

# BMJ Quality & Safety

## The role of practices and Clinical Commissioning Groups in measures of patient experience: analysis of routine data.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Quality &amp; Safety</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjqs-2020-011701.R1
Article Type:	Short report
Keywords:	Patient satisfaction, General practice, Healthcare quality improvement, Health services research, Patient-centred care

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

## The role of practices and Clinical Commissioning Groups in measures of patient experience: analysis of routine data

Gomez-Cano, Fletcher, Campbell, Elliott, Burt, Abel

Word count excluding table and refs: 1223

### Introduction

Recent years have seen an increased focus on measuring how people experience health services to ensure that care and treatment is of the highest quality and safety.<sup>1,2</sup> Better patient care experiences are associated with better adherence, clinical outcomes and patient safety, and with lower health care utilisation.<sup>3,4</sup> In England, the national GP Patient Survey (GPPS) measures patients' experience of Primary Care.<sup>5</sup> As part of an NHS initiative to improve patient experience and facilitate patient-centred care, GPPS scores are currently reported at the level of general practices, Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and nationally.

English CCGs are clinically-led NHS bodies that commission local health care services. There were 209 CCGs in 2016, though there are now fewer, on account of recent practice-mergers. Although GPPS scores are reported for CCGs, little is known about the influence CCGs have on patient experience scores. We have previously shown that patient experience scores vary considerably between GPs within a practice, and that measures reported at practice level can mask this variation.<sup>6</sup> The quality of care or patient experience delivered at any one practice may be influenced by drivers from higher organisations such as CCGs. Recently, CCGs have been shown to influence the rate and accuracy of "fast-track" cancer referrals from English primary care.<sup>7</sup> Here we explore whether there was systematic variation in the quality of patient experience between CCGs compared with variability between practices themselves.

### Methods

Data were analysed from 836,172 GPPS respondents in 2015/16 (response rate 38.9%). The GPPS survey was conducted in two waves (July-September 2015 and January-March 2016). Full details of the survey development and methodology are published elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Patient experience measures*

We focused on seven patient experience measures which have been commonly used in previous research, and which reflect key aspects of patient experience<sup>6,9-13</sup>. Six were based on single survey items: (i) access (difficulty making an appointment), (ii) continuity of care (how often it is possible to see a preferred GP), (iii) helpfulness of receptionists, (iv) overall experience, (v) out-of-hours speed of advice and (vi) out-of-hours overall experience. For the seventh measure, a composite GP communication score was calculated from the mean rating across five linked communication items among patients providing three or more informative responses. Responses to all items were rescaled linearly from 0 to 100 (most favourable), following previous research<sup>6,9-11</sup>.

#### *Statistical Analysis*

For each outcome measure, a 3-level mixed-effect linear regression model was fitted (patients nested within practices nested within CCGs). Patient age, gender, ethnicity, deprivation, and presence of a long-term condition were included as fixed effects. Each model estimated three variance components: residual, practice and CCG. We focused on variances associated with CCGs and practices, and express them as percentages of their sum. From this we can quantify the percentage of the variation in practice GPPS scores attributable to either practices or CCGs. Where the percentage associated with

CCGs is high, the implication is that much of the differences in practice scores is being driven by factors aligned with CCGs. Where the percentage associated with CCGs is low, this implies that practice-level factors are dominant in predicting practice scores.

As some variability between practices and CCGs may reflect structural differences between organisations, rather than organisational policies, we ran an additional set of models adjusting for region (fourteen large regions covering England) rurality (rural/urban based on practice location) and the interaction between them. Comparison of the variance associated with CCGs between models with and without rurality provides some insight into the extent to which differences between CCGs reflect the geography covered by CCGs and regional differences in staffing (e.g. recruitment).

Analyses were performed using R version 3.4.4.

## Results

Table 1 shows the estimated variance components. Before adjusting for region and rurality, the variation in practice scores for the out-of-hours items was mostly associated with the CCG (57% for out-of-hours speed of advice and 56% for out-of-hours overall experience), an area for which CCGs have statutory responsibility. For all other items, practice score variation was mainly associated with the practice, though GP communication and overall experience had notable CCG contributions (17% and 14% of variance associated with CCGs, respectively). A considerable proportion of between-CCG variance can be explained by region and rurality. This was largest for GP communication (43%), helpfulness of receptionists and overall experience (40% for both), and smallest for continuity of care (4%).

**Table 1 Variance associated with CCGs and practices for the seven GPPS outcome measures estimated with the hierarchical models.**

Outcome	Percentage of practice score variance associated with*		Percentage of between CCG variance associated with region and Rurality†
	CCG	Practice	
Access	11.8	88.2	30.3
Continuity of care	4.9	95.2	4.3
Overall experience	14.2	85.8	40.4
Helpful receptionists	8.1	91.9	40.4
GP Communication	16.7	83.3	42.6
Out of hours speed of access	56.5	43.5	36.0
Out of hours overall experience	57.1	42.9	38.3

\*Estimated from a model without region and rurality.

†Estimated from a model including region and rurality. The effects of rurality are inconsistent in direction and magnitude across both region and patient experience items; similar inconsistencies exist by region as permitted by the interaction term in the model.

## Discussion

Our findings suggest that CCGs may have a greater influence than individual practices on patient experience scores relating to aspects of care that are under the control of CCGs, such as out-of-hours care. Although CCGs were observed to contribute to other aspects of patient experience, the contribution from practices was much greater – in agreement with expectations, given that these are generally under the direct control of practices. Similar patterns of variation have previously been seen

1  
2 for US health plans.<sup>14</sup> Various mechanisms exist through which CCGs may exert influence; for example,  
3 local enhanced services (LESs) may have focused efforts on improving access as well as introduction  
4 of the extended hours directed enhanced service. Furthermore, at the time this data was collected,  
5 important transitional changes were taking place in the commissioning of primary care services, with  
6 transfer of responsibility progressing from centralised (NHS England) to local (CCG) commissioning,  
7 and thus with a potential local influence on patient experience. Certainly, some of the variation  
8 associated with CCGs can be explained by macro-scale structural differences such as larger region and  
9 rurality, and the larger-scale approach adopted, for example, at regional rather than at practice-level  
10 in relation to configuring the delivery of out-of-hours GP services. The contribution of region and  
11 rurality is largest for measures related directly to staffing and overall experience, potentially reflecting  
12 geographic variation in the availability of high-quality staff, which has led to schemes aimed at  
13 attracting GPs to underserved areas.<sup>15</sup>

14  
15  
16  
17 This study is not without limitations. The GPPS response rate is 39%. Although this is typical of such  
18 surveys<sup>16</sup> research suggests that non-response does not meaningfully affect relative performance  
19 after accounting for case-mix.<sup>16</sup> We also note that our analysis addresses the data which are publicly  
20 reported - any biases in our analysis will also be present in those publicly reported measures. Also, we  
21 have only accounted for macro-scale structural influences using large-scale proxy measures for region  
22 and rurality. There may be other factors of influence which we have not accounted for, for example  
23 the quality of secondary care or access to particular services.

24  
25  
26 To improve patient experience, or indeed any aspect of quality, it is essential to recognise and  
27 understand which parts of the health system are responsible for, and influence, different domains of  
28 this experience.<sup>17</sup> Just because a measure of patient experience is reported at a certain level of  
29 organisational structure does not mean that that level is the most relevant when considering impact  
30 on the actual experience of patients. This study builds on previous work and suggests that individual  
31 GPs, practices and CCGs (and newly emerging Primary Care Networks) all have a role to play, and that  
32 the magnitude of that role may be very different for different aspects of patient experience. As such  
33 quality improvement efforts may be targeted at all levels of the system, tailored to the scope for  
34 improvement that exists. In this study, practices were shown to be associated with substantial  
35 variation in out-of-hours care experience and on this account, improvement efforts at practice-level  
36 rather than CCG level may be warranted.

## 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1. The Health Foundation. Measuring patient experience. Evidence scan, 2013.
2. Coulter A, Locock L, Ziebland S, et al. Collecting data on patient experience is not enough: they must be used to improve care. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;348(mar26 1):g2225.
3. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. *BMJ Open* 2013;3(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001570
4. Anhang Price R, Elliott MN, Zaslavsky AM, et al. Examining the role of patient experience surveys in measuring health care quality. *Med Care Res Rev* 2014;71(5):522-54. doi: 10.1177/1077558714541480 [published Online First: 2014/07/17]
5. Ipsos MORI. GP Patient Survey – Technical Annex 2017 annual report, 2017.
6. Roberts MJ, Campbell JL, Abel GA, et al. Understanding high and low patient experience scores in primary care: analysis of patients' survey data for general practices and individual doctors. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2014;349
7. Burton C, O'Neill L, Oliver P, et al. Contribution of primary care organisation and specialist care provider to variation in GP referrals for suspected cancer: ecological analysis of national data. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 2020;29(4):296-303. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2019-009469
8. Campbell J, Smith P, Nissen S, et al. The GP Patient Survey for use in primary care in the National Health Service in the UK--development and psychometric characteristics. *BMC Fam Pract* 2009;10:57. doi: 10.1186/1471-2296-10-57 [published Online First: 2009/08/25]

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
9. Lyratzopoulos G, Elliott M, Barbiere JM, et al. Understanding ethnic and other socio-demographic differences in patient experience of primary care: evidence from the English General Practice Patient Survey. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 2012;21(1):21-29. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000088
  10. Lyratzopoulos G, Elliott MN, Barbiere JM, et al. How can health care organizations be reliably compared?: Lessons from a national survey of patient experience. *Medical care* 2011;49(8):724-33. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e31821b3482 [published Online First: 2011/05/26]
  11. Burt J, Lloyd C, Campbell J, et al. Variations in GP-patient communication by ethnicity, age, and gender: evidence from a national primary care patient survey. *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;66(642):e47-52. doi: 10.3399/bjgp15X687637 [published Online First: 2015/11/07]
  12. Warren FC, Abel G, Lyratzopoulos G, et al. Characteristics of service users and provider organisations associated with experience of out of hours general practitioner care in England: population based cross sectional postal questionnaire survey. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;350:h2040. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h2040
  13. Paddison CA, Abel GA, Roland MO, et al. Drivers of overall satisfaction with primary care: evidence from the English General Practice Patient Survey. *Health expectations : an international journal of public participation in health care and health policy* 2015;18(5):1081-92. doi: 10.1111/hex.12081 [published Online First: 2013/06/01]
  14. Zaslavsky AM, Zaborski LB, Cleary PD. Plan, geographical, and temporal variation of consumer assessments of ambulatory health care. *Health Serv Res* 2004;39(5):1467-85. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6773.2004.00299.x
  15. National Health Executive. Workforce and training 2016 [Available from: <http://www.nationalhealthexecutive.com/Health-Care-News/over-100-gps-to-be-sent-to-unpopular-regions-with-20000-bursary> accessed 21/02/2019.
  16. Elliott MN, Zaslavsky AM, Goldstein E, et al. Effects of survey mode, patient mix, and nonresponse on CAHPS hospital survey scores. *Health services research* 2009;44(2 Pt 1):501-18. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6773.2008.00914.x [published Online First: 2009/03/26]
  17. Round T, Abel G. Seeing the wood and the trees: the impact of the healthcare system on variation in primary care referrals. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 2020;29(4):274-76. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2019-010356