

## Core Standards Assessment



Thank you for your commentary on your trust's core standards declaration. We invited third parties – patient and public involvement forums, overview and scrutiny committees and foundation trusts' boards of governors to comment and they responded well. We really appreciate the hard work that went into providing commentaries that produced so much useful intelligence. This report is in response to requests from the third parties for individual feedback.

### How we used the commentaries

In 2007, we received 1469 comments from third parties.

#### Data quality

We make a general assessment of the evidence found in the whole commentary/declaration. Most commentaries will be given a medium score for data quality. The table below outlines the 'criteria' we use to award a higher or lower data quality score. The higher the data quality score applied to a commentary the more impact it will have, however commentaries given a low data quality score will also contribute to the overall risk assessment profile of a trust. **NB** If the commentary merely states that the 3<sup>rd</sup> party has no comment to make on any of the standards, it will not be given a data quality score.

A whole commentary is likely to be given a high, or low score if:	
<b>High</b> data quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It relates to the timescale of the Annual Health Check</li><li>• Shows regular involvement of the forum (visits or inspections)</li><li>• Contains detailed information such as dates and outcomes</li><li>• Makes reference to evidence to substantiate comments that can be produced if requested</li></ul>
<b>Low</b> data quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Outside of the Annual Health Check timescale</li><li>• Evidence is unavailable or incomplete</li><li>• Contains incomplete measures of outcomes</li><li>• Suggests that the information on the trust performance is not based on concrete facts</li></ul>

**In 2007, across all the 3<sup>rd</sup> parties, 9% of commentaries were given a high data quality rating, 42% a medium rating, 32% a low rating and 17% fell into the 'no comment' category.**

---

### What we did with the intelligence we extracted

In 2007 8,196 items of intelligence were extracted and used because they related to one or more of the standards. These might be a single sentence or several paragraphs. **NB** Not all information from the commentaries will be used; if it cannot be applied to a standard(s) or relates to a period of time outside the annual health check timescale, it will not be coded.

Each item was then defined as either **Positive or Negative** intelligence in relation to the trust's compliance with the Standard. In 2007 66% of the items of intelligence were positive about a trust's compliance with a standard.

## Weighting the intelligence

Analysts then apply weighting scores to each item of intelligence according to the strength of relationship that the item has with a particular core standard, its coverage of the trust (whole/service) and how well it was supported with evidence. Again the default position is to award a medium weighting. The table below sets out the 'criteria' used to award a higher or lower weighting.

The higher the weighting score applied to an item of intelligence the more impact that item will have, however items of intelligence given a low weighting score will also contribute to the overall risk assessment profile of a trust.

An item of intelligence is likely to be given high or low score if:	
<b>High weighting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It makes specific reference to compliance or non compliance of the trust to a particular standard and has a clear evidence base for this opinion</li><li>• The statement/intelligence covers the entire scope of the referenced standard</li><li>• The statement is representative of the whole trust</li></ul>
<b>Low weighting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The statement confirms compliance or non compliance with the standard, but there is an absence of supporting evidence</li><li>• It covers a small aspect of the standard</li><li>• The statement is not representative of the whole trust</li><li>• It merely quotes the standard</li></ul>

**In 2007, across all the 3<sup>rd</sup> parties, 492 (6%) of the items were given a 'high' weighting, 4180 (51%) a 'low' weighting and 3524 (43%) a 'medium' weighting.**

In 2007 we also introduced nuggets, a new category for comments that would have a significant impact on likelihood of non-compliance with a standard. Twenty two items of intelligence from PPIF commentaries (relating to 16 trusts) and six from overview and scrutiny committee commentaries (relating to 4 trusts), fell into this category.

## Core Standards Assessment

Third party feedback for Buckinghamshire PCT Buckinghamshire Public Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee



### Summary of items of intelligence extracted from your commentary

<b>Trust code and name</b>	5QD - Buckinghamshire PCT			
<b>Healthcare Commission region/area</b>	South Central			
<b>Data quality rating of the commentary as a whole</b>	Medium			
<b>Number of items of information extracted from commentary</b>	11			
<b>Number of items of information by strength of relationship to standard</b>	<b>High: 1</b>	<b>Medium: 7</b>	<b>Low: 3</b>	<b>Nugget: 0</b>
<b>Core standards commented on</b>	C6, C13a, C15a, C15b, C17, C22c			

## Core Standards Assessment

Third party feedback for Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust Buckinghamshire Overview and Scrutiny Committee



### Summary of items of intelligence extracted from your commentary

<b>Trust code and name</b>	RXQ - Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust			
<b>Healthcare Commission region/area</b>	South Central			
<b>Data quality rating of the commentary as a whole</b>	Medium			
<b>Number of items of information extracted from commentary</b>	12			
<b>Number of items of information by strength of relationship to standard</b>	<b>High: 3</b>	<b>Medium: 3</b>	<b>Low: 6</b>	<b>Nugget: 0</b>
<b>Core standards commented on</b>	C1a, C4a, C6, C8a, C17, C18, C19, C20b, C21, Developmental Standards			

## Core Standards Assessment

Third party feedback for Oxfordshire And Buckinghamshire  
Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust Buckinghamshire  
Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Summary of items of intelligence extracted from your commentary

Trust code and name	RNU - Oxfordshire And Buckinghamshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust			
Healthcare Commission region/area	South Central			
Data quality rating of the commentary as a whole	Medium			
Number of items of information extracted from commentary	5			
Number of items of information by strength of relationship to standard	High: 0	Medium: 2	Low: 3	Nugget: 0
Core standards commented on	C6, C16, C17, C18, Developmental Standards			

## Core Standards Assessment

Third party feedback for South Central Ambulance Service NHS  
Trust Buckinghamshire Public Health Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee



Summary of items of intelligence extracted from your commentary

Trust code and name	RYE - South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust			
Healthcare Commission region/area	South Central			
Data quality rating of the commentary as a whole	Medium			
Number of items of information extracted from commentary	2			
Number of items of information by strength of relationship to standard	High: 0	Medium: 2	Low: 0	Nugget: 0
Core standards commented on	C18, C19			