have responded to the issues regarding reporting in the 'Report measures' section below.

Providers questioned a number of definitions in the guidelines. It is useful to recognise where further clarification is needed and to build this into contract management support and the guidelines. The guidelines are a living document so we will continue to work together to get them right.

Report measures

Sixty four (64) percent of providers think the current report measures are the right ones. Nineteen (19) percent selected 'other' and 17 percent did not think they were right.

The main feedback from those that selected 'other' was that some of the measures can be confusing. We also received feedback that it is costly and timely to make adjustments each time funders make a change to reporting requirements.

Based on this feedback we will keep the current report measures the same and ensure we work together with providers to clarify what we are collecting and why. We have

already started this process by putting together a reporting guide for contract managers and providers (available on the MSD website).

There was a strong theme that the data may not always be possible or appropriate to gather given this is a service for people in crisis. The Ministry intends to work with providers to find a safe way to collect client feedback, where possible and when appropriate to do so.

The report measures are one way to tell the story of quality and demand for services, but they are not used to set targets or ensure a throughput of clients. The Ministry uses the data to help ensure that funds are going to those with the highest needs and that the services that the Ministry funds are having a positive impact on clients, their families and whānau.

We received mixed comments in response to narrative reporting – some felt it should be more specific and others felt that it should just be a space to freely write about the organisation. There was consistent feedback that it can be repetitive so we will be amending the reporting requirements so that providers only need to submit the narrative reporting six monthly.

We will also be making amendments to the guidelines to confirm that the Ministry will not be collecting Individual Client Level Data.

What's next?

We will update the areas of the guidelines that need clarity and work with local contract managers to support providers with these changes/updates. All contracted providers of sexual harm crisis support services will receive a notice of amendments to the guidelines by May 2018.

Any provider who indicated that they would like a follow up regarding their feedback will be contacted.

Appendix One: breakdown of the sexual harm crisis support service guidelines review

What aspects of the service guidelines are working well?

Themes

Gives focus and an understanding of what is required

Reporting process and feedback

Tender process

Everything (except reporting)

Expectations around the service and service delivery

Road map for success

Community collaboration, engagement and networking

Giving the client autonomy and control

What aspects of the service guidelines are not working well?

Themes

Collecting result measures when someone is in crisis

Too rigid

Specialist training is not available in the sector

No funding for services for children

Unresolved clarity around ICLD

Restraints to meet the guidelines

Please outline any barriers to collecting/storing data?

Themes

Training staff

Knowing what data to input

Asking a client to provide feedback (after they have accessed a crisis service)

Labour intensive system

Changes to reporting from funders do not take in to account limitations of systems/time and costs

The cost to providers when government make changes

Do you think the following quantity measures ('the how much') are right?

Themes

System issues - logistically challenging to collect the required information

Definitions / clarity needed – 'Crisis', 'new', 'closed', 'referred'

Context needed e.g. access to ACC counsellors

Should be quality not quantity

Do you think the following quality measures ('the how well') are right?

Themes

Impossible to collect when in crisis

Confusing

Subjective from client and specialist crisis support worker

There are better ways to ask these questions

Do you think the following result measures ('the is anyone better off') are right?

Themes

Crisis - can be impossible to collect feedback

Not specific enough

Power dynamic for authentic feedback

Does the narrative reporting ('to support the data') allow you to 'tell the story' for your organisation?

Themes

Not sure how it's used

Make more specific

Make brief

Less specific and just general update

No room for examples of cases

Do you have any other feedback, comments or suggestions about the Sexual Harm Crisis Support Service Guidelines?

Themes

Really helpful in setting up a service from scratch

Funding constraints

How can they measure success

Clarity around when to close someone

Narrative reporting is repetitive

Clarification around qualifications of staff

Guidelines needed when a Kaupapa Māori service isn't available

Lack of available training