

2019-2020 GP Quality Improvement EPaCCS Data Explained

Key Points & Disclaimer:

1. The data reports provided to GP Practices to support the May-July GP Quality Improvement Workshops ran by The End of Life Partnership were obtained confidentially via the CCG and from EMIS - GP Practices have been provided with their individual practice level data against the CCG overall for comparison. Some areas have also had their data presented at Primary Care Network levels.
2. Practices who wish to run their own independent reports can do so using the coding information on the Cheshire EPAIGE – search for ‘read codes for Cheshire end of life searches’
3. The explanations around the **High Level Outcomes (HLO’s)** below apply to data reports produced after June 2019 i.e. when the new reporting structures (detailed at the end of this document) were applied. Practices will not be provided with a retrospective report of Quarters 3-4 for 2018-19 using the new High Level Outcomes.
4. Priority End of Life data fields referred to as HLO’s have been agreed between the commissioners and providers of the Palliative & End of Life Strategic Collaborative Cheshire
5. EoLP are continually working with GP Practices to better understand individual practice data and to make it both reflective and meaningful to ‘actual’ working practice- as a result several changes have been made to the reporting denominators for 2019-20

Your data explained

High Level Outcome (HLO)	Local Standard	Supporting Explanatory Notes
<p>High Level Outcome 1: Spot audit of ‘living patients’ on the GSF/with a GSF needs based code at a particular date</p>	<p>0.45%</p>	<p>Links to national campaign- find your 1% i.e. roughly 1% of the practice population will die every year</p> <p>Some evidence that at best a practice have the potential to anticipate and therefore identify 0.75% due to nature of dying. Coding options include on the GSF Register as well as needs based coding based upon the stages of the North West Model</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>The North West End of Life Care Model</p> </div>
<p>High Level Outcome 2: Deceased patients where a consent code for sharing end of life information has been ticked or on the end of life care register code used</p>	<p>35%</p>	<p>This coding was historically used by Public Health England to indicate a person had an EPaCCS but locally we are challenging this as not representing meaningful data. Within EMIS these codes do not actually control whether a person’s information is shared with other services, this control happens at GP Practice Level.</p> <p>IMPORTANT: the use of the consent code will help to trigger the clinician to check that appropriate conversations have taken place with the patient and their significant others prior to completing an EPaCCS e.g. that the person is aware that they have a Palliative condition. Any coded data will subsequently show on patient records where these are being shared directly with the patient.</p> <p>NB: it is left to clinician discretion if it is believed that the use of coded end of life information within a patients shared Medical record would cause a person undue distress. HOWEVER it should be noted that it is recommended best practice for sensitive conversations to take place with all patients that are nearing the end of their lives, and whilst these are sometime difficult, at the point of entering EPaCCS clinicians have a duty to ensure this happens.</p>

<p>High Level Objective 3: Deceased patients with a locally defined 'meaningful EPaCCS'</p>	<p>35%</p>	<p>Locally we have defined a meaningful EPaCCS as being:</p> <p>'by the time a person has died they will have all three of the following areas of care recorded through coding :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified as nearing end of life (GSF/needs based coding) • Offered/ had an ACP conversation (includes declined or not appropriate codes) • CPR status or discussion recorded
<p>High Level Objective 4 & 5 & 6: Deceased patients identified with <u>either one</u> of the locally defined meaningful EPaCCS areas coded :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified as nearing end of life –GSF (HLO 4) • ACP conversation coding (HLO 5) • CPR status/ discussion recorded (HLO 6) 	<p>40% 35% 60%</p>	<p>These three areas of coding have been separated out to allow GP Practices to identify if there is a particular area of their coding that is affecting their achievement of the 'meaningful EPaCCS' standard i.e. HLO 3</p>
<p>High Level Objective 7: Deceased patients with a recorded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred Place of Death/Care AND • Actual Place of Death 	<p>25%</p>	<p>Recording of both Preferred Place of Care/Death and Actual Place of Death will have the following three benefits locally</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CQC inspection evidence as some practices are being asked how they know patients are dying where they want to 2. After Death Analysis at GSF meetings – quick way of identifying patients that didn't die where they preferred so that these can be discussed and reflected upon at palliative care meetings 3. As more GP Practices record this information, we will be able to pick up any geographical trends around people achieving their wishes and seek to understand if this is a result of gaps or variations in service provision

What has changed for 2019-20 reporting and why?

1. HLO's 5, 6 and 7 will be reported against all deaths not just those identified as Palliative by a GSF code- new baselines have been established and local standards revised (as per the above table). Practices will subsequently be provided with retrospective data for Q3-Q4 2018-19 using the revised High Level Outcomes.
2. A new HLO 4 indicator will be added to measure % of all deaths that have a GSF needs based code i.e. that have been identified as nearing the end of life
3. ACP coding searches will now include preferred place of death/care 'locations' in response to feedback from Primary Care that location coding is evidence that a conversation has taken place

