

## Introduction

The main aim of this research is to develop and evaluate a measure of productivity which can be applied across all typical general practices in England, and which may result in improvements in practice leading to better patient outcomes.

You have been invited to complete this questionnaire as your practice has been using The General Practice Effectiveness Tool (GPET) for a few months now. We would like to ask you a few questions about your experience of using this measure.

Productivity at its most simple is the relationship between inputs (costs, staff and resources) and outputs. In a health context, this is not meaningful without considering quality of care as well as activity. Therefore, we will also ask a few questions about the resource required to run your practice. This information will not be shared with anyone but will be used to see if there is any relationship between input and effectiveness during the pilot.

The questionnaire should take no more than 30 minutes to complete.

## Part 1: About the practice

1. Please select your practice from the following list:
2. Please select your CCG from the following list:
3. What date did you begin using the tool?
4. Are you still using the tool? If not, please indicate when you stopped doing so.

## Part 2: About the measure

1. On average, how much time would you estimate was spent on using the tool per month? This can include data entry, getting feedback, troubleshooting etc.

\_\_\_\_\_ hours

2. How did this compare with what you had anticipated?

1. Much less than anticipated
2. A bit less than anticipated
3. About the same as anticipated
4. A bit more than anticipated
5. Much more than anticipated

3. If more than anticipated, which of the following aspects of it took more than than you had thought? Please tick all that apply.

- Training
- Gathering data
- Entering the data
- Gaining familiarity with the tool
- Troubleshooting (technical aspects)
- Retrieving feedback
- Discussing feedback

4. How easy was the tool to use?

0 Not at all.....Very 10

5. Overall, how useful was the tool to you as a practice?

0 Not at all.....Very 10

6. How useful was the automatic feedback generated by the software in the report section?

0 Not at all.....Very 10

7. Please tell us what, if any, additional resources were needed in your practice in order to use the tool.

8. Did you experience difficulties in using the software itself?  
*Yes, considerable difficulties / Yes, a few difficulties / No*
9. If yes, please describe briefly the difficulties you encountered.
10. Were there any **performance areas** missing from the General Practice Effectiveness Tool? If so, what were these?
11. Were there any **objectives** missing from the General Practice Effectiveness Tool? If so, what were these, and what performance area should they fall under?
12. Were any of the indicators problematic to gather? If so, please state which indicators these were.
13. Were any of the indicators problematic to interpret? If so, please state which indicators these were.
14. How did you use the data from the tool?
- Discussed feedback at team meetings
  - Discussed feedback in individual meetings
  - Other (please specify)
15. Did the feedback/data lead to any actions taken to improve effectiveness? If so, please summarise these briefly.
16. Which of the following groups have been involved in discussing feedback from the tool (please tick all that apply)?
- Practice management staff
  - GPs
  - Other clinical staff
  - Other administrative staff
  - Patient representatives
17. Would you be interested in using the tool in the future?
18. Any other comments.....

## Part 3: Practice Expenditure

We would like to know how much resource is required to run your practice.

1. Are you likely in the future to compare your performance on the tool against practice spending or resources? Very likely, likely, not sure, unlikely, very unlikely

1. Please could you indicate the total expenditure by the practice per month during the first six months that you were using the measure?

	Staff	Premises	Bills	Other
i. Month 1.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
ii. Month 2.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
iii. Month 3.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
iv. Month 4.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
v. Month 5.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
vi. Month 6.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

Comments.....

2. Was there anything that changed during the pilot that may have had an impact on expenditure or productivity? E.g Staffing changes, contract changes. Please could you tell us which month and a little about the change?
  - i. ....

[End of questionnaire]

## Summary of Quantitative Results

1. On average, how much time would you estimate was spent on using the tool per month? This can include data entry, getting feedback, troubleshooting etc.

Amount of time	Frequency (%)
1-1.5 hours	6 (15%)
2-2.5 hours	15 (38%)
3-3.5 hours	5 (13%)
4-4.5 hours	6 (15%)
5-5.5 hours	2 (5%)
At least 6 hours	5 (13%)

*(Base: 39 respondents)*

(Six respondents also commented that it took longer in the first month or two.)

2. How did this compare with what you had anticipated?

Comparison	Frequency (%)
Much less than anticipated	2 (5%)
A bit less than anticipated	2 (5%)
About the same as anticipated	10 (24%)
A bit more than anticipated	17 (42%)
Much more than anticipated	10 (24%)

*(Base: 41 respondents)*

**3. If more than anticipated, which of the following aspects of it took more than you had thought? Please tick all that apply.**

Aspect	Frequency (%)
Training	2 (5%)
Gathering data	20 (49%)
Entering the data	11 (27%)
Gaining familiarity with the tool	12 (29%)
Troubleshooting (technical aspects)	5 (12%)
Accessing feedback	3 (7%)
Discussing feedback	2 (5%)
Other (please specify) <sup>1</sup>	2 (5%)

<sup>1</sup>these both related to performing the calculations to enter the data

*(Base: 41 respondents)*

**4. How easy was the tool to use?**

Response	Frequency (%)
0 (not at all)	0 (0%)
1	1 (3%)
2	1 (3%)
3	6 (15%)
4	5 (13%)
5	5 (13%)
6	7 (18%)
7	8 (20%)
8	4 (10%)
9	1 (3%)
10 (very)	2 (5%)
Mean	5.6
Standard deviation	2.1

*(Base: 40 respondents)*

**5. Overall, how useful was the tool to you as a practice?**

Responses	Frequency (%)
0 (not at all)	4 (10%)
1	4 (10%)
2	0 (0%)
3	3 (8%)
4	7 (18%)
5	7 (18%)
6	6 (15%)
7	5 (13%)
8	4 (10%)
9	0 (0%)
10 (very)	0 (0%)
Mean	4.5
Standard deviation	2.4

*(Base: 40 respondents)*

**6. How useful was the automatic feedback generated by the software in the report section?**

Responses	Frequency (%)
0 (not at all)	5 (13%)
1	0 (0%)
2	3 (8%)
3	4 (10%)
4	8 (20%)
5	3 (8%)
6	4 (10%)
7	7 (18%)
8	4 (10%)
9	2 (5%)
10 (very)	0 (0%)
Mean	4.7
Standard deviation	2.6

*(Base: 40 respondents)*

**8. Did you experience difficulties in using the software itself?**

Response	Frequency (%)
Yes, considerable difficulties	1 (3%)
Yes, a few difficulties	14 (35%)
No	25 (63%)

*(Base: 40 respondents)*

**14. How did you use the data from the tool?**

Response	Frequency (%)
Discussed feedback at team meetings	17 (41%)
Discussed feedback in individual meetings	14 (34%)
Have not used it (yet)	10 (24%)
Other (please specify) <sup>1</sup>	4 (10%)
No response	5 (12%)

*(Base: 41 respondents)*

<sup>1</sup>“Other” responses included three who had discussed it with a patient representative group, and one who had circulated it to GP partners)

**16. Which of the following groups have been involved in discussing feedback from the tool (please tick all that apply)?**

Group	Frequency (%)
Practice management staff	28 (68%)
GPs	13 (32%)
Other clinical staff	9 (22%)
Other administrative staff	17 (41%)
Patient representatives	5 (12%)
No response	10 (24%)

*(Base: 41 respondents)*

**17. Would you be interested in using the tool in the future?**

Response	Frequency (%)
Yes	16 (40%)
No	24 (60%)

*(Base: 40 respondents)*