National Association of State Head Injury Administrators

Delphi Consensus

Resource Facilitation







Moody/NASHIA Delphi Consensus Project

NASHIA awarded a one-year grant from the Moody Foundation

Goal was to develop consensus on:

- 1. Name/Definition
- 2. Principles and approaches
- 3. Components
- 4. Outcome measures/common data elements

Work facilitated by Judy Dettmer & Jill Ferrington, with support from Rebeccah Wolfkiel of NASHIA



Delphi Consensus Process

Delphi technique is designed as a group communication process which aims to achieve a convergence of opinion.

Delphi can be used to achieve the following objectives:

- * To explore or expose underlying assumptions
- * To seek out information which may generate consensus

.

Delphi Consensus Steps

Develop a set of Assumptions

- Literature
- Expert Input

Develop a
Steering Committee
to refine
assumptions

Test
assumptions
with a broad
group via
survey until
consensuses is
reached





Steering Committee Members (1 of 2)

- Gavin Attwood: CEO, United State Brain Injury Alliance
- John Corrigan: Professor, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at Ohio State University & Director of the Ohio Brain Injury Program
- Maggie Ferguson: Disability & Injury Prevention Project Director, Public Health Division, IA Department of Health and Human Services
- Liz Gerdeman: Former Director, MINDSOURCE-Brain Injury Network, Colorado Department of Human Services
- Nicole Godaire: CEO, Brain Injury Association of MA



Steering Committee Members (2 of 2)

- Flora Hammond: Professor & Chair of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at Indiana University School of Medicine; Chief of Medical Affairs and Brain Injury Co-Medical Director at the Rehabilitation Hospital of IN
- Kate Kerkmans: CEO, Brain Injury Alliance of CO
- Peggy Reisher: CEO, Brain Injury Alliance of NE
- Lance Trexler: Rehabilitation Neuropsychologist, Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Indiana University School of Medicine
- Steve Wade: Executive Director, Brain Injury Association of NH and Consulting Executive Director, Brain Injury Association of America-ME Chapter



Delphi Consensus Process/Criteria

45 Survey Participants

- 25 providers
- 8 with lived experience or family members/care givers
- 13 researchers

Steering Committee set consensus at 80% Two rounds of surveys were required to meet consensus





Delphi Consensus

Summary of Results



Delphi Consensus Implications

- The Delphi Consensus results reflect an agreed upon set of best practices as it relates to resource facilitation
- They are NOT a mandate
- The findings could potentially be built into future policy or grant requirements should a funder choose to use them



A universal name would be helpful for funding, research, program improvement, and policy.

The first choice for a name is = **Brain Injury Resource Facilitation**

95% chose Brain Injury Resource Facilitation as one of their top three choices.



Core Components

On average the core components reached a consensus rate of = 90.25%

There are several core components that should be included for a program to be considered a Resource Facilitation for Brain Injury Program:

- Connecting individuals to community resources
- Discovery of an individual's strengths and challenges
- Identification of needs
- Goal setting planning
- Plan implementation
- Arrangement and coordination of supports



Core components continued...

- Monitoring
- Re-assessment
- Outreach and awareness of brain injury
- Outreach and awareness of brain injury services
- Build capacity through brain injury education and training for organizations to teach about brain injury
- Brain injury education and training for individuals
- Brain injury education and training for families/caregivers
- Provide education about brain injury to policy makers
- Emotional Support
- Advocacy on behalf of individuals
- Advocacy for systems change



Resource Facilitation Principles and Approaches

On average the core components reached a consensus rate of = 97%

- 1. Facilitation is available to anyone with brain injury or their family and others supporting an individual.
- 2. Facilitation is available to anyone regardless of their abilities.
- 3. Facilitation considers the wants and needs of the individual with the brain injury to be priority.
- 4. Facilitation adapts to the needs of the individual and the opportunities for meeting those needs.
- 5. Facilitation builds community partnerships.
- 6. Facilitation outcomes are measured.
- 7. Once connected, follow up activities lead to more proactive services.



Resource Facilitation principles and approaches continued...

- 8. Support other providers/professionals in the community who serve individuals with brain injury through approaches such as training/education, capacity building, technical assistance, and consultation.
- 9. Individuals with brain injury have unique needs.
- 10. Resource facilitation programs require staff to have knowledge in the following areas:
 - a. causes, course, and consequences of brain injury
 - b. the community and its associated resources
 - c. diverse systems of intersectionality of brain injury
 - d. diversity and inclusion
 - e. what it means to have lived experience as an individual with brain injury or family member/caregiver



Resource Facilitation Principles and Approaches continued...

- 11. Resource Facilitation should be provided to individuals with brain injury, family members, and caregivers with technical assistance and consultation for providers/agencies.
- 12. Resource Facilitation can be provided either virtually or in person.
- The duration should be flexible.
- Resource facilitation should help people live happy and healthy lives.
- Resource facilitation can be accessed throughout a lifetime.



Resource Facilitation Principles and Approaches continued...

- 13. Building capacity (strengthening awareness, understanding, knowledge, tools, and skills) should be an integral part of Resource Facilitation among:
- People with brain injury
- Support systems
- Community professionals and service providers



Measurements/Outcomes:

On average the core components reached a consensus rate of = 85.4%

- It is important to have a common definition of data categories used by all RF programs across the country.
- 2. It is important to have a set of common outcome measures implemented by all RFs across the US.
- 3. It is important to have a database for common data and outcomes to be reported for funding, research, program improvement, and policy.
- 4. Examining the impact for individuals served, the program, and the community is essential in the evaluation process.



Measurements/Outcomes continued...

- 5. Evaluation approaches should be flexible to meet the program needs.
- There may be unique program outcome measure consideration in addition to core outcome measures.
- 7. Individual's satisfaction with their services delivery should be measured.
- 8. Individual's improvement in quality of life should be measured.
- 9. Impact for individuals served, the program, and community is essential in the evaluation process.



Next Steps

Report/Dissemination



Toolkit





