

Standards based assessment Feedback for Windsor and Maidenhead OSC

Thank you for your commentary on your trust’s core standards declaration. We invited third parties – local involvement networks, overview and scrutiny committees, foundation trusts’ boards of governors, local safeguarding children’s boards and learning disability partnership boards 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 2009, we received 2881 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 3rd 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:	
High data quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It relates to the timescale of the Annual Health Check • Shows regular involvement of the forum (visits or inspections) • Contains detailed information such as dates and outcomes • Makes reference to evidence to substantiate comments that can be produced if requested
Low data quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of the Annual Health Check timescale • Evidence is unavailable or incomplete • Contains incomplete measures of outcomes • Suggests that the information on the trust performance is not based on concrete facts

In 2009, across all the 3rd parties, 8% of commentaries were given a high data quality rating, 37% a medium rating, 37% a low rating and 18% fell into the ‘no comment’ category.

What we did with the intelligence we extracted

In 2009 8949 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 analysed as above.** Each item was then defined as either positive or negative intelligence in relation to the trust’s compliance with the Standard. In 2009 75% 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:	
High weighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • The statement/intelligence covers the entire scope of the referenced standard • The statement is representative of the whole trust
Low weighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statement confirms compliance or non compliance with the standard, but there is an absence of supporting evidence • It covers a small aspect of the standard • The statement is not representative of the whole trust • It merely quotes the standard

In 2009, across all the 3rd parties, 256 (3%) of the items were given a 'high' weighting, 5534 (62%) a 'low' weighting and 3159 (35%) a 'medium' weighting.

Nuggets are comments that would have a significant impact on likelihood of compliance/non-compliance with a standard. In 2009 there were 20 nuggets - 10 from local children's safeguarding boards, 3 from LINK commentaries and 7 from overview and scrutiny committee commentaries. NB There were some commentaries where we were unable to extract any comments – this could be because the commentary states that the 3rd party has no comment to make, or the commentary could not be applied to any of the standards.

Summary of the intelligence extracted from your commentary

Trust	RWX Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust Provider			
Care Quality Commission area	South East			
Data quality rating	1			
Number of items of information extracted	1			
Number of items of information strength of relationship to core standard	High: 0	Medium: 0	Low: 1	Nugget: 0
Core standards commented on	C17			

Healthcare Commission's Annual Health Check 2008-2009 Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust The Joint East Berkshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee have no specific comments to make in relation to the Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust Annual Health Check Declaration to the Healthcare Commission for 2008/09. The Joint Committee are pleased and congratulate the Trust on their general cooperation and openness during the past year. The Trust have been regular attendees at meetings and have made positive and helpful contributions. Queries and requests for reports have been met promptly and openly discussed. With kind regards, Cllr. Simon Meadowcroft Chairman of the Joint East Berkshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee