Paediatric Mental Health Association

900

EXPERIENCE OF THE TREE OF LIFE NARRATIVE GROUP THERAPY DELIVERED VIRTUALLY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DIABETES (CYPD) DURING COVID-19 PANDEMICNeemisha Jain, Ruth MacQueen. *Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust*

10.1136/archdischild-2021-rcpch.271

Background The Tree of Life group draws on narrative therapy and aims to help young people to connect with narratives and identities beyond that of their diagnosis of diabetes. It is typically delivered in a face-to-face group setting but has been adapted to be delivered online primarily in response COVID-19.

Objectives The key objectives were to

1. Evaluate input required to successfully deliver group narrative therapy
2. Evaluate feedback from CYPD who completed the online group session
3. Reflect as facilitators who had delivered their first Tree of Life group
4. Consider the feasibility of future sessions being online.

Methods 14 young people age 11–13 were invited to attend via email/telephone contact. CYPD were identified based on previous known psychosocial adjustment difficulties.

The group was facilitated by a Consultant Paediatrician and Clinical Psychologist, both had completed training in facilitating the Tree of Life group.

In preparation for adapting the group to be virtual, additional training was completed by the Clinical Psychologist. The facilitators met on 2 occasions virtually to plan the session.

All resources required were posted to 7 CYPD who consented to attend. Ground rules for the day were adapted due to it being online keeping in mind online security, clinical governance and children's safeguarding requirements.

A SurveyMonkey feedback on four different scales; enjoyment, feeling listened to, feeling part of the group and whether they would recommend the group to others was developed.

Ratings were on a scale of 0–10 where 10 was a high rating of satisfaction. Verbal feedback was also collected on the day.

Results Pre session meetings and planning by the facilitators was required.

6 CYPD attended via Microsoft Teams on the day (1 drop out on the day).

5 of the 6 CYPD completed SurveyMonkey feedback.

- Enjoyment (I did/did not like what we did today) Average rating (AR): 9.6
- Listening (The leaders and others in the group did/did not listen to me) AR: 9.8
- Being part of the Group (I did/did not feel like part of the group) AR: 9.6
- Recommend to others (I would/would not recommend this group to other young people who have diabetes) AR: 10

All participants verbally shared that they had appreciated meeting other young people who had diabetes, they had been able to talk openly and enjoyed the creative aspect of developing the tree. CYPD appeared to find the text chat option being available as useful and used it freely.

Facilitators experienced the session as extremely positive and felt that it helped build a closer relationship with CYPD. We were impressed by the openness and willingness to share from the participants. Developing personalized certificates which focused on the strengths and aspirations of the CYPD helped give positivity to the session. Having the parents join for the certificate award ceremony build a relationship with the family.

Future sessions can successfully be built with this experience and young people respond well to online delivery.

Conclusions Therapy can be delivered effectively remotely even by those with no prior experience.

Feedback was extremely encouraging and all CYPD would recommend it to others.

Children's Ethics and Law Special Interest Group

901

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF COVID-19 VACCINATION IN CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLEElizabeth Margaret Wearmouth. *N/A*

10.1136/archdischild-2021-rcpch.272

Background Children and young people under 18 years are often asymptotically infected with COVID-19 but have much lower rates of mortality or morbidity than adults. Infection and transmission in schools tends to mirror that in the local community.

Pandemic impact, research and the UK vaccination programme are rapidly evolving. The public perception of risk/uncertainty and media messaging are key factors. The programme will shortly include all adults over the age of 18, thereby including education staff. Only high risk children/young people with severe neurodisabilities are currently included in vaccine priority groups. Vaccines reduce transmission as well as giving individual protection but there is insufficient evidence at present to judge the wider population benefits of child vaccination.

One vaccine is currently licensed for young people between 16 and 17 years of age. If a safe and effective vaccine were to be approved in UK for children under the age of 16, would mass vaccination in this age group be ethically justified?

Objectives To examine the ethical aspects of COVID vaccination in UK for children and young people under the age of 18 years.

Methods A seven point framework for ethical principles of mass vaccination programmes will be used to analyse arguments for and against the extension of the UK COVID vaccination programme.

Safety, efficacy, risks and benefits of the vaccine and the vaccination programme, the just distribution of burdens and

benefits and a comparison with alternatives such as non pharmaceutical interventions or extra adult vaccinations require assessment. The programme should be voluntary, cause least disruption to education and protect and honour public trust.

Valid consent would require a factual, culturally sensitive, age appropriate explanation of risks and benefits of vaccination/non-vaccination. Young people between 16 and 17 could give their own consent; parents would consent for younger children.

Results

Argument for vaccination: Children and young people have already suffered significant losses due to the pandemic in terms of interrupted education, social contact, safeguarding and mental health support. COVID has become a major driver in increasing health inequalities in this group. It is therefore in their interests to maintain school attendance.

Vaccination could reduce transmission of infection between students and education staff. This, coupled with other measures, could ensure that school/education settings remained open. Young people aged 16–17 may wish to express their autonomy to be vaccinated making altruistic choices to protect their families or wider community or to allay their own anxiety.

Argument against vaccination: In terms of national equity, the direct benefit of the vaccine to individual healthy children is minimal. As with all vaccination programmes, benefits, uncertainty and risks such as side effects would need factual, balanced information in order to allow informed decision making. Adverse experiences could impact vaccine confidence and trust in health professionals more generally.

Vaccinating younger children would require more specialised services than currently required for adults. This could adversely affect other routine child health and immunisation programmes, especially those based in schools.

In terms of global equity, the moral aspects of vaccine supply to countries most adversely affected by the pandemic require international political co-operation and are outside the scope of this paper.

Conclusions This decision is finely balanced. It depends on timing and dynamics of COVID infection in UK. It is important that alternatives to mass child vaccination are fully assessed before decisions are made.

Public attitude to personal risk and common good is, and always has been, vital to the success of the programme. The opinions of young people are especially relevant and should be actively sought.

British Academy of Childhood Disability

902

PREVALENCE AND SOURCES OF TENSION IN PAEDIATRIC INPATIENT CARE

Ceit Jesmont, Katy Wood, Vincent Tse, Chris O'Brien. *The Great North Children's Hospital, Newcastle Upon Tyne*

10.1136/archdischild-2021-rcpch.273

Background Rising numbers of children with medical complexity and the availability of life-sustaining treatments engender challenging decisions and opportunities for conflict. Conflict results in relationship breakdown, detrimental impacts on

family and staff wellbeing, and suboptimal patient care. The prevalence of conflict in paediatric inpatient settings remains poorly described.

Objectives To report the prevalence of conflict in a large UK children's hospital, as part of the wider term 'tension', which also encompasses the themes of ethical dilemmas, end-of-life issues and unresolved safeguarding concerns.

Methods Prospective twice weekly survey to medical and nursing teams in a 12-ward tertiary children's hospital, over a 4-week period, to identify presence and sources of tension in patients admitted for ≥ 5 days. Sources of tension were devised via a multidisciplinary focus group. Baseline clinical data were extracted from electronic patient records.

Results 153/1295 children (median age 5 years) had an admission of ≥ 5 days. Patients had a median of one co-morbidity (IQR 2, range 0–9) with tube feeding requirement, global developmental delay/learning disability and neurodisability most common.

Of the 153 patients, 65 (42%) had one or more sources of tension identified; 40 (26%) staff-staff conflict, 19 (12%) staff-family conflict, 28 (18%) unresolved safeguarding, 23 (15%) ethical and 8 (5%) end-of-life issues.

The most common reasons for staff-family conflict were 'unrealistic expectations/excessive healthcare demands' (20/40, 50%), 'communication breakdown' (19/40, 48%) and 'treatment disagreements' (12/40, 36%). 'Multiple team involvement with no clear plan' was the most common staff-staff conflict reason (9/19, 47%). Ethical matters centred on therapeutic misalliances, such as ceiling of care decisions (7/23, 30%) and parental refusal of recommended interventions (6/23, 26%); no cases were forwarded to our Clinical Ethics Advisory Group. Only 1/8 noted to have anticipated end-of-life issues by healthcare staff had active palliative care involvement.

31/65 (48%) had multiple sources present; commonest co-existing themes were staff-family conflict and staff-staff conflict.

Presence of any source of tension was associated with longer duration of admission (≤ 30 days: OR 6.04, 95% CI: 2.3 to 15.6, $p < 0.001$) and increased number of co-morbidities (≥ 4 co-morbidities: OR 2.34, 95% CI: 1.01 to 5.5, $p = 0.048$).

Conclusions This preliminary survey suggests sources of tension are highly prevalent in tertiary paediatric care, in particular conflict. Our data adds to the small existing literature and suggests targeting of resources to reduce tension.

Hospital-wide strategies are required for early identification and resolution, family and staff support and removing barriers to discharge home. A local framework to provide team and family support when tension is anticipated has been developed from our work, incorporating possible risk factors identified: existing medical complexity, multiple team involvement and prolonged admission. Measures within the framework include identification of a lead clinician to co-ordinate care, support by psychologists and social care professionals, upskilling staff in mediation and clear pathways for addressing safeguarding, ethical and palliative care themes.

Further studies are required in wider settings and with families to co-produce future solutions to address tension.