

HEALTH & WELLBEING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 30

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Performance and Quality in Primary Care		
Date of Meeting:	11 September 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, Resources		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Kath Vlcek	Tel: 29-0450
	Email:	Kath.vlcek@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) received a report on GP Performance at its September 2011 committee meeting. There were a number of issues that remained outstanding, so it has returned to the Health and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee (HWOSC)
- 1.2 The Clinical Commissioning Group is due to take on responsibility for assessing GP performance and quality from April 2013. They will be doing so using a 'scorecard' system.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Members note and comment on the contents of this report and its appendices.
- 2.2 That Members agree to take up the offer of a seminar on performance and quality in Primary Care hosted by the CCG.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) heard about GP Performance at their September 2011 committee meeting. There were a number of issues that remained outstanding so it has returned to the Health and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee (HWOSC), which has superseded the HOSC.
- 3.2 The minutes of the September 2011 HOSC say:

35.1 *This item was introduced by Ms Elizabeth Tinley, Service Lead, Brighton & Hove City Primary Care Contracts and Commissioning Directorate, Sussex Commissioning Support Unit.*

35.2 *Members agreed that they were disappointed that this report did not include information on the performance of individual GP practices in the city and asked for a paper to be circulated including this material.*

35.3 *Members also asked for some work to be done mapping the relative performance of city GP practices against areas of deprivation across the city – i.e. to ascertain whether GP practice performance was significantly correlated with deprivation etc – and requested that this be circulated alongside information on comparative performance.*

35.4 *In response to a question from Cllr Robins on the use of locums by individual GP practices, members were told that PCTs had no power to influence the use of locums by GP practices – the practice rather than named GPs is contracted to provide services. However, Ms Tinley agreed to find out whether information on locums was nonetheless collated, and, if so, whether there was any correlation between locum use and performance.*

35.5 *In answer to a question from Mr Hazelgrove on Patient Groups, members were informed that patients could choose to establish their own groups, although this could cause problems as the groups had to be fully representative of the practice population rather than a self-selecting sample.*

35.6 *The Chair thanked Ms Tinley for her contribution.*

35.7 *That the committee should receive additional information on:*

- (a) comparative performance of each city GP practice*
- (b) mapping of GP performance against city demographics*
- (c) use of locums and its correlation (if any) with GP practice performance.*

3.3 The Clinical Commissioning Group is due to take on responsibility for assessing GP performance and quality from April 2013. They will be doing so using a 'scorecard' system.

3.4 Information on the scorecards is available on <http://www.brightonandhove.nhs.uk/localservices/gp/NHSBrightonandHove-GPbalancedscorecard.asp>

3.5 The CCG has offered to host a seminar for HWOSC members on performance and quality in Primary Care to provide further time for discussion and detailed questions on the data and its implications,

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 None to this report for information.
- 4.2

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 None to this report for information.

Legal Implications:

5.2 None to this report for information.

Equalities Implications:

5.3 None to this report for information but the appendices from the CCG are focussed on GP performance and on inequalities.

Sustainability Implications:

5.4 None to this report for information.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 None to this c report for information.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6 None to this report for information but the appendices from the CCG are focussed on GP performance and on any risk that may ensue.

Public Health Implications:

5.7 None to this report for information but the appendices from the CCG are focussed on GP performance and consequently on public health.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.8 None to this report for information.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

6.1 None to this report for information.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The HOSC had queries that remained outstanding so it was referred on to HWOSC for information.

7.2 Members who were on HOSC may have already attended a workshop on GP performance, which is a significant issue, so it was felt appropriate to offer the same opportunity to newer members.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. GP Performance and Quality Scorecard Presentation handout
2. Example of a scorecard
3. Example of GP practice profile
4. GP taxonomies
5. GP Scorecard newsletter

Documents in Members' Rooms

None.

Background Documents

None.