UNIVERSITY OF TEESSIDE
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW

NOTES ON DISCUSSION OF CACTUS / BRAIN BIO DEVELOPMENTS

2th March 2007

Present:

Tony Chapman
Judith Brown
Amanda Clarkson
Dave Woodhouse

We agreed a number of principles in the meeting:

- That CACTUS should remain as a independent clinic which is wholly owned by the University
- That the Steve Baldwin Foundation is operationally separate from CACTUS and is outside of the remit of any discussions with Brain Bio Centre (BBC)
- We accepted that BBC and CACTUS would not merge, or that
- CACTUS would be absorbed by BBC.
- We accepted that it was not appropriate for the psychology subject group to undertake evaluation work as if it were an 'independent' organisation from either CACTUS or BBC. Instead, we adopted the principal that the evaluation work was integral to the work of all three organisations. However, we felt that there should be some independent external scrutiny so that the objectivity of the results could be confirmed (Dave suggested Sunderland University may be able to do this for us).

We drew a clear distinction between the organisations roles and tried to map these out to make sense of how everything connected

- CACTUS – to provide therapeutic support to young people
- BBC(N) - to provide therapeutic support to adults – this will be financially autonomous from CACTUS. Effectively it will be a franchise of BBC(S) operating at UT
- BBC(S) Provides marketing and publicity for BBC(N)
- BBC(S) Offers clients to BBC(N) from northern region
- BBC(N) and (S) will pay SSSL for evaluation work on a case by case basis
- All units will use exactly the same protocols
- Evaluation work will be done by Psychology in SSSL
- Pricing policy must be discussed – argument for it to be the same in N and S to avoid competition between centres, although there are still doubts about the ability of N clients to pay

- Still not altogether what part Steve Baldwin Foundation plays in all this

We then tried to map out what would happen to individual clients on a flow diagram. It seemed that the above points covered most eventualities.

However, there remained to be significant worries about the economic viability of undertaking work for BBC(N) given the known economic problems of clients in the NE.

Judith and Dave would need to work out the sums properly to see if this was viable, but in so doing, they would have to factor in the costs of paying Amanda a realistic income to sustain her involvement.

Risks

- Still not clear about the size of the market
- Who can pay?
- Are there any routes to support people to get the service from other funding bodies?
- What is pricing structure going to be

Worries

- Our capacity to provide service is very limited (about 8 days a month from Angela amountng to around 200 clients per year)

- Is there a case to professionalise the process through UTEL?
- Who is prepared to subsidise (carry the can) if this is a loss making enterprise.

NB. Tony received a note from Mary on the business status of BBC. Which looked okay to his untrained eye.