

# 'Managing Change in the NHS' (2001) publications

NCCSDO

*Report of a study on the uptake and use of two SDO  
publications*

---

**Steve Cranfield & Helena Ward**

**March 2002**

© Crown copyright 2002

Researched and written by Steve Cranfield, Independent Researcher, and Helena Ward, Communications Manager, NCCSDO

### **Acknowledgements**

Our thanks are due to the following for their advice and assistance:

#### *NCCSDO*

**Dr Naomi Fulop**, Director, NCCSDO

**Pamela Baker**, Programme Manager, NCCSDO

#### *Independent advisors and researchers*

**Marsaili Cameron**

**Jud Stone**

Our thanks are also due to those respondents who agreed to be interviewed. To preserve confidentiality, names of individuals have not been included here.

**The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NCCSDO or those who gave advice and assistance.**

**Steve Cranfield** BA BPhil MA (Education) RGN RMN

**Helena Ward** BA Hons

22 March 2002

## **Contents**

### **Executive summary**

- 1 Context of the research**
- 2 Aims and methods**
- 3 Findings and discussion**
- 4 Conclusions**

### **Appendix 1**

- 1 Interview schedule**

# Executive summary

## Publication data and aim of study

- The two publications 'Organisational Change' and 'Making Informed Decisions on Change' were launched in June 2001 and have been widely distributed nationally in hard copy and accessed in electronic format via the NCCSDO website. Interest in the publications has been high and the NCCSDO continues to process substantial numbers of enquiries and requests about the publications.
- Between December 2001 and March 2002 a telephone survey was carried out to assess the impact of the publications on their intended target audiences.
- The study was designed and carried out by a team of independent researchers working in collaboration with and assisted by NCCSDO staff.
- A total of 21 people were interviewed using a structured questionnaire; respondents were drawn from team, service and organisational leadership levels.

## Awareness and dissemination of resources

- Most of those interviewed have heard about the resources via colleagues, circulation lists within their organisations or the NCCSDO website. Inclusion on reading lists and recommendation by educators on management courses has proved a highly effective route of disseminating both resources but particularly the review.
- Most have read both publications and where opportunities have arisen have circulated them widely and recommended them to others. Many have commented on how the resources have been at the 'top of my pile' and remained there.
- Many were aware of the resources being available on the NCCSDO's website although most were also keen to have their own hard copies.

## Target audiences

- There is widespread agreement that the resources are appropriate to their intended target audiences. Indeed the review has exceeded expectations in this respect and has proved to be very popular with practitioners and team managers also.
- There is some uncertainty as to whether the shorter digest is effectively reaching people at team level, due mainly to problems of accessing resources, including electronically, at this level.

## Methods of use

- Both resources have been unanimously (in many cases overwhelmingly) praised for lending themselves to a range of different uses. These include: individual briefing, study, education and training, policy and strategy and as a research tool and reference aid.
- Several practical examples were provided of the many ways in which the resource is being used to raise awareness of change management in health

and social care and to help facilitate and inform current and planned change initiatives.

- The main barriers to use are extrinsic, e.g. limited time and conflicting priorities.

### **Assessment of publications**

- Both resources are evaluated as useful or very useful tools which lend themselves to several actual or anticipated uses. Reasons given include: user-friendliness and lack of jargon, attractive design, relevance and topicality, up-to-date information on resources, clarity and conciseness, clear links made between research evidence and practice and the fact that the resources are tailored to the needs and circumstances of health and social care.
- Many commented on the important niche these publications have filled. Many expressed praise and gratitude to the NCCSDO for fulfilling an obvious need.
- Popularity of the review has exceeded initial expectations and this is now being used by a wider group than anticipated. It has proved to be particularly useful by team and service level managers undertaking continuing professional development and management/leadership courses.
- The particular selection of management models has been found to be appropriate, with very few suggestions for omissions or additions.
- Most consider that the Review in particular will continue to have a good shelf life and will not rapidly date.
- Some suggestions were made for further developing the resources, including PowerPoint presentations, self-directed learning packs and ideas for creating web links to specific sections of the longer review.

### **Knowledge and awareness of the SDO Programme**

- Knowledge and awareness of the SDO Programme's identity and role appear to be reasonably good among those interviewed although several have found the full name of the organisation cumbersome and hard to remember.

# 1 Context of the study

In response to specific needs identified by government and by the NCCSDO's own national listening exercise, the SDO programme has commissioned and published two complementary resources under the title 'Managing Change in the NHS' – a substantial review of the evidence of change management, entitled *Organisational Change: A Review for Health Care Managers, Professionals and Researchers* and a shorter digest of the review and associated issues, called *Making Informed Decisions on Change: Key Points for Health Care Managers and Professionals*. Both publications were launched at a national conference, co-hosted by the Health Service Journal, in London in June 2001.

Distribution of the resources began in May 2001 and remains on-going; they are expected to have reached the majority of their target groups by late summer 2002. The documents are also available for downloading on the NCCSDO's website.

The NCCSDO is committed to developing quality resources which are grounded in the real needs of potential users. A key part of this commitment is to monitor and evaluate uptake, use and impact of publications at specific stages, and to build on the lessons learnt, both in terms of individual projects and broader communications strategies.

Accordingly an impact study was commissioned, co-ordinated by an independent team of researchers and conducted in collaboration with the NCCSDO. The researchers had contributed to the editing, design and development of the two resources. The study was designed to gain early feedback from the field about uptake, use and perceived impact of the resources.

## 2 Aims of the study

The nature of the study was based on the assumptions that:

- the publications, *Organisational Change* and *Making Informed Decisions on Change* have a relatively substantial active life in their present form – probably something in the order of three years
- each publication would appeal to distinct audiences with relatively little cross-over – an assumption which it would be important to test against available evidence of dissemination
- their distribution and public availability will coincide with important opportunities for potential users to contribute to research and development, debate and policy making, and implementation of change management at local, regional and national levels.

Accordingly, the agreed priority is to ensure that users get as much as possible out of the resources during the coming months and beyond – and that users' views are sought on potential future resources to be offered by NCCSDO.

Key aims for the study the NCCSDO had already identified included the following:

- Are people from the intended target groups using the change management models discussed in the two publications?
- In what ways are they being used, and when?
- What helps or hinders their use?

Agreed aims of the study were to:

- identify the dissemination pattern to date of *Organisational Change* and *Making Informed Decisions on Change*
- identify the likely usage patterns of the resources, along with a profile of the kind of changes that the resource might realistically support
- use that information gathered to help inform the NCCSDO's ongoing communications strategies and programme evaluations
- identify ways in which the ideas in the resources might be further developed.

## Methods

The study used quantitative and qualitative methods based on:

1. Data on requests for the publications, their dissemination and numbers of downloads from the NCCSDO website.
2. Structured telephone interviews with key users of the resources.

### 1 Data on publications, requests and web downloads

Analysis of data on publications, requests and web downloads was undertaken by Helena Ward at NCCSDO.

### 2 Interviews

#### (a) Identification of interviewees

Those approached were categorised according to leadership level within the NHS, as follows:

**Organisational level** – for example, chief executives, chairs; non-executive directors; executive directors; senior specialists and advisers such as organisation development practitioners or clinical governance leads.

**Service level** – for example, service managers; locality managers; departmental managers; clinical directors; lead clinicians.

**Team level** – for example, ward sisters/charge nurses; multidisciplinary team leaders; section heads.

#### (b) Selection and contact of potential interviewees

Initial selection of respondents was as much as possible randomised and based on names of those who had requested copies of the resources from the NCCSDO personally, by mail, telephone or email. A small number of additional names were gathered by snowballing to boost numbers.

Within the confines of a 'randomised' sample we attempted to cover a reasonable range of different organisational and professional interests, responsibilities and areas of expertise. We also attempted to ensure a reasonable spread across the country.

Interviewees were contacted by a combination of email, fax and telephone with an introductory letter provided by Dr Naomi Fulop, Centre Director at the NCCSDO.

### **(c) Format of interviews**

Interviews were conducted by telephone using a structured questionnaire format agreed with NCCSDO (see Appendix 1). Notes from interviews were transcribed in writing and analysed. Issues explored with respondents focused on:

- Knowledge of the role of the NCCSDO and the SDO Programme
- Assessment of the resource(s) as an information/briefing/learning tool
- Assessment of their value in raising awareness of change management issues and enabling users to contribute to current debates
- Ideas for, and assessment of, their dissemination – i.e. to what extent are the resources getting to those who might need them?
- Examples of ways in which they are currently being used and ideas for potential use
- Barriers to potential use and ideas for overcoming these
- Ideas for how the resources might be improved.

Interviewees were also asked if they would be willing to participate in any follow-up interview in 6 months' time to assess the extent to which the publications may have contributed to developing policy and practice.

After conducting 3 interviews one question (on 'evidence') was dropped from the questionnaire because respondents found they had already covered the issue by the time this question was asked.

### **Project operation**

The project was overseen at the NCCSDO by Dr Naomi Fulop and Pamela Baker. Design, implementation and write-up of the research were undertaken by Steve Cranfield, independent researcher, and Helena Ward, Communications Manager at NCCSDO. Additional advice on methodology and assistance with contacts and conducting one interview were provided by Marsaili Cameron and Jud Stone, independent researchers.

### **Results**

To obtain an agreed minimum sample of 20 people, approximately 40 people were contacted. Of these we interviewed 21 between 10 December 2001 and 7 March 2002. The majority of non-respondents either did not reply to emails or return calls as previously arranged, often after several attempts to reach them. In two instances people had changed jobs. From conversations with people's personal assistants and work colleagues we gathered that the main reasons for



non-compliance were lack of time and annual leave, not, as far as we can gather from, a lack of interest in the topic or lack of receipt of the publications.

Interviews were conducted by Helena Ward and Steve Cranfield. Jud Stone assisted in carrying out 1 interview.

### **Interviewees' profiles**

The following provides information about the leadership level, job title and geographical distribution of interviewees. Names and other specific details have been removed to maintain confidentiality.

#### ***Team***

- Charge Nurse - Nottingham
- Nurse Manager - Devon
- Senior Nurse - Darlington
- Diabetes Lead Nurse - Surrey
- Educational Psychologist - Edinburgh

#### ***Service***

- Training Manager - West Sussex
- Planning and Development Manager - Gateshead
- Senior Lecturer - Northampton
- Specialist Registrar - Oxford
- Outpatient Improvement Manager - Salford

#### ***Organisational***

- Lead Manager, Cancer Network - North of England
- Deputy Director of Operations - West Suffolk
- Chief Executive - North London
- Chief Executive - Southport
- Chief Executive - Cornwall
- Cancer Services Co-ordinator – South West of England
- Clinical Governance and Audit Manager - Birmingham
- Health Strategy Co-ordinator, Local Government - London
- Strategic Development Manager - Edinburgh
- Head of School of Health - London
- Head of OD - a National Leadership Centre

*Gender* 10 interviewees were male and 11 were female.

*Time* Interviews lasted between 7 and 45 minutes. Average time of interviews was 15 minutes.

## **3 Findings and discussion**

### **3.1 Publication update**

On average, NCCSDO is still processing 10 requests for the publications a day. Requests are made by email, telephone and fax. So far 10,620 copies of the review and 10,800 copies of the booklet have been distributed. Approximately 100 of each were distributed pre-launch to those involved in the project and other

key people, and approximately 1,000 have been distributed at events, e.g. the Launch, NHS Confederation Conference, NICE Conference, 1st National SDO Conference, and so on. 2,500 copies of each were sent out as a mailshot (see below) and approximately 7,000 have been distributed as a result of requests.

### ***Mailshot***

With the permission of the Department of Health in October 2001 NCCSDO distributed the publications to:

- Chief Executives of Trusts, HAs, PCGs, PCTs.
- Medical, Nursing and HR Directors of Trusts.
- Internal OD consultants.
- Directors of Public Health and Health Authority Nurse and HR Leads.
- Directors of Social Services.
- Deans and Associate Deans of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Medicine, Dentistry and General Practice.
- Patient Representative Groups.

### ***Website***

The publications are available to download on the SDO website ([www.sdo.lshtm.ac.uk](http://www.sdo.lshtm.ac.uk)). Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc (CCP) did not give permission to reproduce Figure 9 on p 62 of the Review in electronic format so the PDF file has been altered accordingly. Web server statistics for the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) show that the Review has 3,800 hits on average per month and the booklet 1,500 hits. In January 2002 the review had 4,908 hits and the booklet 2,299.

### ***Articles, e-bulletins etc.***

Articles about the publications/launch have appeared in *the Health Service Journal*, *Health Management* (the journal of the Institute of Healthcare Management), *The Chariot* (LSHTM) and the *Canadian Health Services Research Foundation* newsletter.

Adverts for the publications have appeared in several Department of Health e-bulletins on the Internet:

- Chief Executive bulletin
- Human Resources bulletin
- GP bulletin
- Medical Director bulletin
- Nurse Executive Director bulletin
- Allied Health Professions bulletin

A review of the publications will appear in the March 2002 issue of *Primary Health Care Research and Development* published by Arnold.

Since the launch of the publications in June 2001, the NCCSDO has received many unsolicited emails, letters and telephone calls in praise of them.

### **3.2 Awareness of publications**

NB. Here and in the following sections cross references to the relevant questionnaire item (see Appendix 1) are included in brackets.

Approximately two-thirds of respondents had received copies of the resources in the period June–December 2001, the remainder having received them since the beginning of 2002. Several people commented on how promptly they had received the publications after requesting them. (B2)

People had heard or seen them from a variety of sources, including colleagues, in-house information and circulation lists, via colleagues or tutors and the web, including accessing the NCCSDO website, via links from other sites or through search engines. (B3)

The inclusion of the publications on course reading lists was mentioned as an effective way of drawing them to people's attention.

About half had not known the resources were available on the NCCSDO website but were glad to know. One or two commented that the Review had proved too large for them to download or print out.

All had at least skimmed both publications and several had read both all, or in part. Some had read substantial parts of the Review while others said it encouraged dipping into. (B4)

#### ***Distribution***

Distribution of the publications varied, with widest distribution occurring with those in senior management positions and of course depending on how many copies they had ordered. Those using the texts on courses had distributed it widely. Others, including those in executive and management positions had also distributed 10 plus copies within departments using cascade systems or had alerted colleagues to the website while others, particularly those in small teams or using the documents for study and research purposes said that they had not circulated them. A number of respondents had placed further orders. (B5)

A few respondents said they had placed copies in NHS and Higher Education (HE) libraries and recommended this as an effective method of dissemination.

### **3.3 Assessment of target audiences**

The majority of respondents said that the different sets of target audiences for the two publications, as listed on their respective front covers, struck them as the appropriate ones and did not appear to exclude any important categories of personnel. Only one respondent thought that the term 'clinicians' should have been used in the titles, in order to attract the interest of junior doctors. (C6)

Some pointed out the usefulness of having the target groups clearly identified on the cover:

*It makes them more attractive and relevant to people. If they were are just labelled change management, people may dismiss them.*

'Anyone who is a manager in the health service' was the most frequently mentioned category for both publications.

All appreciated that the Booklet was a useful summary of the Review and was intended for a wider audience and that the Review was likely to appeal to those wishing to find out more about the subject in depth, including those already familiar with the area. The Booklet was regarded as a useful taster, particularly for those from a non-managerial clinical background. One or two thought it might lend itself to group briefing sessions given that the audience for this resource is unlikely to have time to sit down and read a booklet. A representative quote about the Booklet follows:

*I think there are basically three types of target audiences*

*1 Up and coming managers, who are interested in learning about management and management of change, ward sisters, clinical staff new into post or promotion, and so on. We have a cohort of such staff in Cornwall, for example, and we are looking at ways of building publications and resources like these into our annual teaching programmes.*

*2 Existing managers in services who definitely can benefit from this kind of thing.*

*3 Non-executive directors who are looking around for something that clearly explains what management of change is all about, and what's more important, explains it so clearly from the health point of view. There's so little that does that that you can refer people to.*

Interestingly, many respondents, including those from team level, commented that they had read or dipped into the Review first and had found this more user-friendly than they had expected.

### ***Additional target groups***

Additional potential specific target groups identified included: management and health MBA students, junior doctors, lecturers and students of health care management, grade D, E and F nurses ('these people are well motivated but need a conceptual/theoretical framework'), project nurses in acute trusts ('all doing big change management projects with little or no theory') and staff in transition from clinical practice into their first management project. (C7)

Respondents suggested a range of channels for disseminating the publications including specific websites and email lists, internal bulletins, NHS and HE libraries, course reading lists, and specific personnel such as directors of nursing. (C7i)

### ***Likelihood of use***

Most respondents said that people were quite likely or very likely to read both publications at least in part if not all. Several commented that the topicality and usefulness of both publications meant that they were likely to 'stay high on the pile of things to read'. (C8)

Reasons they would be read widely included clear targetting to the needs of the readers, attractive design and text, the name of the NCCSDO, the relevance of the topic of change management, excellent referencing and lists of resources and the motivation provided by the increased expectations being placed on NHS staff

and managers at present. A couple of respondents suggested that more guidance on how to use or adapt the resources might have been useful although for most the documents were self-explanatory. (C9)

Representative comments include the following:

*I was loath to give up my copies.*

*If we're not careful we'll overdo the modernisation /change management message. It's a difficult balance to maintain. NCCSDO's publications are more likely to reach their target audiences because the data and evidence is well presented.*

*They are great documents to use as a resource and for organisation development in particular. They short circuit a lot of the reading you would have to do which is scattered all over the place in textbooks and such like. But to be honest, I'm not sure how passionate other people really are about change management, it's one of my passions but I wouldn't say this is widely shared in many organisations.*

### **3.4 Current and anticipated use**

All respondents were able to identify several current or anticipated uses for both publications, including: individual briefing; individual study; group discussion; education and training; policy and strategy; research tool; and reference aid. (C10)

Clearly those who had had the publication the longest were more likely to have identified example of ways in which they had been actually used. There follow some examples contributed which demonstrate how the Review and/or Booklet have been put to a variety of uses, ranging from the small scale to the large. (C10i)

#### **Outpatient Improvement Manager in a hospital in the North-West**

is using the review to help her manage the process of change in setting up an integrated spinal care service.

#### **Cancer Service Co-ordinator in the West**

is using the publications for her own study and for discussions with the team in her cancer collaborative, where they are grappling with issues like re-design.

#### **Charge Nurse at a hospital in the Midlands**

he and a colleague have already adapted one change process as a result of reading the publications, in particular the discussion of SWOT analysis.

#### **Senior Nurse at a hospital in the North**

is redesigning a service and has found the publications 'immensely helpful'.

#### **Planning and Development Manager at an NHS Trust in the North**

is using the review as reference material to help him with the Trust's modernisation programme.

### **Training Manager in an NHS Trust in the South**

is using the publications to teach a session on change management for ENB course R28 Triage for Nurses working in Primary Health Care.

### **Clinical Governance and Audit Manager at a hospital in the Midlands**

is using the booklet in the new clinical governance support team programme at the hospital.

### **Senior Lecturer–Practice Development at a university in the Midlands**

recommends that all her students on an undergraduate BSc in clinical leadership read the whole of booklet and from there follow up relevant readings in the review.

### **Chief Executive of a PCG in the South-West**

has identified ways in which the resources would be useful for him to use personally as part of a development forum for chief executives.

### **Head of School of Health at a university in London**

has used the section on action research in the booklet 'an awful lot'.

### **A senior civil servant in local government in London**

reported that colleagues in her organisation are actively using the review to inform management of health policy across the capital.

### **Head of Organisation and Development at a national centre for leadership in health in the UK**

includes the review and booklet as 'invaluable' resources for participants on her OD skills programme, has disseminated the resources widely and has 'had excellent feedback about them from course participants'.

## **3.5 Barriers to use**

Respondents were prompted to identify a range of intrinsic and/or extrinsic barriers to use. (C11)

Of the barriers identified, nearly all were extrinsic. Very few intrinsic barriers were identified, i.e. to do with the publications themselves in terms of language, length, style or presentation, that would hinder their use. Indeed many commented on how the aspects of the documents were likely to facilitate their uptake. A couple of respondents commented that the Review requires uninterrupted concentration in places and might be hard for people unable to, unused to or not interested in, reading at work.

The main extrinsic barriers identified were: problems in accessing the documents, particularly for the non-medical workforce; setting aside time to read them; lack of prioritisation of change management; and information overload generally.

Representative comments were:

*It takes a lot of time to read properly. It's more difficult to dip into than the booklet. I've found that generally people don't read a huge amount anyway. It's a substantial document, so time – I'm already familiar with some of the concepts and it would take me a good 4 or 5 hours to read it from cover to cover.*

*There's also a factor about whether people recognise how change management is central to their everyday jobs. Many people still do not see it as part and parcel of their work. Lack of time and deadlines are major factors. Also a lack of belief that if people become interested in the change management debate that they will be empowered to do anything to change their organisation. I would love to organise a study day for my staff, but I know that people would probably not come due to lack of time, other more pressing issues, etc.*

*Time is a major factor. Also the impetus around change management can falter – these publications are great for kick starting interest again. The suggestions in “organisational change” can give you inspiration when you are flagging.*

Respondents identified few additional barriers to the use of the publications by others. (C12)

A representative comment was as follows:

*“Organisational Change” is a good reference tool for training and education programmes. Someone guiding the user through the materials. You have really solved the problem in part here by issuing the shorter version which will fit the bill nicely for those people who haven't the time to look at the larger version. But my impression is that most people including at ward level will want to gravitate eventually towards the longer version. In some ways this document is ahead of its time for managers and professionals. Evidence is the most important issue and it is dealt with well in this publication. I imagine it will have a long shelf life, but I'm not sure if people will be getting much use out of it yet. Currently people seem to be using shorter guides, e.g. those produced by CHI and NPAT to help them with redesign projects.*

### **3.6 Assessment of publications**

Most respondents rated both publications as useful or very useful. (D13)

Reasons included: accessibility, clarity and concision, up-to-date material, attractive design and layout, user-friendly language, good mix of case studies and narrative, the clear links between theory and the public sector and health, importance attached to evidence, and clear explanations of the models 'without overloading the reader'. In relation to the Review, several mentioned the value of having essential information brought together in the same document rather than being scattered across the literature. (D13i)

Most rated the publications as useful or very useful in raising awareness of current change management issues and enabling users to contribute to current debates. (D14)

Reasons included: topicality of the material; clarity and clear sign-posting in the materials. (D14i)

The following single extract provides a useful overview of many of the complex and sensitive issues that several respondents raised at this point and indicates the extent to which many of the central messages of the publications have struck a chord with the field:

*I imagine they're very useful when dealing with PCT mergers etc. You've achieved a good balance – readers don't feel bogged down*

*by complexity but then again they're not simplistic publications either. Change is very complex and the results are rarely clear-cut and I think the publications portray this well. When I was commissioning around workforce issues managers always wanted unambiguous answers and unfortunately they often don't exist. I don't want to be defeatist, and hopefully in future issues will become more clear-cut, but I think the publications highlight well that you can't guarantee outcomes. If you're making a change they're a good confidence booster. They enable you to add substance/evidence to saying "that won't work". It's useful to have a series of ideas or a theory to hook things on, e.g. how to deal with a world-famous consultant who won't follow basic procedures. Having read them, people will be more confident in their ability to articulate the dynamics around change management. As explained, staff are already heavily involved in change management. Models like Theory of Constraints have been applied here. The 'plan-do-study-act' cycle models have been used too and staff can see that they can work in practice. Exposes people to the 'language' of change management but in a non-threatening and non-jargony way.*

When asked what respondents liked best about the publications, the majority praised their clarity, conciseness, relevance and topicality ('It's not just a dry academic summary'), interesting content and attractive design and covers. Nearly all of the sections of both documents found favour with one or more people. In the majority of interviews the level of praise for the authors and the NCCSDO was often very fulsome. (D15i)

Of particular interest were the case studies, the discussions about evidence, the comprehensive references.

Respondents found very little to criticise in either publication. (D15–D16)

One person commented that some of the models in the Review were 'a bit thin on illustrations or examples'. Another would have preferred the Review to have been produced as a ring-binder to enable it to be used and photocopied more easily.

One person had not realised that the Booklet included a summary of the Review. The same person queries the size and shape of the Booklet ('It doesn't fit easily into your pocket').

### ***Review***

None of the change management models were regarded as not meriting inclusion and none should have been left out. (D15iii)

A few examples of alternatives that should have been included were identified. These included: a simple networking model (after Kanter); TQM relabelled as ESQM; the work of William Bridges. Two people suggested that chaos theory, currently dealt with in an appendix to the Review, could have been brought up front.

Most considered that the publication would continue to have a good shelf life and will not rapidly date.

Suggestions for improving or further developing the Review (D15vi) included:

- Producing audio-visual aids, including OHPs, floppy disks, PowerPoint presentations
- Further case study material



- Further material with guidance on how to produce a baseline assessment and evaluation of change
- Annual updates of the web version, as distinct from reprints or new editions in hard copies
- Production in a ring binder, to enable updates
- Converting into a self-directed learning pack, with activities
- Splitting up the pdf web version of the Review into separate downloadable sections

### ***Booklet***

Suggestions for improving or further developing the Booklet (D16iv) included:

- Workshops based around the resource
- Updates
- Additional or updated examples
- Widening the base to include non-clinical examples

However, some commented that journals were more likely to meet many of the information needs.

### **3.7 Further contact**

All 21 respondents expressed willingness to be re-contacted in the future to discuss the publications.

### **3.8 Knowledge and awareness of the SDO Programme**

All respondents were asked 4 questions designed to assess knowledge and awareness of the SDO Programme (Ai–v). These questions were usually put at the end of the interview. Numbers of responses are as follows:

(i) The NCCSDO stands for National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisation R&D

13 Yes      7 No      1 Unsure

(ii) It manages the work of the SDO national research programme and started operating in April 1999

15 Yes      0 No      6 Unsure

(iii) Its brief is to consolidate and develop the evidence base on the organisation, management and delivery of health care services

16 Yes      4 No      1 Unsure

(iv) It published a national listening exercise in 2000

8 Yes      10 No      3 Unsure

### ***Comments***

(i) Several commented that they knew what the NCCSDO stood for but only after having read, and in some cases re-referring to the covers of the books. A number said the full title was 'a mouthful'.

- (ii) A few thought that the NCCSDO had been operating for longer.
- (iii) The brief of the organisation, as distinct from its name, was clear to most.
- (iv) Most had not heard or read about the national listening exercise.

## 4 Conclusions

### Method

The decision was taken early on to focus on the use of email as the first point of contact to reduce time wastage often caused by fruitless phone calling. This restricted the numbers of people we could contact to those easily reachable by this means. This tended to exclude those working in small teams or where a single email address was shared by a team. Generally speaking, those at organisational level proved much easier to contact via this method and this is partly reflected in the proportions of those interviewed.

Had more interviews been conducted we would have attempted to recruit more respondents at team level, where due to staff commitments on the ground it often proved very hard to gain access to people direct or to guarantee returned calls.

Telephone interviewing proved a useful means of making economical use of respondents' time and conducting short very focused interviews was popular.

### Achieving aims

The study achieved its main aims (see Section 2 above) and gathered a range of useful feedback and views about the two publications, highlighting the importance of evaluation in the process of commissioning research.

Hard copies of the publications have been distributed to over 10,000 people around the country, with different organisational and professional interests, responsibilities and areas of expertise. Electronic versions of the documents on the SDO website receive between 1,500 and 5000 hits per month. Several useful suggestions were given by those interviewed of effective ways of drawing the publications to people's attention.

The resources have been praised for their user-friendliness, lack of jargon, relevance and clarity and these factors have played an important part in getting them read by people and where possible circulated within organisations. Extrinsic factors such as time and conflicting priorities seem to be the main barriers to use rather than factors to do with the publications themselves (e.g. language, presentation) and indeed many people commented how aspects of the documents were likely to facilitate their use.

The publications have been identified as being appropriate to their intended audiences and the review is actually being read by a wider group than originally anticipated. It is very encouraging that several interviewees have used the publications to help them initiate or adapt a specific change process at work and their suggestions for further developing the resources will be very useful to the NCCSDO.

# Appendix 1 Interview schedule

## Managing Change in the NHS: Interview Schedule

Name:

Job title:

Leader level: Organisational/Service/Team (Check self-designation.)

Interviewer:

Does NCCSDO have full contact details:  Yes  No

Date/time/duration of interview:

Permission to re-contact?  Yes  No (Ask at end of interview.)

### (A) Assessment of awareness of NCCSDO

#### **ASK THIS SECTION AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW**

1 I'd like to start by asking you briefly how much you already know about the SDO Programme. For example, did you know the following facts?

(i) The NCCSDO stands for National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisation R&D

Yes  No  Unsure

(ii) It manages the work of the SDO national research programme and started operating in April 1999

Yes  No  Unsure

(iii) Its brief is to consolidate and develop the evidence base on the organisation, management and delivery of health care services

Yes  No  Unsure

(iv) It published a national listening exercise in 2000

Yes  No  Unsure

### (B) Assessment of awareness of publications

2 When did you first receive/see the publication(s)?

Organisational Change: A Review (OD)

Making Informed Decisions on Change (MI)

3 How/where did you first hear about them?

Advance publicity     Colleagues     Periodical (e.g. HSJ)

In-house information     Circulated copy     Website

Other (please specify)

(i) Did you know that both publications are available free on the NCCSDO's website?  
Yes/No

4 Which of these publications have you read?

OD  skimmed  in part  all of it

MI  skimmed  in part  all of it

5 How widely would you say they have been circulated or looked at in your  
unit/team/department/organisation

OD  widely  to a few  me only so far

MI  widely  to a few  me only so far

## (C) Assessment of target audience(s)

6 Which kinds of target audiences do you think the publications are aimed at? (Prompt with  
lists in each publication and/or for any distinctions between the audiences.)

OD

MI

7 Are there any other audiences the publications should be trying to reach?

OD

MI

(i) How could NCCSDO reach these audiences? (Prompt for ideas, including journals and  
bulletins.)

8 I'm interested in your views about the dissemination process. In your estimation, how likely  
are people in the intended target audiences to gain access to these two publications?

OD Very likely/quite likely/unsure/quite unlikely/very unlikely

MI Very likely/quite likely/unsure/quite unlikely/very unlikely

(i) Can you give some reasons why?

9 Once people get to see them, how likely are they to read or use them?

OD Very likely/quite likely/unsure/quite unlikely/very unlikely

MI Very likely/quite likely/unsure/quite unlikely/very unlikely

(i) Can you give some reasons why?

10 Are you aware of ways in which they are currently being used, or about to be used, by other people? Yes/No

(i) If Yes, In what ways are they being used? (Prompt for examples of actual or **anticipated** use: **DRAW ANY APPROPRIATE INFERENCES.**)

OD

individual briefing

individual study

group discussion

education and training

policy and strategy

research tool

reference aid

other

MI

individual briefing

individual study

group discussion

education and training

policy and strategy

research tool

reference aid

other

(ii) By whom are they being – **or might they be** – used? In what role?

(iii) In what kinds of contexts/situations? (See also above prompt list.)

11 What do you think is likely to hinder other people using them? (Prompt: intrinsic factors, e.g. difficult to read, lack of availability, unfamiliarity of concepts, jargon; extrinsic factors: e.g. other research and development priorities, lack of interest in change management, lack of resources or support to implement ideas)

OD Intrinsic/extrinsic factors

MI Intrinsic/extrinsic factors

12 What do you think is likely to help other people using them, including overcoming some of the barriers you have just identified?

OD Intrinsic/extrinsic factors

MI Intrinsic/extrinsic factors

## (D) Assessment of publications

13 Overall, how would you assess the publication(s) as an information/briefing/learning tool

OD Very useful/useful/unsure/not useful/very unuseful

MI Very useful/useful/unsure/not useful/very unuseful

(i) Can you explain why?

14 How useful are the publications in raising awareness of change management issues and enabling users to contribute to current debates?

OD Very useful/useful/unsure/not useful/very unuseful

MI Very useful/useful/unsure/not useful/very unuseful

(i) Can you explain how? (Prompt with some current change management issues, such as the change-over to PCTs or the planned reconfiguration of regions and health authorities.)

**FOR THOSE PHONE INTERVIEWS WHICH ARE LIKELY TO BE SHORTER THAN 20 MINUTES FOCUS ON QUESTION 15 AND OMIT QUESTION 16**

15 (Omit if has not seen OD.) I'd like to get your specific views about the content and structure of OD

(i) What do you like most about this publication?

(ii) What do you like least?

(iii) Should any of the change management models have been left out? Why?

(iv) Should any of other change management models have been included? Why?

**QUESTION (iv) ON 'EVIDENCE' OMITTED**

(vi) How might the publication be improved or further developed?

16 (**OMIT IF TIME LIMITED.**) I'd like now to get your views on MI

(i) What do you like most about this publication?

(ii) What do you like least?

(iii) How useful is the overview of the change management models?

(iv) How might the publication be improved or further developed?

17 (**OMIT IF TIME IS LIMITED**) Are there any specific or general comments you would like to make on the publications? (Complete sections as appropriate.)

Organisational Change: A Review (OD)

Making Informed Decisions on Change (MI)

18 Are you willing to be contacted by us again in a few months time to discuss the publications?  Yes  No

Thank you for your help.

This document was published by the National Coordinating Centre for the Service Delivery and Organisation (NCCSDO) research programme, managed by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

The management of the Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) programme has now transferred to the National Institute for Health Research Evaluations, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC) based at the University of Southampton. Prior to April 2009, NETSCC had no involvement in the commissioning or production of this document and therefore we may not be able to comment on the background or technical detail of this document. Should you have any queries please contact [sdo@southampton.ac.uk](mailto:sdo@southampton.ac.uk).