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The SCIROCCO Exchange Tool was used in the self-assessment process.

The tool was structured as a **12-items questionnaire** associated with a particular “dimension”.

### DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Readiness to Change</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Population Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Structure &amp; Governance</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Citizen Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Digital Infrastructure</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Evaluation Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Process Coordination</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Breadth of Ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Funding</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Innovation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Removal of Inhibitors</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maturity level in each dimension was evaluated using the assessment scale ranging from **minimum rating of “0” to a maximum score of “5”**.

The self-assessment process comprised **two separate stages**:

1. Individual self-assessment survey, completed by each appointed stakeholder
2. Online consensus building meeting due to COVID-19 restrictions
An individual self-assessment survey

A total of 7 out of 23 identified stakeholders filled-out the printed version of the individual integrated care assessment.

Each individual assessment was then entered into the online database using the SCIROCCO online tool by the Slovak research project team member.

Table 1: Participants of individual self-assessment survey, their role and affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General manager of the local provider of health and social facilities and services</td>
<td>Social facilities and services complex “Slnecny dom”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Social Insurance Agency in Slovakia – Kosice</td>
<td>Social Insurance Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-director of the Regional Public Health Authority</td>
<td>Regional Public Health Authority in Kosice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Expert for Physiotherapy and Medical Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Physioplus, Centre for physiotherapy and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker of Kosice District (Department of Social Affairs)</td>
<td>Local authority, Kosice-North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Mental Health Association</td>
<td>INTEGRA, o.z., Michalovce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department of Social Care Facilities Administration</td>
<td>Kosice Self-Governing Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the individual self-assessments were plotted on individual spider diagrams (Figure 1) for each self-assessment completed. Next, the combination of these individual assessments during the consensus process resulted into a composite diagram over the scores individually provided and visualised with bubbles (Figure 2).
B Consensus building meeting

- A short presentation with results of the individual assessments was sent in advance to confirmed participants of online meeting as a basis for stakeholders’ discussion.

- Due to the restrictions related to safety measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 in Slovakia the consensus meeting was organized online using the GoToMeeting Platform.

- A total of 3 professionals (out of 7 stakeholders who fulfilled individual self-assessment) were available for participation in online meeting.

- All attendees were representatives of different settings at regional or local level (self-governing region, health and social services, and clinical health care).

- Consensus building process was based on moderated discussion.

- The moderator was the SCIROCCO project national team member and expert in the field of health and social care.

- The discussion was triggered and facilitated by using the online shared presentation and also with the assistance of 2 other members of SCIROCCO project national team.

- The main principle of consensus building was built on expert discussion via shared facts, experience of the clinical practices, and social care experiences and responses to questions asked by the moderator.
### Table 2: Participants included in the consensus meeting; their role and affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Expert for Physiotherapy and Medical Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Physioplus, Centre for physiotherapy and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General manager of the local provider of health and social facilities and services</td>
<td>Social facilities and services complex “Slnecny dom”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department on Social Care Facilities Administration</td>
<td>Kosice Self-Governing Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final spider diagram as result of consensus meeting
**Scope**

- To capture the perception of multiple stakeholders on **maturity and readiness to change** in Kosice self-governing region, in order to **identify strengths and weaknesses of the adoption process**, to provide the basis to enable improvement through knowledge transfer.

**Assessment Process**

- Five step process:
  1. Identification of local **stakeholders**;
  2. Individual self-assessment;
  3. Share of the individual assessments with stakeholders;
  4. Online **consensus meeting**;
  5. Data analysis;
  6. Regional report.

**Strengths**

- At the country as well as regional levels several **strategic documents** exist that emphasize integrated care approaches, but there is no real progress on the perspective of implementation.
- There is **potential for cooperation** between professionals within the health and social care systems, even though for time being there is no clear vision, planning or management of this collaboration on governance level.
- Only one dimension (4. **Process Coordination**) was able to reach higher - but still not satisfactory - level of maturity (score 2). There are some basic norms adopted and standard procedures developed; however, these standards are not uniform, interdisciplinary, and suitable for usage by a wide range of existing diagnoses.

**Weaknesses**

- The maturity level was found to have the lowest value (score 0) in the four following dimensions: 2. **Structure & Governance**, 7. **Population Approach**, 9. **Evaluation Methods**, and 10. **Breadth of Ambition**.
- Of those, 2. **Structure & Governance** dimension seems to be the most important starting point that may help to facilitate the process of adoption and implementation of other inevitable change.
“An expert working group needs to be created; it is necessary to enhance multidisciplinary discussion, allocate resources, involve the third sector and convince policy-makers to adjust legislation.”

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- One of the key problem is **lack of communication and coordination between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family**. Governmental and regional authorities are aware of the lack of integration between health and social systems, including the long-term care. Nevertheless, no efficient national and regional policy, guidance, nor systematic actions have been taken.
- **An expert working group** that would be able to advise/propose measures for integration process at the regional and/or municipality level is needed.
- Although certain level of funding within the EU sources is available, these **financial resources** are primarily used for the (re)construction of so called ‘integrated care’ centres.
- **The need for improvement in all assessed dimensions is necessary** to deploy integration.
The level of integration of health and social care system is very low.

All assessed dimensions in Kosice Region have space for significant improvement.

There hasn´t been recognised one single dimension that could be identified as having reached an appropriate maturity level.

The major strength identified in Kosice Region is 4. Process Coordination as this dimension scored higher, but still not satisfactory (level of maturity score: 2).

Inhibitors are still present and require systematic and organised action to be successfully removed.

There is low level of awareness of the integrated care approaches among stakeholders and citizens in general. Consequently, there is no pressure on the competent authorities to get the concept of integrated care on the agenda of upcoming economic and social development programmes of the Kosice region. Moreover, the implementation of the national strategic documents on integrated care is inadequate and insufficient at regional level.

Structural characteristics, such as high mean age of primary healthcare and social care workers as well as inadequate understanding of the importance of interdisciplinary team work in management and practice may have negative impact on the integration of health and social care services.

Cultural factors may sometimes result in barriers. The problem may be excessive conservatism bias and resistance to change. Therefore, change is usually driven only by bottom-up initiatives and non-governmental organizations.

New financial schemes at national level need to be developed; the EU funding should represent one of the multi-sourced financing mechanisms.

Read more: https://www.sciroccoexchange.com/uploads/Maturity-Assessment-in-Slovakia-1.0.pdf
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