	Quality Impact Assessment : QIPP Project (Quality, Innovation, Productivity and Prevention) 2018/19
Project Name	QOF+
UI Number	
Project Lead	Sarah Southall/ Ranjit Khular
Quality Lead	Liz Corrigan
Programme Board	Primary Care/ MMO Programme Board
Verifying Clinician	Dr S Reehana
Project Overview	The QOF+ scheme has been developed as a framework to be delivered by Primary Care within which there are arange of potential scheme ideas, with a broad focus on prevention. The scheme in 2018/19 will focus on Diabetes (primary and secondary prevention) Obesity and Alcohol. The scheme will will focus on practices: screening for hazardous and harmful drinking and providing brief intervention: Screening for T2DM and appropriate intervention. This intervention includes onward referral to the NDPP or alterative equivalent provision if required. producing care plans for all patients with a known diagnosis of diabetes, customised to the level of patient need Offering BMI calculation for new patients and those with obesity-related conditions such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease and deliver or signpost patients to the most appropriate intervention. Some launch events will be held as par of the mobilisation process to ensure practitioners are clear about the expectations of them.
Quality Indicators	patients aged 18 or over that are new to list , who have had screening carried out using an Assessment Score. patients deemed to have 'pre-diabetes' 'overall risk of developing diabetes, for whom 'brief intervention' has been offered patients deemed to have 'pre-diabetes' (high overall risk), who have a record of being referred to an intensive lifestyle intervention <u>patients with diabetes, on the register:</u> * for whom a care plan has been completed * who have a record of an albumin: creatinine ratio test * with a record of a foot examination and risk classification patients newly diagnosed with diabetes, on the register, in the preceding 1 April to 31 March who have a record of being referred to a structured education programme within 9 months after entry onto the diabetes register <u>patients with diabetes, on the register</u> * in whom all eight care processes are complete in the preceding 12 months * in whom the last blood BP (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80mmHg or less * whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less Alcohol: percentage of patients aged 16 or over who have been screened for hazardous, harmful or dependent levels of alcohol consumption using the AUDIT-C tool patients with any or any combination of at risk conditions who have been screened for hazardous, harmful or dependent levels of alcohol consumption using the AUDIT-C tool patients identified as having hazardous or harmful levels of alcohol consumption, who are recorded as having been offered 'brief advice' <b>Obesity</b> patients, with diabetes, for whom a BMI is recorded patients, with BMI >=30 kg/m2 who are recorded as having been offered 'brief advice' .
KPI Assurance (sources & reporting)	

$\square$		ASSESSMEN	т
		Positive Impact of the Project on:	Negative Impact of the Project on:
	Patient Safety	Improved identification of patients at risk of developing diabetes, who are at risk of drinking at harmful levels and whose BMI presents risks to their health will be identified and appropriate intervetions delivered to prevent the onset of diabetes, alcohol related harm and conditions related to Obesity	
Section B	Patient Experience	Depending on their presentation patients will be given brief advice by the GP or be signposted or referred to other services (depending on severity or level of need)	Some patients may not engage with the interventions proposed or agree with the outcomes of the risk assessments
	Clinical Effectiveness	The interventions that would be undertaken by the practices and those that patients would be signoisted towards are all preventative and if followed through would reduce the lokelihood of the patient becoming diabetic, obese or drinking at harmful levels. This will have positive impacts on the patients wellbeing in the longer term.	
	Mitigation		ents that the interventions being recommended are in line with based on evidence that they will result in a postive effect on

	have positive impacts on t	he patients wellbeing in the rterm.				
Mitigation GP staff delivering the service will advise the patients that the interventions being recommended are in line with best practice/ clinical guidelines and that these are based on evidence that they will result in a postive effect on their longer term health and wellbeing.						
	(What i	Risk Grading s the Risk of the negativ				
	Likelihood Score	Consequence Score	Ov	erall Risk Score		
	1 Rare; 2 Unlikely; 3 Possible; 4 Likely; 5 Almost Certain	1 Negligible; 2 Minor; 3 Moderate; 4 Major; 5 Catastrophic	Likelihood x Consequence (L x C) = R (Risk score)	Drop Down Selection		
Patient Safety						

2

	Risk Scoring Guide:
t of the Project on:	
	Instructions for use
	1 Define the risk(s) explicitly in terms of the adverse consequence(s) that might arise from the risk.
	2 Use table 1 to determine the likelihood score (L) for those adverse outcomes. If possible, score the likelihood by assigning a predicted frequency of occurrence of the adverse outcome. If this is not possible, assign a probability to the adverse outcome occurring within a given time frame, such as the lifetime of a project or a patient care episode.

If it is not possible to determine a numerical probability then use the probability descriptions to determine the most appropriate score

3 Determine the consequence score (C) for the potential adverse outcome(s) relevant to the risk being evaluated.

4 Calculate the risk score the risk multiplying the likelihood by the consequence: L (likelihood) x C (consequence) = R (risk score)

5 Identify the level at which the risk will be managed in the organisation, assign priorities for remedial action, and determine whether risks are to be accepted on the basis of the colour bandings and risk ratings, and the organisation's risk management system. Include the risk in the organisation risk register at the appropriate level

4 to 6: Moderate Risk

isk Quantification Matrix able 1 Likelihood score (L) /hat is the likelihood of the consequence occurring?

Likelihood score	1	2	3	4	5
Descriptor	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain
Frequency	This will	Do not expect it	Might happen or	Will probably	Will undoubtedly
How often might	probably never	to happen/recur	recur	happen/recur	happen/recur,
it/does it happen	happen/recur	but it is possible	occasionally	but it is not a	possibly
		it may do so		persisting issue	frequently

Risk System						
Likelihood score	1	2	3	4	5	
	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain	
5 Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25	
4 Major	4	8	12	16	20	
3 Moderate	3	6	9	12	15	
2 Minor	2	4	6	8	10	
1 Negligible	1	2	3	4	5	
Risk scoring = consequence x likelihood (L x C)						
1 to 3	Low Risk	8 to 12	High Risk			
4 to 6	Moderate Risk	15 to 25	Extreme Risk			

D	
Section	

Section C

Patient Experience

**Clinical Effectiveness** 

GP / Clinical Name

Date

2

The CCG Chair has been involved in the development of this scheme from the outset, introduction of the discussion with member practices and the prioritisation of clinical areas that have been included. Her involvement has also provided oversight of the commissioned literature review and return on investment report and engagement with practices following availability of the first draft commissioned interature review and return on investment report and engagement with practices following availability of the first draft scheme. Since then ongoing discussions have taken place with GP representatives at a range of forums, engagement has been extensive.

GP / Clinical Review (Required)

Dr S Reehana 16.05.18

	ור	Quality Leads Comments (Required)			
		Quality Lead Name	Liz Corrigan		
		Date	03/04/18		
Section E		Comments	Will need to take into account the current issues with the NDPP provider capacity. Have training needs for staff been identified across the board or is this a work in progress? Are any problems anticipated in the light of reduced Public Health lifestyle provision? No, as the scheme does not require PH practitioners to deliver any of the interventions. the services that practitioners would refer patients to are still within the rationalised PH Commissioning portfolio e.g specialist alcohol services Has thought been given to alternatives if practices do not want to sign up? Could the Leicester diabetes risk score be added to the NHS Health Check template via discussions with Public Health?		

		APPROVAL - Business Case QIA				
	Reviewer	Signature	Date			
ш	Project Lead	Sarah Southall and Ranjit Khular	01.04.18			
Section	Patient Rep					
Sec	Quality Lead	Liz Corrigan	03/04/18			
	Programme Board Review	Primary Care Programme Board	09.04.18			
	Approval Board Approval	Primary Care Commissioning Committee (Public)				

Post Implementation Review

		Benefits Realisation & C	Close Review						
	Date of Project Implementation								
	Date of Project Review								
	Findings From Benefits Realisation Review	include here feedback from patients, performance & activity i	de here feedback from patients, performance & activity information +/- and quality monitoring arrangements for the future.						
	Concerns identified as a result of this scheme								
	What change has occurred as a result of the project implementation								
пG	Date of Closure	insert date							
Section	Summary of Achievements & Monitoring Arrangements	sert bullet points providing a summary of achievements and how the project/ service will be monitored hereafter.							
	Reason for Closure	e. project achieved, abandoned, delivered or suspend.							
	Final Risk Score								
	APPROVAL								
	Reviewer	Signature	Date	Agreed Yes/No Including Comments					
	Project Lead								
	Patient Rep								
	Quality Lead								
	Head of Quality								
	Programme Board Review								