

OP12.1

Developing a collaborative care model for people with severe mental illness: intervention theory development

Jon Allard(1), R Gwernan-Jones(2), R Bing(1), L Gask(3), N Britten(2), V Pinfold(4), L England(5), S Reilly(6), H Plappert(4), H Lloyd(1), L Gill(1), M Birchwood(7)

(1) Plymouth University

(2) University of Exeter

(3) University of Manchester

(4) McPin Foundation

(5) University of Birmingham

(6) Lancaster University

(7) University of Warwick

Corresponding author: Dr Jon Allard, Plymouth University, Primary Care Group, PLYMOUTH, UK. E-mail: jon.allard@plymouth.ac.uk

Background & Aim: Ongoing care for individuals with severe mental illness (SMI) is often split between specialist mental health services and general practices. The PARTNERS2 (P2) programme aims to develop and evaluate a model of collaborative care (CC) to support adults with (SMI) to have improved quality of life and care by situating specialist mental health workers (case managers) alongside GPs. This presentation describes how we developed a coherent, practical intervention in preparation for a RCT.

Methods: A realist synthesis involving stakeholders drew from four sources to create an intervention theory: a) systematic review; b) narrative review of recovery; c) telephone interviews with international leaders; d) focus groups with SMI service users. We extracted causal micro-hypotheses embedding them in the CC model.

Results: The first stages of the synthesis process produced agreement for most key issues about an optimum model of CC for SMI:

- Physical, mental health and social outcomes are all important
- Care Partners (case managers) are the central intervention resource supported by supervisors
- Individualised goals are prioritised
- Monitoring and support for self-management should be provided through coaching
- Assertive follow up is critical
- Care Partners need to liaise with GPs, practice nurses and psychiatrists to ensure joined up care
- GPs need to understand the role of Care Partner in self-management enhancement
- Shared electronic records. Other issues relating to peer workers, group work and endings needed to be resolved through the consensus meetings.

Conclusions: The systematic review revealed great heterogeneity of CC models and anticipated outcomes. The narrative review emphasised the need to build on individuals' strengths and address personal goals. The expert interviews provided strong well-reasoned practical solutions and the focus groups developed understanding of how productive collaborative relationships can work in practice. Consensus meetings with open challenging discussions were able to reach agreement about key uncertainties.