



Klinika adiktologie

1. lékařská fakulta a Všeobecná fakultní nemocnice

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Development of the Standards and the Certification Process in Prevention in the Czech Republic: A Case Study



Roman Gabrhelik
Veronika Pavlas-Martanova
Croatia, November 2012



The EU standards

- Brotherhood, A., Sumnall, H.R. (2011). European drug prevention quality standards. A manual for prevention professionals. EMCDDA, Luxembourg: The Publications Office of European Union.
- Accessible at: <http://bookshop.europa.eu>



EU Standards vs. Czech Standards

Table 1: Proposed use of version 1 of the European drug prevention quality standards (adapted Brotherhood, Sumnall, 2011)

Purpose	Recommended (EU Standards)	Czech Standards
Information, education and guidance	✓	✓
Developing or updating quality criteria	✓	✓
Self-reflection	✓	✓
Discussion in group settings	✓	✓
Performance appraisals	✓	✓
Formal self-assessment the standards suitable for these purposes	Not yet (Further work is planned to make the standards suitable for these purposes)	✓
Funding decisions		✓
External accreditation		✓
Substitute for outcome evaluation how to conduct evaluation	No, although the standards provide guidance on	=



Czech Standards: Introduction

- Full title
 - **The Standards of Professional Competency of Providers of the Programmes of School-based Primary Prevention of Risk Behaviour**
 - not been approved by the Ministry of Education and other ministries involved as of the date of the drafting of this article
 - hereinafter referred to as ‘Standards’
- ME 2005 and 2008 approved:
 - The Standards of Professional Competency of Providers of Primary Prevention Programmes Focused on Substance Use, hereinafter referred to as
 - hereinafter referred to as “Substance Use Standards”
- The objective of the Standards is **to assess the programmes** aimed at any type of risk behaviour, differentiating only between three types of direct preventive efforts, i.e. **three types of programmes**: universal programmes, selective programmes, and those indicated by the **school-based** primary prevention of risk behaviour.



Standards Development

- 1st phase
 - 2005: Development of the Substance Use Standards
- 2nd phase
 - 2006 – 2008: Pilot implementation of the Substance Use Standards
 - 2008: 1st revision of the Substance Use Standards and of the whole certification process
- **3rd phase**
 - 2008 – 2012: implementation continued
 - 2011 – 2012: 2nd extensive revision of the Standards and of the whole certification process



2012 Revision

- **All types of risk behaviors**
- Newly defined RBs in prevention
- **4 general standards:** programme, clients' rights, personnell, and organizational aspects (instead of previously used 12 standards)
- **3 special standards** according to the level of prevention (general, selective, indicated)
- **Terminology harmonized** (*Explanatory Dictionary of Basic Terms and Concepts in Prevention*)
- **Harmonization with the *Four-level Model* of Qualifications for the Practitioners of the Primary Prevention of Risk Behaviour in the School System**



2012 Revision

- The EU standards reflected:

Brotherhood, A., Sumnall, H.R. European drug prevention quality standards. A manual for prevention professionals (2011). EMCDDA, Luxembourg: The Publications Office of European Union, (Dostupné za úhradu elektronicky na: <http://bookshop.europa.eu>.)



Standards Development (2)

- 2008 – **1st evaluation of the certification process:**
 - A questionnaire surveys, focus groups with the certifying officers, and external evaluation took place as a part of the first
 - = revision of the key documents.
- The second revision was performed on the basis of panel discussions, minutes of focus group meetings and feedback collected from the field, and it culminated with external opposition papers concerning the draft of the document.
- The third step in the study involved a meta-analysis of the general trends in the development of the Standards.



Standards: 2nd revision

- *Standards* is an extensive document
- 2nd revision
- What is specific: **broader concept of all relevant types of the risk behaviors** as approved by the Czech ME.
- In their general and specialised parts, the Standards define the basic terms, the target groups of prevention programmes, and the efficiency principles of primary prevention efforts.
- In addition, the features that a high-quality programme should possess are outlined in the form of scored categories such as:
 - availability, focus, respect for client rights, evaluation of client needs, adequate staffing and organizational support for the programmes, adequate facilities and supporting infrastructure, etc.



The practical impacts of the 2nd revision of the Standards

- The practical impacts of the 2nd revision of the Standards include partial changes in the revised **Certification Rules** and **On-site Inspection**.
- ...are the following:
 - **100% of the price** of the process is paid by the applicant and there can be a competition for the amount within the subsidy proceedings held by the individual ministries (*the applicants previously paid only 30% of the costs*);
 - **proposal for restricting the access of the programmes to schools** – according to the draft, the ME would only recommend entry into schools for certified programmes (this would also regulate the flow of the schools' spending in the area of prevention);
 - **Higher involvement of professional associations in decisionmaking** on the certification process (their participation in the Certification Committee at the Ministry of Education); and
 - **extending the validity** of the certificate to **5 years**.



Certification process (1)

- The process **assesses the service according to the criteria** specified by the approved Standards and grants/rejects the certificate of compliance with such Standards.
- The certification of the professional competency of the providers of school-based primary prevention programmes refers to the **assessment and formal acknowledgement of the programme's compliance** with the determined **quality and comprehensiveness criteria** (Pavlas Martanova (Ed.), 2012c).



Certification process (2)

- **The certification process is governed by a prescribed procedure** (defined by the *Certification Rules* and *On-Site Inspection Guidelines*) which follows the applicant's request to the certification agency (a service organisation appointed by the Ministry of Education) to conduct an on-site inspection.
- The **certification team** sent by the certification agency to perform the on-site inspection consists of three **members** who are experts in the area of risk behaviour, **have passed the certifying officer training course**, receive continued training, **and are supervised**.



Certification process (3)

- In the certification process, **governmental and non-governmental facilities may apply for the certification of their programmes**, and
- specially trained certifying officers conduct an **on-site audit** of the service provider on the basis of the application.
- The certificate granted is respected as the guarantee of the quality of the programme and it **affects the flow of the subsidies from the state**.
- The process of the certification of the professional competency of the providers of risk behaviour prevention was set up in accordance with the Czech versions of the applicable European standards for evaluation, certification, and audit.
- These certification standards guarantee 1) the **minimisation** of the risk of **conflict of interest** and 2) the **objective and impartial** nature of the **process**.



Certification process (4)

- The **certifying officers have extensive experience in primary prevention** and know the school environment well.
- The certification team members are selected by the agency based on a **register of certifying officers** with a view to ensuring impartiality and preventing any conflict of interest.
- In their work they **study the relevant documents** and **visit the programme** to assess whether it meets the requirements of the Standards.
- They submit their findings to the **Certification Committee** of the ME in the form of the *On-Site Inspection Sheet* and *Final Report*.
- The professional competency certificate is finally awarded by the ME on the basis of the opinion of the **Certification Committee**. Similarly, it is revoked by the Minister of ME following the identification of significant deficiencies which do not meet the requirements of the Standards for the quality of the programme being provided.



Trends 1

- The first revision of the Standards identified the basic phenomena described below and the revision attempted to respond to them in practice:
 - closer contact with the reality of the programme being provided – an on-site visit was included;
 - narrowing-down of the Standards and removal of duplicities;
 - straightforward explanation and evaluation – mandatory “A” points were introduced and enforced;
 - addressing newly encountered situations;
 - update of the legal framework.



Trends 2

- The second revision of the Standards resumed the previously commenced trends, attempted to meet certain requirements which were not met in the previous period, and also showed the need for harmonisation with up-to-date advances in the area of primary prevention:
 - a more universal application of the standards – updated to include all types of risk behaviour and to be acceptable for all the ministries associated with schools;
 - respecting the variety of prevention programme providers but also coherence in the basic requirements, and the proposal to restrict the access of non-certified providers to schools;
 - compliance with the basic literature and school-related documents (in terms of both the terminology and research trends);



Trends 2 (cont'd)

- continued streamlining and coherence of the interpretation of the Standards; the typology of the prevention programmes (universal, selective, and indicated) is reflected in the special standards; the certification of training programmes and publishing activities have been abandoned;
- coherence in the education and training of the prevention workers entering schools;
- a practical explanatory framework as a guideline annex to the Standards;
- update of the legal framework.





Trends 3 – What is needed next, comments on sustainability

- Both of the revisions outline certain future visions; the following trends, which are a challenge for the future period, persist:
 - **introducing the general context and comparison** with the European standards;
 - the **pilot and actual implementation** of the certification process under the new conditions;
 - **implementation of the Four-level Model** of Qualifications for Primary Prevention Practitioners; after the model is applied in practice some requirements may be omitted from the Standards;
 - **a coherent procedure** in primary prevention **across ministries** – the need for mutual communication and cooperation;
 - in connection with the previous point, a **uniform flow of subsidies**
 - **protection of the school against low-quality, low-efficiency** and non-certified primary prevention programmes;
 - a **single Prevention Act** should be at the top of activities mentioned above.



Thank you for your attention

E-mail:

gabrhelik@adiktologie.cz