



palgrave▶pivot

Improving Healthcare Services Coproduction, Codesign and Operations

Sharon J. Williams
Lynne Caley

palgrave
macmillan

Improving Healthcare Services

“This manuscript provides a valuable contribution in exploring two mechanisms – co-production and quality improvement – that have largely been developed independently but synergistically can offer more to improving healthcare systems. The authors consider the varying terminology and definitions for both approaches and discuss the benefits and challenges of developing an integrated approach. Interesting case studies are provided as illustrative examples of patient and family involvement in quality improvement. Conceptual integrated models are provided which integrated key principles of co-production with two popular approaches used in healthcare: Lean thinking and Model for Improvement. The reflective (what’s missing) sections consider the lessons learnt from undertaking this research and/or the learning for healthcare organisations. This then allows academics to benefit from the agenda provided for future research. Healthcare professionals and managers looking to co-produce healthcare improvements will also find this text invaluable.”

—Professor Zoe Radnor, Vice President, *Strategy and Planning; Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, City, University of London*

Sharon J. Williams • Lynne Caley

Improving Healthcare Services

Coproduction, Codesign and Operations

palgrave
macmillan

Sharon J. Williams
College of Human & Health Sciences
Swansea University
Swansea, UK

Lynne Caley
Consolidated Caley Ltd
Peterborough, UK

ISBN 978-3-030-36497-7 ISBN 978-3-030-36498-4 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36498-4>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover Pattern © Melisa Hasan

This Palgrave Pivot imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

FOREWORD

Victor Fuchs (1968) opens his early book on the “emerging service economy” with the acknowledgement that in contrast to making a product, there are always two parties involved in making a service. I interviewed him to explore how he came to that (Fuch 2015). He said, “it’s obvious.” I pressed him for more. He related the story of the time when one of his children cut his hand. Fuchs’ wife wanted to develop a plan for the problem, was uncertain about the need for a suture and called the doctor. Together they discussed the indications for a suture, where to get it and what to do if it wasn’t needed. “So,” he said, “it took two parties to make the service—you see, it’s obvious.” I wonder if it’s so obvious today. We live in a world where the logic of making a product – one party “makes” it, another party(s) buys it – seems to be the dominant view of how everything is made...even services! The authors of this book offer a refreshing contrast as they invite us to consider how services are actually made and improved. They build on the assumption that innovation and improvement become possible when there is a deep knowledge of the way things are “made” – hence, the link between service operations, improvement and coproduction.

For example, the coproduction of a service to achieve, preserve or improve someone’s health involves a relationship and some action (Batalden 2018). They are held together in the shared work of patient and professional by knowledge, skill, habit, and some shared power. In addition, the work involves a willingness to be vulnerable in order to create, benefit from authentic relationships. The creation of a healthcare service is driven by several “streams” of knowledge: a.)the lived reality of the person – sometimes known as “beneficiary” or “client”; b.)the “as is” system

and its navigation by those seeking benefit; c.) “science-informed practice”; and d.) the lived reality of the person – sometimes known as “professional.” This multiple knowledge-driven dyadic work of two parties is not “free-standing.” (Batalden et al. 2016). It occurs in settings that enable a sense of “agency” by those involved, an experienced sense of “support” for the shared work, an ongoing curiosity for “design,” and encouragement for “integrative thinking” across a variety of knowledge domains (Riel and Martin 2017).

Opening the logic of making a service invites clarity about “ownership” of the desired outcome and an accountability for the contribution that a service makes to that end. For example, despite many hopes, suggestions and efforts to try, it is actually very difficult to outsource one’s own health or learning to another person, even a related “professional.” Further, “service coproduction” invites measurement of the contributions that each party brings to the task, whether the intended aim was realized, and the degree to which the setting helped make it easier or more difficult.

These invitations for “service-making” offer new opportunities for design, for human and system development, for value creation, for innovation and for ongoing improvement. This volume offers its readers a reflective place to begin. Savour it.

The Dartmouth Institute for
Health Policy and Clinical Practice
Geisel Medical School at Dartmouth
Hanover, NH, USA
August 2019

Professor Paul Batalden

REFERENCES

- Fuchs, V. (1968). *The service economy*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Fuchs, V. (2015, October 2). Personal conversation with author. Palo Alto.
- Batalden, P. (2018). Getting more health from healthcare: Quality improvement must acknowledge patient coproduction. *BMJ*, 362, k3617. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k3617>. (Published 6 September, 2018).
- Batalden, M., Batalden, P., Margolis, P., et al. (2016). The coproduction of health-care service. *BMJ Quality Safety*, 25, 509–517.
- Riel, J., & Martin, R. (2017). *Creating great choices: A leader’s guide to integrative thinking*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

PREFACE

Involving service users in the design and delivery of healthcare has become a popular concept for practitioners, managers, policymakers, academics and patients and their families. Various approaches to how this might be achieved are being introduced alongside the various models and frameworks used to improve the quality of healthcare systems. We explore the opportunity to integrate models used for co-design and co-production with those of quality improvement. Drawing on service operations management, this study develops the thinking around the involvement of services users in improving healthcare services. We use two case studies which focus on two long-term chronic conditions and five published cases to illustrate an insightful explanation of how quality improvement can be integrated to co-production. We provide a research agenda that supports further development and understanding of what we have termed person-centred improvement. This study will be of interest to healthcare professionals, managers, researchers, educators and advanced students in public service operations and health service management.

Swansea, UK
Peterborough, UK

Sharon J. Williams
Lynne Caley

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank all the patients, relatives, healthcare professionals and managers that contributed to the case research included in this text. The authors would also like to thank Jessica Harrison who commissioned this work and the publishing team who provided guidance and support when bringing together the final manuscript. Special thanks are extended to Professor Zoe Radnor who has acted as an academic mentor to Professor Sharon Williams during her academic career and encouraged her to write this and her first pivot entitled Improving Healthcare Operations. The authors would also like to express their thanks to Professor Paul Batalden for his foreword and for Professor Radnor for her endorsement of this text.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction to Public Service Management and Service Operations	1
2	Quality Improvement in Healthcare: Where Are We Now and Where Next?	15
3	Citizen Involvement: What Does It Mean?	25
4	Defining Co-production	39
5	Quality Improvement and Co-production and Co-design Models and Approaches	55
6	Case Study: Improving a Pulmonary Rehabilitation Programme – A Co-produced Approach	69
7	Case Study: Improving a Community Based Huntington’s Disease Service – A Family-Centred Approach	81
8	Co-producing Quality Improvement: Cases from the Published Literature	91

9 The Role of Co-design and Co-production in Improving Healthcare Services: Conclusion and Future Research Agenda	103
Index	119

ABBREVIATIONS

COPD	Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
EBCD	Experience based co-design
HD	Huntington's Disease
Mfi	Model for Improvement
OPD	Outpatient Department
PAM	Public Administration and Management
PDSA	Plan Do Study Act
PPI or PI	Patient and Public Involvement or Patient Involvement
PR	Pulmonary Rehabilitation
QFD	Quality Function Deployment
QI	Quality Improvement
SOM	Service Operations Management

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1	Theoretical framework. (Source: Authors)	8
Fig. 4.1	Ladder of participation. (Source: Adapted from the New Economic Foundation (2013, p. 10))	45
Fig. 4.2	From consultation to co-production. (Source: Compiled by the authors)	46
Fig. 6.1	Stages of Pulmonary rehabilitation improvement programme. (Source: Compiled by authors)	71
Fig. 6.2	PDSA cycles of change to improve flow. (Source: Compiled by authors)	72
Fig. 7.1	Knowledge and Activities of person-centred approach used by the HD team. (Source: Compiled by authors)	86
Fig. 9.1	Revised theoretical framework. (Source: Compiled by the authors)	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 6.1	Summary of the PR improvement and co-production activity	74
Table 6.2	EBCD and the PR Case study	76
Table 7.1	Summary of the HD improvement and co-production activity	85
Table 9.1	Integrating lean thinking and principles of co-design and co-production	108
Table 9.2	Questions for future research	112