

12 Costing psychiatric interventions

JENNIFER BEECHAM and MARTIN KNAPP

When we mean to build,
We first survey the plot, then draw the model;
And when we see the figure of the house,
Then must we rate the cost of the erection;
Which, if we find outweighs ability,
What do we then but draw anew the model
In fewer offices, or at least desist
To build at all? (Shakespeare, *King Henry IV, Part II*)

The demands and needs for cost information in psychiatric contexts have multiplied considerably in recent years, but have often been frustrated by inadequate data. The typical costs data available to the policy-maker, manager, clinical professional or researcher have been dominated until recently by age-old accounting practices and line management arrangements, and constrained by fragmentation of responsibility. Most limiting of all, costs data have rarely been used in making decisions about individual cases. In considering the demands and needs for costs in psychiatry, this chapter describes a research instrument – the Client Service Receipt Inventory (CSRI; Beecham & Knapp, 1992) – which has been developed and extensively applied in order to meet some of these needs. The chapter includes illustrations of applications of data recorded using the CSRI.

Scarcity and costs

It is difficult to think of a health care system, in the present day or in the past, that has not faced resource constraints. Demands and needs for health care almost always exceed available supplies. Indeed, often the pressures of scarcity have forced the complete re-drawing or

abandonment of promising plans and laudable aspirations. A current example is the push to develop better community-based mental health services, where the needs-led aspirations of the 1990 National Health Service (NHS) and Community Care Act have been compromised in some localities by severe shortages of appropriate services, giving way to supply-led service arrangements (Johnson *et al.*, 1997).

We should not be surprised – or even perhaps particularly depressed – by this and other examples of policy or preferred practice fettered by the scarcity of resources. Any lack of surprise should not be for the cynical reason that there always seems to be a gulf between political rhetoric and actual delivery, but because scarcity is the fundamental reality. Aspiration will and should always run ahead of attainability.

Recognition that there are insufficient resources to meet expressed demands or underlying needs is the prompt to examine carefully how those resources are deployed. Almost every debate in and about Britain's mental health care services boils down to a discussion – sometimes a heated disagreement – about resource use. In particular, can they be employed more productively (that is, with greater efficiency) or more fairly (with greater equity) in one use rather than another? Almost any attempt to answer these efficiency and equity questions will involve collecting and analysing quality evidence on needs, outcomes and of course costs. This chapter focuses on the last of these elements.

Demand

Demands for cost information stem from a variety of policy, practice and research needs. Notwithstanding the well-known difficulties of defining and measuring need, it has been remarked that there have not only been increases in levels of need for mental health services, but also growing gaps between latent or assessed needs and supplies of services to meet them. Certainly, the ageing of the population is increasing the numbers of people with dementia, posing major new challenges for public sector health and social care services (Knapp *et al.*, 1998*a*). There is evidence of growing needs for child and adolescent mental health services (Costello *et al.*, 1993), and the Psychiatric Morbidity Surveys of 1993/1994 uncovered large residuals of unmet needs (Meltzer *et al.*, 1995*a,b*).

Resource limitations, or economic pressures generally, can create their own vicious circles. Needs that are inadequately addressed one year because of supply constraints can return, perhaps with a crisis-like vengeance, to dog providers in subsequent years. Child and adolescent mental health problems are closely associated with psychiatric and other problems in adulthood, unless the continuities

can be broken with effective early treatment (Maughan & Rutter, 1998). These growing needs and their attendant problems represent latent demands for economic information. They are the underpinning causes of scarcity, and the underlying reasons for needing to adopt soundly based allocation criteria, such as efficiency and equity.

Increasingly, these latent demands get turned into expressed demands for costs information, although the transition is by no means straightforward (Knapp, 1997). There are many such demands (see Box 12.1). For instance, the substantial changes to the mental health care system announced by UK ministers soon after the Labour government came to power in June 1997, many of them developed in the National Service Framework launched in 1999, clearly need wide-ranging accurate resource utilisation data to inform local and national decisions. Governments always need resource information of this kind, but no more so than during a period of rapid change, as the next few years promise to be. Similarly, the licensing of new drugs and the development of new psychosocial interventions generate demands for information, not just on efficacy but on resource consequences (cost-effectiveness and cost offsets).

The mental health care system in the UK is characterised by pluralism of both provision and funding. On the funding side, the NHS is the major funder of treatment and care services, but in fact comprises quite a large number of fairly autonomous agents, particularly primary care groups and trusts, and health authorities. There are also local authority social services departments, housing departments and the criminal justice system, all financing services. On the provider side, alongside the substantial historical presence of

Box 12.1

Expressed demands for cost information

- To check value for money (and best value) for users and purchasers.
- To underpin and guide purchasing and providing decisions within quasi-markets, and for other 'managed care' initiatives.
- To inform, monitor and evaluate current or proposed mental health policies.
- To inform service delivery and practice, and to guide care managers operating within devolved budgets.
- To evaluate the resource implications of new treatment modalities.
- To assist the marketing of new treatments such as pharmacotherapies.
- To inform decisions by formularies, licensing authorities and reimbursement groups.
- To audit service provision and purchasing, and for accountability and probity checks.

the public sector, there are private and voluntary providers, as well as advocacy groups and campaigning organisations. The rapid development of this 'mixed economy' of funding and provision was, of course, a major policy priority for the Conservative governments of the 1980s and 1990s, but the mixed economy is clearly not going to disappear with a Labour government. Consequently, there is an even more pressing need for transparency of information about the costs of different interventions, and the resource consequences of successful and unsuccessful treatment. These are not required simply for cost comparisons between competing providers, but represent cost needs that run throughout Britain's complex care system.

Supply

When the first edition of this book was published in 1992, there was little British evidence on the economics of mental health treatments and services. The position has changed, quite markedly in some fields, even though costs information generally remains relatively scarce. The internal market introduced by the 1990 Act obviously generated a need for costs and price data to be collated and disseminated, because priced contracts drove the quasi-market system, and the response has been quite impressive in some areas. Auditors within and outwith care-providing agencies have increasingly turned their attentions to value-for-money and, more recently, 'best value' criteria, and public health and social care agencies have been able to provide more such evidence. Care managers and keyworkers in many localities have been instructed to work within preset budgets and have been given costs and other data to assist their decision-making. Research-funding bodies have also responded with the explicit recommendation that health services research projects should look not only at outcomes for users but also at the costs for providers and the wider society, with the result that many more study teams include a health economist.

How then is cost information to be gathered? This chapter focuses on a research tool (the CSRI) that has been developed and successfully employed in the collection of information on costs, service utilisation, income and related matters. We describe this schedule, illustrating its flexibility for use in many mental health service and evaluation contexts. Collecting such data is the first of three linked tasks, so the next section continues by broadly outlining our methodology for estimating service costs and for calculating the costs of the full care packages recorded on the CSRI.

We will then illustrate the use of the CSRI from some of our own research. Like the plans for the new health and social care systems set

in place in the early 1990s, and reinforced by the Labour government in more recent policy pronouncements, the aim of this research tool and its accompanying methodology has been to generate costs data that are client-focused rather than agency-centred, comprehensive rather than partial, consolidated rather than fragmented, and constructively employed in the improvement of efficiency and equity rather than merely employed to monitor probity. In this section, we use data generated by the CSRI to outline the service and cost implications of psychiatric hospital reprovision, look at cost–need associations and explore issues of the relative cost-effectiveness of community-based arrangements.

A costing methodology for research in psychiatry

The basic cost rules

We first recommended four general costing ‘rules’ for psychiatric research 10 years ago (Knapp & Beecham, 1990). The first rule recommends that costs should be comprehensively measured. They should therefore range over as many service components of care programmes or ‘packages’ as is relevant in any particular circumstance.

Unless costs are defined and measured comprehensively, one treatment mode may appear to be less costly than another, when in reality that mode merely shifts costs into forms that have not been measured (Weisbrod *et al.*, 1980, p. 403).

The calculation of comprehensive costs is most usefully effected at the individual level, partly because this is the level at which clinical data are collected, and partly because this preserves inter-client variability in the research domain – an essential feature of any needs-based service system. The second costing rule then urges that neither these variations between clients nor the likely variations between facilities or areas of the country should be overlooked. Analysed properly, these cost variations can produce useful policy and practice insights, for costs will usually be linked to differences in individual characteristics and needs and outcomes.

An examination of cost differences encourages conclusions to be drawn about comparative performance. The third rule should then come into play: such comparisons must be made on a like-with-like basis. It is of little value, for example, to report that community care costs less than hospital care if clients in the community have fewer behavioural or health problems than those in hospital. Finally, cost information is far more useful if it does not stand in isolation from

other relevant evidence, particularly outcome data. Reliance on cost information alone could be dangerous, just as it is inadvisable to *neglect* costs in policy and practice discussions and decisions. In a radical review of community care that had a major influence on the 1990 health and community care legislation, Griffiths wrote:

“To talk of policy in matters of care except in the context of available resources and timescales for action owes more to theology than to the purposeful delivery of a caring service.” (Griffiths, 1988, p. iv)

For example, underpinning most evaluations is the hoary old question: for whom and under what circumstances is one intervention preferable to another? But to define the criterion ‘preferable’ solely in clinical outcome terms, without regard to cost, is to invite unnecessary (that is, avoidable) difficulties of implementation.

These cost rules embody two sets of principles: they are consistent with the demands of economic theory as applied to health and social care (Knapp, 1984; Knapp, 1995; Drummond *et al*, 1997), and they are also essentially the costing counterparts to the usual principles of any evaluation. This congruence and the economic theoretical grounding help considerably in the design and interpretation of empirical research. With these four rules tucked under one arm, we will describe the instrumentation developed for collecting service utilisation data and calculating comprehensive support costs. Although the potential undoubtedly exists within care management or care programme frameworks, it is not yet possible to ask any one person about the full cost implications of a client’s care package. The process of calculating the full costs of supporting individuals, therefore, is broken down into the three connected tasks described below:

- the collection of service receipt or utilisation data for individual clients or patients over a consistently defined period;
- the costing or pricing of each service used; and
- the combination of these two sets of information in order to calculate the cost of the full care packages.

Each of these tasks is described in general terms below, illustrating the approach in a variety of applications, although focusing primarily on an economic evaluation of psychiatric reprovision with which we have been associated.

Collecting service utilisation data – the CSRI schedule

In order to calculate the costs of community care for people moving from long-stay hospital residence, we developed and employed a new

instrument in 1986, the CSRI. The CSRI built on previous research at the Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU), University of Kent at Canterbury, particularly on child care and young offender services (see Knapp & Robertson, 1989, for a partial review), and incorporated relevant parts of previously developed instruments in the mental health field, particularly the Economic Questionnaire of Weisbrod *et al* (1980). Although the instrument needed to be tailor-made to fit the research context, an early requirement, and one that has proved invaluable in subsequent research, was easy adaptability. At the time, the CSRI was to be employed in the PSSRU's evaluation of the Department of Health's Care in the Community demonstration programme of 1984–1989, which concerned all the main adult client groups, and also in the evaluation of the psychiatric reprovion services being established under the closure programmes for Friern and Claybury hospitals in North London.

In both evaluations, we could be certain that most clients would have a key carer or case manager, or would be living in a group home where a diary would be kept of residents' activities (especially contacts with health, social care and related services, and with peripatetic professionals). The questionnaire was therefore originally designed for administration by an interviewer from the research team to the principal carer of the person with mental health problems. For about 10% of the clients, the key carer could not be identified, for example when someone was living independently in domestic accommodation. In these situations, the schedule was successfully completed in an interview with the client. It was also completed during telephone interviews and by staff with no interviewer present, even though not specifically designed for that mode of use. In some research projects, the key questions of the CSRI have been incorporated into other schedules. However, experience has confirmed our initial expectations that a trained interviewer can best tease out accurate and comprehensive information.

The CSRI was piloted in the summer of 1987 in the Maidstone Care in the Community project for people with learning difficulties, where a wide range of services had been developed, affording the chance to test the instrument under different conditions. A second round of instrument refinement was based on use of the CSRI in another three Care in the Community projects. Since its introduction, the CSRI has been used in many evaluation studies, and some of the service contexts are listed in Box 12.2.

The questionnaire is usually printed on six A4 pages and takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. Both factors, however, will vary depending on the client's situation, the research focus, the scope of costs and the extent to which required data are recorded on other

Box 12.2

A selection of evaluation contexts in which the CSRI has been used

- A long-term evaluation of an assertive outreach service, the Daily Living Programme (Knapp *et al*, 1994; Knapp *et al*, 1998*b*).
- A study of people with schizophrenia living in the community in two London districts (Beecham *et al*, 1995).
- The evaluation of psychiatric and mental handicap hospital rundown and community care developments (Knapp *et al*, 1992; Cambridge *et al*, 1994; Donnelly *et al*, 1994; Beecham *et al*, 1997).
- A comparison of an experimental case-management-oriented community psychiatric nursing service with a more traditional model (McCrone *et al*, 1991).
- An evaluation of a new intervention to improve compliance with medication (Healey *et al*, 1998).
- Evaluations of children's mental health and social care (Beecham & Knapp, 1995; Knapp *et al*, 1998*c*).
- Studies of community care for older people (Beecham *et al*, 1993; Petch *et al*, 1996).
- Studies of care for people with challenging behaviour (Felce *et al*, 1998).
- Evaluations of new drugs (Drummond *et al*, 1998).
- An evaluation of specialist work schemes (Schneider & Hallam, 1997; Hallam & Schneider, 1999).

schedules used in the study. CSRI questions are largely structured but, given the complexity of community care arrangements, a few narrative answers are required. The design of the questionnaire incorporates blank spaces in which to write additional comments or interpret the occasionally confused responses of the interviewee. A series of 'prompt cards' can supplement the CSRI. These may contain indicative lists of accommodation types, different services and social security benefits. For a local evaluation, they may contain lists of named services.

The CSRI collects retrospective information on service utilisation, service-related issues and income in a manner commensurate with estimating care package costs. The retrospective period (prior to the date of the interview) is a compromise between the accuracy that comes from not asking respondents to cast their minds back too far and the comprehensiveness that can only come by allowing sufficient time to elapse for some uncommon, but potentially expensive services to be used. In the hospital rundown evaluations, we divided the service utilisation section (see below) into two parts, one covering the previous month – in the North London reprovision study, this was the twelfth month after discharge from hospital – and the other asking about less regularly received services (such as

hospital admissions or GP visits) over the past 12 months. These durations are not fixed and can be varied to fit particular research designs. For example, repeated use of the CSRI – as in the first phase of the Daily Living Programme (Knapp *et al.*, 1994) evaluation, when interviews were conducted at 4, 11, and 20 months after entry to the study – allows data to be recorded only for the period between interviews. For this longitudinal study, information gathered at all interviews was recorded on the same schedule, which meant the interviewer could use data from the previous interview to prompt or guide questions.

The first section of the CSRI covers *background and client information*, for example, recording client study number, gender and date of birth. Depending on the availability of information from other instruments, the interviewer could then ask for details of past admissions and discharges from hospital, participation in a special programme, registration with a general practitioner (GP) and medication. This opening section also records the date and place of interview and identifies the interviewer. A useful development of the CSRI has been to incorporate questions on other socio-demographic indicators, such as educational attainment or ethnicity (The Client Socio-Demographic and Service Receipt Inventory (CSSRI-EU); Chisholm *et al.*, 1999).

The second section concentrates on describing the study member's *accommodation and living situation*. Accommodation is usually a major component in terms of its contribution to clients' support arrangements and the associated cost. The CSRI records information on: address, partly for the purposes of identifying facility type and budget, and partly because location influences cost (London is more expensive than the rest of the country, for example), and some adjustment may be needed; tenure of accommodation (such as council or privately rented, residential home or owner-occupier); a simple description of the size of the unit (number of rooms and number of other residents); the amount paid by the client or household in rent or other payments; and receipt of housing benefit, if any.

Many clients with severe mental health problems do not live in domestic accommodation but in specialised facilities, such as residential or nursing homes, hostels or group homes. We can impose a standardised categorisation of facilities using information recorded on the CSRI about residents' tenure, facility size, staffing arrangements and managing agency (NHS, local authority, voluntary or for-profit organisations). Where several clients live in the same facility, some of these questions need be completed only once. In our evaluation of domus care, these overarching questions were separated from the main questionnaire (Beecham *et al.*, 1993).

Unfortunately, many people with mental health problems (although generally not the former long-stay in-patients moving to planned community care schemes) quite frequently move from one address to another (Slade *et al*, 1999), and the CSRI can record such changes of address, including hospital re-admissions. Instability of accommodation obviously complicates cost calculation, but for clients it can have dire consequences for ability to work, entitlements to social security and indeed mental health itself. In some applications of the CSRI, where study members are more likely to live in domestic accommodation, this section has been more comprehensive, asking about the composition of the household and whether clients themselves have any care responsibilities. More attention is also paid to how household expenses are covered.

Research has shown that concerns about money can have an adverse effect on some mental health conditions (Brugha *et al*, 1985; Granzini *et al*, 1990). Many people with mental health problems have low incomes, owing in part to the heavy reliance on social security benefits and also to problems associated with under-claiming of benefits, low wages if work is found and unstable work patterns (Melzer *et al*, 1995*b*). Information on *employment history, earnings and other personal resources* is therefore collected. Former long-stay hospital residents rarely find (open) employment, but for many other groups of people with mental health problems, employment and its loss are important facets of both service effectiveness and cost. More questions, therefore, may be needed on employment history, and a number of questions may be needed on current employment activities. The costs of lost employment resulting from mental ill health or in-patient treatment will fall to clients (lower income) and to society (lost productivity), the actual values to be attached depending on a variety of labour market and individual circumstances.

If employment-related costs are unlikely to be an issue, it is more important to clarify receipt of social security benefits. In strict economic terms, these should be considered as transfer payments, which do not represent an aggregate cost to society, but they are also good proxies for living expenses, since clients usually rely on these benefits as their main (often only) source of income. Data on *changes* in benefit status over the past year may also be important, as they will reflect changes in clients' accommodation or other circumstances, or changes to the entitlement regulations.

The *service receipt* section is at the core of the CSRI and can take up most of the interview time. Community care is delivered and received within a fragmented 'system' in which many agencies and organisations provide a variety of services. There is certainly no standard package of care handed out as people are referred to psychiatric care and so there

will be a great deal of variation between clients' packages of care. In this section, the schedule identifies receipt of services that are not funded within the accommodation budget; either health or social care services available to everybody or specialist mental health services. Information is collected on services for which the client leaves the accommodation facility to attend, such as day activity centres, hospital-based services, appointments at the GP surgery or leisure activities. Some professional support or services are provided to the client at home: home-help, community psychiatric nurse or field social worker visits are examples. For most research purposes, the CSRI provides a list of the different service types, such as local authority day care or out-patient appointment, which forms the left-hand column of a table. For each service type, the number of contacts over the chosen retrospective period is requested and the average duration of these contacts. In the final column, in which 'not-applicable' cells are shaded, the interviewer can record whether the contacts are normally made at a clinic or office or at the client's home. For domiciliary services, it is also important to identify whether the professional sees several clients for a group session (as with occupational therapy) or sees them sequentially (as with GP visits). The allocation of service costs to individuals must take into account the scope of the visit.

For services that are likely to absorb a high proportion of care package costs, we advocate collecting more detail. For example, the length of each in-patient admission should be accurately recorded alongside information on the type of hospital and/or ward. (Intensive psychiatric care units have been found to cost nearly three times as much per day as long-stay hospital wards; Netten *et al*, 1998.) Special consideration should also be given to recording relevant details of a new intervention and its comparator.

The final section of the CSRI considers the role of informal carers. The availability of such support for people leaving long-stay psychiatric hospitals appears to be limited (Knapp *et al*, 1992), but if a number of study members are known to be living independently or with other members of their families, more weight would need to be given to this dimension. The CSRI includes questions on the input of informal carers in terms of time spent (frequency and duration of support) and tasks undertaken (personal care, shopping, domestic tasks and social visits). Financial costs borne by family and friends can also be recorded and may include extra food or heating, increased replacement of clothes and equipment, as well as cash gifts. Family members may receive extra income as a consequence of their relative's problems, such as attendance allowance.

These five sections form the framework for the CSRI, within which responses to questions are carefully structured to facilitate cost

estimation. It is the emphasis put on different aspects of each section that provides the instrument's flexibility and its adaptability to different research and service contexts. Each CSRI summarises one person's care package (see Boxes 12.3, 12.4 and 12.5), the components of which we would expect to vary given that any individual study member has a different set of characteristics and needs (broadly defined). By aggregating the service receipt across sample members, a list of all services used can be compiled. A unit cost should be estimated for each of these services.

Estimating unit costs for health and social care services

The second major task in measuring the costs of support for people with mental health problems is the costing or pricing of the various services used by clients. Economic theory advocates basing cost measures on *long-run marginal opportunity cost*. In practice, by 'long-run', we mean to move beyond the small-scale and immediate development of community care (for example), which could probably be achieved by using present services more intensively at very low marginal cost. Since national policy intentions are to develop community services, it would hardly be credible to measure only short-run cost implications. By 'marginal', we mean the addition to total cost attributable to the inclusion of one more client (the production of the marginal unit of output in general economic parlance). By 'opportunity cost', we mean that the resource implications should reflect opportunities forgone rather than amounts spent. The opportunity cost measures the true private or social value of a resource or service, based on its value in the best alternative use. In a perfectly informed and frictionless market economy, this 'best alternative use value' would be identical to the price paid in the market. Not everything is marketed, not every market works smoothly, and information is rarely complete, with the result that observed prices and opportunity costs diverge. The recorded depreciation payments on capital equipment or buildings, for example, will not usually reflect the opportunity costs of using these durable resources, nor will the (zero) payments to volunteers and informal carers usually indicate their social value.

In application of these principles, it happens that today's (short-run) average revenue cost, plus appropriate capital and overhead elements, is probably close to the long-run marginal cost for most services we would encounter. In this chapter, we will say no more about the calculation of these average revenue costs or their capital add-ons, for once we open out the description we will need more space than can presently be made available. Moreover, the details are not everyone's cup of tea. We have written about them elsewhere, briefly

Box 12.3

Psychiatric reprovion package, independent living

Mr A is 39 years old, lives alone in a flat rented from the housing association and has no informal care support. He has gastro-intestinal problems, which require monitoring by his GP. He also takes medication (without supervision) for dermatological problems. He presents no behavioural problems.

<i>Services received</i>	<i>Average weekly cost</i>	<i>Description</i>
Social work	£15.45	Social worker and link worker visit once every two weeks for 30 minutes
GP	£1.50	10 surgery appointments during the past year
Chiropodist	£0.36	Two visits during the past year
Hospital out-patients	£14.79	One appointment each month for a check-up and depot injections
Housing officer	£5.41	Visits once very two weeks for 15 minutes
Accommodation	£109.41	Includes taxes forgone by the local authority, and capital, management and maintenance costs borne by the housing association
Living expenses	£102.27	Income support, invalidity benefit and disability allowances
Total weekly cost of care package, 1997/98 prices	£249.19	

Source: Hallam, 1998

(Knapp & Beecham, 1990), in more detail in relation to mental health care (Beecham, 1995), and in much greater depth with various health and social care examples (Netten & Beecham, 1993). An annual compendium is also available that pulls together a number of research and other sources to present nationally applicable unit costs for over 70 health and social care services (Netten *et al.*, 1998).

In the psychiatric reprovion study, two main procedures were used to cost or price each service. Accommodation facilities, hospital and day care services were expected to account for a large proportion of the total cost of care packages, and their unit costs were carefully and individually calculated by adjusting published or routinely collected facility accounts. Particular attention was paid to services

Box 12.4

Psychiatric reprovion package, assessment centre

Mr B is 51 and lives with seven other residents in an assessment centre managed by the community health services trust. He needs daily medical care for respiratory problems. Mr B becomes verbally aggressive at least once a month and has episodes of extreme agitation, during which he becomes doubly incontinent. He is able to concentrate for short periods only, has poor hygiene habits and tends to be socially isolated. A heavy smoker, he is considered a health risk and has twice been responsible for causing a fire.

<i>Services received</i>	<i>Average weekly cost</i>	<i>Description</i>
Social work	£0.95	Social worker has visited twice during the past year for one hour each time
Depot injection	£5.37	Cost of the drug given by in-house staff
Chiropodist	£1.42	Visits once a month seeing four residents on each occasion
Dentist	£0.15	One check-up during the year
Optician	£0.23	One visit to optician for sight test in past year; glasses were not prescribed
Day centre	£3.54	Drops in for approximately one hour per week
Accommodation	£1225.59	Includes care, hotel and building-related costs of the residential facility
Living expenses	£29.99	Personal expenses and bus pass
Total weekly cost of care package, 1997/98 prices	£1267.24	

Source: Hallam, 1998

at Friern and Claybury Hospitals, the costs of which would be required as comparators for community care costs. The planned level of detail to be obtained, and therefore the accuracy of the pricing, was lower where the service was likely to contribute less to total cost, such as input from field social workers, nurses, psychiatrists or chiropodists. For these services, national statistics or data from other studies were used to build up our unit costs. In all cases, prices were calculated to approximate the long-run marginal costs of care, including the opportunity costs of all capital employed.

Box 12.5

Psychiatric reprovion package, staffed group home

Ms C is 57 years old and lives in a small registered care home that has six places. It is one of four units with a central office and waking staff cover at night. She has no particular health or behavioural problems, but is a careless smoker, causing problems on a daily basis.

<i>Services received</i>	<i>Average weekly cost</i>	<i>Description</i>
Social work	£0.11	One visit by field social worker during the past year. Two residents seen during this visit
GP	£1.37	Three visits during the past year
Psychiatrist	£1.70	Two visits during the past year seeing two residents on each occasion
Chiropodist	£1.42	Four 30-minute visits per year
Resource centre	£70.93	Attends five days a week, four hours a day
Accommodation	£897.22	Includes care, hotel and premises costs of residential facility as well as personal expenses
Total weekly cost of care package, 1997/98 prices	£972.75	

Source: Hallam, 1998

Costing full care packages

The CSRI is a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. The interview collects the data that enable packages of care to be identified. This information must then be manipulated and joined with information on the costs of those services. This data preparation stage allows service receipt to be allocated at a constant unit over a defined period of time. The unit of measurement for service receipt (per hour, say) should be the same as that used for the calculation of service costs. The period of time is often defined by the research: for the North London reprovion study, the follow-up period was one year after discharge from hospital; for the Care in the Community programme evaluation, the follow-up was nine months; and for the Daily Living Programme, several follow-up periods were used, varying from 4 to 9 months.

Boxes 12.3, 12.4 and 12.5 provide three illustrative case studies, taken from the economic evaluation of psychiatric reprovion in North London. For each person, we describe the components of his or her care packages, that is, the frequency and duration of contact with any services over the year prior to interview. The average weekly costs are listed for each component, estimated using the approach outlined above, and the total weekly cost of the care package calculated. In the next section, we consider some of the ways in which these cost-related data can be used to address policy and practice issues.

Illustrations of costs research

We can illustrate the employment of the resultant economic data by considering some results from the long-running evaluation of psychiatric reprovion in North London. In debates about the rundown of long-stay hospital provision and its replacement by community care, doubts about economic viability are rarely far from the surface. In this chapter, we address three questions. What are the service and cost consequences of moving long-stay patients from the hospital to be supported by community-based services? Can we predict subsequent community costs from information gathered on patients in hospital? Of the many variants of community care, which are the more costly, and which the more cost-effective?

The decision to close two of the largest psychiatric hospitals in North London was taken in 1983, since which date the regional health authority and the Department of Health have funded research to examine the psychiatric reprovion services being established to replace them. In association with the Team for Assessment of Psychiatric Services (TAPS), researchers from the PSSRU at the University of Kent at Canterbury and the London School of Economics, and more recently the Centre for the Economics of Mental Health at the Institute of Psychiatry, have been studying the economics of reprovion (Beecham *et al.*, 1997; Knapp *et al.*, 1997). The main focus of the economic evaluation has been on in-patients who have been in continuous residence for at least a year, and who, if over 65 years of age, do not have a current diagnosis of dementia. In this chapter, we concentrate on people who left hospital and for whom follow-up data were collected one year after discharge. (Many former hospital residents have also been assessed five years after discharge.) The first reprovion patients moved to the community in 1985.

Describing community care services and costs

By March 1993, when Friern Hospital was closed, a total of 813 people who met the study criteria had left the two hospitals under the rundown plans, most under the reprovision arrangements that carried financial transfers. Baseline information for all patients in the hospitals was collected by the TAPS researchers covering: mental health status, using the Present State Examination (PSE; Wing *et al.*, 1974) and the Social Behaviour Schedule (SBS; Sturt & Wykes, 1986)); physical health; personal and historical data; patient attitudes; living skills, using the Basic Everyday Living Skills schedule (BELS; Leff, 1997); information on patients' social networks using the Social Network Schedule; and an assessment of living environments. Altogether, including the 'new long-stay' patients who had accumulated in the two hospitals since the study began, baseline information has been assembled on nearly 1000 in-patients. The TAPS research design compared aspects of the quality of life for patients discharged from the two hospitals with similar patients who remained behind, but also assessed change before and after discharge from hospital (Leff *et al.*, 1996*a*; Leff *et al.*, 1996*b*; Leff, 1997).

Detailed service utilisation data formed the basis of our cost estimates for 533 people leaving the two hospitals, and community care costs were more broadly estimated for a further 218 people. The remaining 8% of the full sample of leavers died before the interview date, could not be traced or moved out of the region. For 533 people for whom data were collected on the CSRI, community service use and the associated costs are summarised in Table 12.1. These data aggregate the care packages (see the examples in Boxes 12.3, 12.4 and 12.5) for each study member in the sample. The figures illustrate the variety of services used by psychiatric reprovision clients, spanning specialist mental health provision and secondary and primary health care services, as well as social care services provided by public sector agencies (local authority social services departments) and independent sector organisations. The low level of contact with police or probation services is noteworthy – former long-stay patients rarely cause high-support burdens to the criminal justice system.

The final two columns of Table 12.1 show the relative contribution to total costs for each service. Accommodation placements obviously dominate, as most study members live in high-support residential homes or staffed group homes. Hospital-based services also continue to play a major role. In-patient services were used by only 15% of sample members, but absorbed 16% of the costs of support for those who were re-admitted. Day support services, whether provided within or outside the hospital, are also an important source of support,

TABLE 12.1
Distribution of costs by service

<i>Services used in the community</i>	<i>Clients using each service¹ (%)</i>	<i>Average contribution of service to total cost (%)</i>	
		<i>Over all clients using service (%)</i>	<i>Over all clients (%)</i>
Accommodation and living expenses	100.0	86.9	86.9
Hospital out-patient services	25.9	1.9	0.5
Hospital in-patient services	14.8	16.1	2.4
Hospital day patient services	22.9	14.7	3.4
Local authority social services day care	17.4	9.7	1.7
Voluntary organisation day care	15.2	8.1	1.2
Social club services	6.6	2.3	0.2
Education classes	4.5	6.9	0.3
Community psychiatric services	57.8	0.9	0.5
Chiropody	41.3	0.1	0.1
Nursing services	29.1	1.5	0.5
Psychology services	14.4	1.0	0.1
Occupational therapy	8.6	2.5	0.2
Drugs (depot injection)	14.3	1.0	0.1
Miscellaneous services ²	18.6	0.9	0.2
Physiotherapy	2.4	–	–
GP	74.5	0.5	0.3
Dentist	25.3	0.2	–
Optician	19.9	0.2	–
Community pharmacist	5.8	0.7	–
Field social work	23.6	4.3	1.0
Police and probation services	5.8	0.7	–
Client's travel	29.3	0.4	0.1
Volunteer inputs	1.7	4.2	0.1
Case review	9.9	0.5	0.1

1. Data available only for those people for whom a full CSRI was completed ($n=533$).
2. Includes a number of services each used by only a few study members. Examples are finance officer, aids and adaptations, audiology, aromatherapy, employment officer, home-help, job club and reminiscence group.

together accounting for just over 6% of the total costs of support for all clients (final column). In contrast to these quite expensive services, some are used by a much higher proportion of clients, but make a smaller contribution to total cost; community psychiatry services, chiropody, and the GP are examples.

This type of descriptive information begins to reveal where the cost burdens lie. Which services must expand to support former long-stay

hospital patients as they move to community-based care? If in hospital all these services (or functions) were provided from within the hospital budget, who now funds these components? These are issues about the distribution of resources in community mental health care provision that can only be addressed by taking a comprehensive approach.

Associations between costs, client characteristics and needs

The average cost of community care for our sample of 751 former long-stay hospital residents was £690 per week (1997/1998 prices), yet the most expensive care package was at least 20 times more costly than the cheapest. Why do care package costs vary?

We would expect a primary source of this variation to be client needs or problems. For example, do people with greater needs or problems get more support? We use the term 'problem' to describe those psychosocial characteristics of clients on which psychiatric and associated support services are expected to have an impact. If costs summarise, albeit imperfectly, the resources expended or services delivered to clients, how well are services tailored to address these problems? Using a cost function approach, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was employed to explore the causal links between cost and its hypothesised determinants. We summarise the findings here and the methodology, and full results and implications, are considered at greater length in other papers (Knapp *et al.*, 1995; Knapp, 1998). The estimated cost functions indicated that community care costs are sensitive to differences in a number of client characteristics as assessed in hospital, explaining 21% of the variation in the total weekly cost of support. Demographic characteristics exert only a limited influence on costs; neither age nor gender proves to be significant, but costs are higher for people who have never married. Three of the reasons for original admission to hospital (transfer from another psychiatric facility, inability to cope and admission to hospital under the Mental Health Act) are associated with the much later community re-provision costs, but their effects are not easy to interpret and the data may have referred to circumstances prevailing many years earlier. Easier to understand, perhaps, is the effect of people's history of hospital care. A greater proportion of life spent in hospital and a greater number of previous admissions to hospital increased the costs of support packages in the community, suggesting that prolonged institutionalisation increases the need for community support services.

The influences of clinical factors on cost are particularly interesting. People with more negative symptoms (a measure constructed from

the PSE scores) have higher than average costs. Higher scores on the Social Behaviour Schedule reflect higher staff-reported ratings of abnormal behaviours and, with one exception, imply higher costs. The negative effect of attention-seeking behaviour could be indicative of a therapeutic response, or may be related to social network size and gregarious behaviour. Two indicators of physical health needs (number of areas in which daily nursing care is required and taking medication for physical illness) are both associated with higher costs. Diagnosis had no obvious effect on cost once the above factors had been taken into account.

A third set of analyses on the reprovision study data explored whether particular variants of community care for former long-stay in-patients were more costly, or more cost-effective. Exploring inter-sectoral cost differences has particular policy relevance today. Are public sector services more costly or less efficient than non-public ones? Does the high cost of care in health authority facilities, in contrast to facilities run by other organisations, reflect the creation of environments that encourage client dependency, or at least not encourage independence? Or, alternatively, is high cost the logical corollary of the tendency for health authority facilities to accommodate those former residents with greater needs? To address these questions, analyses were undertaken on data for the 429 former in-patients who were living in specialised accommodation; that is, residential or nursing homes, hostels, staffed group homes or sheltered housing, which were distinguished using standardised definitions. Sectoral responsibility for individuals was defined as that which managed the accommodation facility: NHS, local authority social services department, voluntary (non-profit) organisation, private (for profit) organisation or individual, or consortium arrangements (usually health and voluntary sector organisations working together). Costs were found to be lowest in the private sector and highest in the NHS and consortium sectors. However, quality of care indicators suggested that the lowest-cost sector is performing least well, and higher-cost sectors offer better quality (Knapp *et al.*, 1999).

Conclusion

The types of analyses described above begin to address some fundamental issues of efficiency and equity on the allocation of mental health care resources. Who gets what services at what cost? Can scarce mental health resources be better employed in one way than another? Alongside data on clients' needs and characteristics, finding the answers to these questions relies on good-quality costs data. Sensible

expectations of any service are that it will respond to the needs of each user and seek to improve their welfare (broadly defined) or at least prevent further deterioration in, say, symptoms. It is also sensible, therefore, to assess the resource inputs (costs) at a similar level, giving research the capacity to evaluate together the costs and the effectiveness of a service.

In this chapter, we suggest that costs summarise the end-product of decisions to commit resources in a particular way: the provision of services and other support. At the client or individual level, such decisions result in the provision of a 'care package', or a set of services that each client uses. Just as mental illness has consequences for individuals in many areas of their life, so too will their care package span many types of different support services. These services often involve several provider agencies and organisations, but management information systems are not yet sufficiently developed to capture a full picture of all the components of the care package. To carry out our research, therefore, we developed a specific instrument for collecting costs-related data for people with mental health problems, the CSRI.

Since its first use in 1986, the CSRI has been developed and modified as the demands for cost information have both increased and broadened in scope. One research-based issue has been to consider whether a shortcut could be found for the CSRI and its attendant methodologies. This would make cost estimation a less daunting and less time-consuming research task and therefore increase the frequency with which cost and cost-effectiveness studies are undertaken. Our re-analysis of five large research databases allowed us to identify the services that contributed most to the total costs of supporting people with mental health problems. Accommodation and living expenses, in-patient hospital stays, NHS and local authority day services, and out-patient appointments were found to account for between 90% and 98% of total costs (Knapp & Beecham, 1993). This 'reduced list' methodology was implemented in a study of residential care services in eight health districts (Chisholm *et al*, 1997).

Building on our work of the 1980s, the CSRI has been adapted to evaluate a variety of service contexts and a wider range of adult and child client groups, and there has also been considerable international interest. Adapting the CSRI for use in cross-national studies has involved careful translation, as well as work to standardise service definitions across different care systems (Drummond *et al*, 1998; Chisholm *et al*, 1999). Local versions for evaluating mental health care in Italy and Spain have been developed (Amaddeo *et al*, 1996; Vásquez-Barquero *et al*, 1997), and work is currently underway to adapt the

CSRI for use alongside a case register (Amaddeo *et al*, 1997) and for use in clinical practice.

In the Foreword to Drummond (1980), Alan Williams suggested that:

“one cannot but help sympathise with clinicians and other health service professionals who feel that with so many pressures upon them they might at least be spared the distasteful task of having to think about efficiency, and the husbanding of scarce resources, on top of all their other problems.” (p. vii)

Two decades later, the pressure to economise has increased markedly. The cost-effectiveness imperative is stronger than ever. The demands for cost information have grown, and requirements for cost information now permeate all levels of decision-making and serve to emphasise the changed context within which mental health services are planned, delivered and received. The supply of (decent) cost information has not kept pace with the demands that technological and practical changes have created, but methodologies have been developed and banks of data and experience are being constructed to bolster the supply response and to aid cost-sensitive decision-making. There will never be answers to each and every cost question, but the distance between what is demanded and what can be supplied appears to be narrowing.

Acknowledgements

Research described in various parts of this chapter has been funded over a number of years by the Department of Health and North East Thames Regional Health Authority, and some has been conducted in collaboration with Angela Hallam, Barry Baines and the TAPS, led by Julian Leff. We record our considerable gratitude for this support and assistance, but we bear the sole responsibility for the chapter.

References

- AMADDEO, F., BONIZZATO, P., BEECHAM, J., *ET AL* (1996) ICAP: un'intervista per la raccolta dei dati necessari per la valutazione dei costi dell'assistenza psichiatrica. *Epidemiologia e Psichiatria Sociale*, **5**, 201–213.
- , BEECHAM, J., BONIZZATO, P., *ET AL* (1997) The use of a case register for evaluating the costs of psychiatric care. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, **95**, 195–198.
- BEECHAM, J. (1995) Collecting and estimating costs. In: *The Economic Evaluation of Mental Health Care* (ed. M. Knapp), pp. 61–82. Aldershot: Arena.

- & Knapp, M. (1992) Costing psychiatric interventions. In: *Measuring Mental Health Needs* (1st edn) (eds G. Thornicroft, C. Brewin & J. Wing), pp. 163–183. London: Gaskell.
- & — (1995) The costs of childcare assessment. In: *Social Work Assessment with Adolescents* (eds R. Sinclair, L. Garnett & D. Berridge). London: National Children's Bureau.
- , CAMBRIDGE, P., HALLAM, A., *ET AL* (1993) The costs of domus care. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, **8**, 827–831.
- , — & ALLEN, C. (1995) Comparative efficiency and equity in community-based care. In: *The Economic Evaluation of Mental Health Care* (ed. M. Knapp). Aldershot: Arena.
- , HALLAM, A., KNAPP, M., *ET AL* (1997) Costing care in the hospital and in the community. In: *Care in the Community: Illusion or Reality* (ed. J. Leff). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- BRUGHA, T., BEBBINGTON, P., TENNANT, C., *ET AL* (1985) The list of threatening experiences: a sublist of twelve life event categories with considerable long-term contextual threat. *Psychological Medicine*, **15**, 189–194.
- CAMBRIDGE, P., HAYES, L. & KNAPP, M. (1994) *Care in the Community: Five Years On*. Aldershot: Arena.
- CHISHOLM, D., KNAPP, M., ASTIN, J., *ET AL* (1997) The Mental Health Residential Care Study: the costs of provision. *Journal of Mental Health*, **6**, 85–99.
- , —, KNUDSEN, H. C., *ET AL* (1999) Client Socio-Demographic and Service Receipt Inventory – European Version: development of an instrument for international research. EPSILON Study 5. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **177** (Suppl. 39), s28–s33.
- COSTELLO, E., BURNS, B., ANGOLD, A., *ET AL* (1993) How can epidemiology improve mental health services for children and adolescents? *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, **32**, 1106–1114.
- DONNELLY, M., MCGILLOWAY, S., PERRY, S., *ET AL* (1994) *Opening New Doors: An Evaluation of Community Care for People Discharged from Psychiatric and Mental Handicap Hospitals*. Belfast: HMSO.
- DRUMMOND, M. (1980) *Principles of Economic Analysis in Health Care*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , STODDART, G. & TORRANCE, G. (1997) *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , KNAPP, M., BURNS, T., *ET AL* (1998) Issues in the design of studies for the economic evaluation of new atypical antipsychotics: the ESTO study. *Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics*, **1**, 15–22.
- FELCE, D., LOWE, K., PERRY, J., *ET AL* (1998) Service support for people with severe intellectual disability and the most challenging behaviours in Wales: processes, outcomes and costs. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, **42**, 639–652.
- GRANZINI, L., MCFARLAND, B. & CUTLER, D. (1990) Prevalence of mental disorders after catastrophic financial loss. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, **178**, 680–685.
- GRIFFITHS, R. (1988) *Community Care: Agenda for Action*. London: HMSO.
- HALLAM, A. (1998) People with mental health problems leaving long-stay psychiatric hospital. In: *Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 1998* (eds A. Netten, J. Dennett & J. Knight). Canterbury: PSSRU, University of Kent at Canterbury.
- & SCHNEIDER, J. (1999) Sheltered work schemes for people with severe mental health problems: service use and costs. *Journal of Mental Health*, **8**, 163–178.
- HEALEY, A., KNAPP, M., ASTIN, J., *ET AL* (1998) Cost-effectiveness evaluation of compliance therapy for people with psychosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **172**, 420–424.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS (1983) *Mental Health Act*. London: HMSO.
- JOHNSON, S., RAMSEY, R., THORNICROFT, G., *ET AL* (1997) *London's Mental Health*. London: King's Fund.
- KNAPP, M. (1984) *The Economics of Social Care*. London: Macmillan.

- (1995) *The Economic Evaluation of Mental Health Care*. Aldershot: Arena.
- (1997) Economics and mental health: a concise European history of demand and supply. In: *Making Mental Health Services Rational* (ed. M. Tansella), pp. 157–166. Roma: Il Pensiero Scientifico.
- (1998) Making music out of noise – the cost function approach to evaluation. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **173** (Suppl. 36), 7–11.
- & BEECHAM, J. (1990) Costing mental health services. *Psychological Medicine*, **20**, 893–908.
- & — (1993) Reduced-list costings: examination of an informed short cut in mental health research. *Health Economics*, **2**, 313–322.
- & ROBERTSON, E. (1989) The cost of child care services. In: *Child Care Research, Policy and Practice* (ed. B. Kahan). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- , CAMBRIDGE, P., THOMASON, C., ET AL (1992) *Care in the Community: Challenge and Demonstration*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- , BEECHAM, J., KOUTSOGEORGOPOULOU, V., ET AL (1994) Service use and costs of home-based versus hospital-based care for people with serious mental illness. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **165**, 195–203.
- , —, FENYO, A., ET AL (1995) Community mental health care for former hospital in-patients. Predicting costs from needs and diagnoses. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **166** (Suppl. 27), 10–18.
- , — & HALLAM, A. (1997) The mixed economy of psychiatric provision. In: *Care in the Community: Illusion or Reality* (ed. J. Leff), pp. 37–47. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- , WILKINSON, D. & WIGGLESWORTH, R. (1998a) The economic consequences of Alzheimer's disease in the context of new drug developments. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, **13**, 531–543.
- , MARKS, I., WOLSTENHOLME, J., ET AL (1998b) Home-based versus hospital-based care for serious mental health illness. Controlled cost-effectiveness study over four years. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **172**, 506–512.
- , SCOTT, S. & DAVIES, J. (1998c) The cost of anti-social behaviour in younger children. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, **4**, 457–473.
- , HALLAM, A., BEECHAM, J., ET AL (1999) Private, voluntary or public? Comparative cost-effectiveness in community mental health care. *Policy and Politics*, **27**, 25–41.
- LEFF, J. (1997) *Care in the Community: Illusion or Reality*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- , DAYSON, D., GOOCH, C., ET AL (1996a) Quality of life of long-stay patients discharged from two psychiatric hospitals. *Psychiatric Services*, **47**, 62–67.
- , TRIEMAN, N. & GOOCH, C. (1996b) Prospective follow-up study of long-stay patients discharged from two psychiatric hospitals. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, **153**, 1318–1324.
- MAUGHAN, B. & RUTTER, M. (1998) Continuities and discontinuities in anti-social behaviour from childhood to adult life. *Advances in Clinical Child Psychology*, **20**, 1–47.
- MCCRONE, P., BEECHAM, J. & KNAPP, M. (1991) Community psychiatric nurse teams: cost-effectiveness of intensive support versus generic care. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **165**, 218–221.
- MELTZER, H., GILL, B., PETTICREW, M., ET AL (1995a) *Physical Complaints, Service Use and Treatments of Adults with Psychiatric Disorders*. London: OPCS Social Survey Division, HMSO.
- , —, —, ET AL (1995b) *Economic Activity and Social Functioning of Adults with Psychiatric Disorders*. London: OPCS Social Survey Division, HMSO.
- NETTEN, A. & BEECHAM, J. (eds) (1993) *Costing Community Care: Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- , DENNETT, J. & KNIGHT, J. (1998) *Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 1998*. Canterbury: PSSRU, University of Kent at Canterbury.
- PETCH, A., CHEETHAM, J., FULLER, R., ET AL (1996) *Delivering Community Care: Initial Implementation of Care Management in Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

- SCHNEIDER, J. & HALLAM, A. (1997) Specialist work schemes: user satisfaction and costs. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **21**, 331–333.
- SLADE, M., SCOTT, H., TRUMAN, C., *ET AL* (1999) Risk factors for tenancy breakdown for mentally ill people. *Journal of Mental Health*, **8**, 361–371.
- STURT, E. & WYKES, T. (1986) Assessment schedule for chronic psychiatric patients. *Psychological Medicine*, **17**, 485–493.
- VÁSQUEZ-BARQUERO, J-L., GAITE, L., CUESTA, M., *ET AL* (1997) Versión española del CSRI: una entrevista para la evaluación costes en salud mental. *Archivos de Neurobiología*, **2**, 171–184.
- WEISBROD, B., STEIN, M. & TEST, L. (1980) Alternatives to mental hospital treatment: economic benefit–cost analysis. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, **37**, 400–405.
- WING, J., COOPER, J. & SARTORIUS, N. (1974) *The Measurement and Classification of Psychiatric Symptoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.