

## **Wilson Development: Approach to evaluating the options for the community facility projects/ functions**

The Wilson development is a health and wellbeing campus. The wellbeing component has a number of options under consideration. These options are derived in part from the feedback from the community conversations, and in part from subsequent stakeholder discussions and workshops (these are reflected in the logic model).

This has presented us with a list of potential services/ programmes that could be delivered from the Wilson site as a wrap-around to the clinical services. However it is not clear which of these services are feasible and relevant, and which ones are “nice to haves”. This paper briefly describes the approach that will be taken in evaluating and determining which options to build the strategic outline case on.

The approach consists of the following steps:

**Step 1:** Define and agree the criteria to evaluate the options and weight the agreed criteria (see below)

**Step 2:** Apply the criteria to the various options and define a short-list of viable options

**Step 3:** Discuss with the relevant commissioners and decision makers on the design and the potential shape the option will take in the Wilson, and the revenue stream that may ensue from it

**Step 4:** Estimate the space requirements/ flexible use of space for each option

**Step 5:** Estimate the building cost of this option and the running costs

The criteria below are the first draft of suggested criteria and are described in terms of the factors that will help evaluate that specific criteria.

<b>Multi-criteria Decision Analysis: Wilson Community Facility Projects/ Functions</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1. Relevance</b>	<p>Does the intervention/ option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Support a strategic plan priority or initiative, etc?</li> <li>b. Support a commissioning &amp;/or community engagement priority?</li> <li>c. Meet a local health need?</li> <li>d. Promote integrated and seamless service provision?</li> <li>e. Align with the Merton Prevention Framework?</li> </ul>
<b>2. Alignment with clinical services</b>	<p>Does the intervention/ option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have a clear association with one or more of the planned clinical services at the Wilson?</li> <li>b. Add value to one or more of the clinical services?</li> <li>c. Link with a clinical pathway?</li> <li>d. Align with the service specification and the commissioning / contractual arrangements for a clinical service?</li> <li>e. Facilitate treatment in an appropriate environment?</li> </ul>
<b>3. Community Focus</b>	<p>Does the intervention/ option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Meet public expectations/ local want?</li> <li>b. Improve patient / carer experience including dignity/respect?</li> <li>c. Address patient/ community choice?</li> <li>d. Help to meet the individual's whole needs across health and social care?</li> <li>e. Decrease future care needs for patient, carer or family?</li> <li>f. Improve community engagement / empower participative decision making?</li> </ul>
<b>4. Equity</b>	<p>Does the intervention/ option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Impact on reduction in inequalities in health / wellbeing?</li> <li>b. Provide equal access for the target population?</li> <li>c. Inclusively cater for the needs of the diverse population?</li> <li>d. Impact on access to services for other populations or other NHS agencies?</li> <li>e. Demonstrate availability to those who need it most?</li> <li>f. Impact on different domains of quality of life (i.e. Disability reduction, increased independence, pain reduction, increased role in society, social relationships etc.)?</li> </ul>

<b>Multi-criteria Decision Analysis: Wilson Community Facility Projects/ Functions</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>5. Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is it the most evidence based cost-effective solution to achieve this goal? (What evidence is there for it being cost-effective?)</li> <li>b. Does it contribute to a reduction in expenditure in the long term?</li> <li>c. When will the initiative deliver cash savings?</li> </ul>
<b>6. Feasibility and sustainability</b>	<p>Does the intervention/ option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have a funding stream or the potential to align with a funding stream?</li> <li>b. Clearly identify available service providers/markets and their capability to provide the service?</li> <li>c. Demonstrate sustainability of service providers/market delivery?</li> <li>d. Create a revenue stream for the Community Facility?</li> <li>e. Address the quality of physical resources such as building/ space needed to implement it?</li> </ul> <p>Is it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Acceptable to all stakeholders?</li> <li>g. Achievable within a realistic timescale?</li> <li>h. Possible to evaluate the intervention/ option?</li> </ul>

**Below are the criteria with space to suggest the weights for them:**

<b>Multi-criteria Decision Analysis: Wilson Community Facility Projects/ Functions</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight (total of 100)</b>
<b>1. Relevance</b>	
<b>2. Alignment with clinical services</b>	
<b>3. Community Focus</b>	
<b>4. Equity</b>	
<b>5. Efficiency</b>	
<b>6. Feasibility and sustainability</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>