

APMS Scoring Panel
2nd November 2016, Leigh Cricket Club

1. Panel Members

Gary Young – Lay Member on Primary Care Committee

Ernie Rothwell – Lay Member on Primary Care Committee

Rob Wilson – Assistant Director of Strategy & Collaboration, Wigan Borough Clinical Commissioning Group

Debbie Szwandt – Assistant Director of Primary Care, Wigan Borough Clinical Commissioning Group

Dr James Weems – Local GP / Clinical Champion

Karen Holgate – Lead Practice Manager

During the session Karen declared that she was a Director of Health First Federation.

2. Background

This was a follow up session to the initial stakeholder workshop held on 5th October 2016.

The purpose of this session was to finish scoring the criteria against the commissioning options for each APMS site. A process of gathering additional information had been completed and the Information Pack updated.

At the session on 5th October the Panel had scored the following criteria:

- Levels of Deprivation,
- Number of Patients Registered – Trends,
- Patient Choice,
- Quality of the Building.

At the follow up session on 2nd November the panel needed to score the following criteria:

- Accessibility; disability, location, hours & transport links,
- Risk To destabilises practice in area (Quality & Capacity of Practices within 1 mile),
- New houses planned (within 1 mile radius),
- Estates Lease Terms

Attendees from the previous stakeholder workshop were invited to attend to observe the panel scoring. One representative from Intrahealth attended. The panel welcomed comments and questions as per the previous session.

3. Decisions before the Panel started scoring

Opening hours was included under the Accessibility criteria. In line with previous discussions this would be a service specification issue and so not considered when looking at the Accessibility criteria.

When looking at the Risk to destabilise the practices nearby it was decided that this would be assessed by Quality and Capacity of Practices within 1 mile and so these two criteria would be merged.

4. Panel Scoring

4.1 Accessibility; disability, location, hours & transport links

When the Panel discussed they agreed that generally accessibility for all the sites would score fairly high. In terms of Renewing or Merging (with ensuring a practice was still at the location) as this would have little impact on accessibility.

A discussion was held around the commissioning option end the contract and if scoring Accessibility against this option would be relevant to the final score. Ending a contract would mean the service was not accessible from that site anymore and so would all score equally low.

The scores around the option Renew and act as hub were slightly lower due hubs needing seven day service and reduction in public transport.

4.2 Risk to destabilises practice in area (Quality & Capacity of Practices within 1 mile)

The Panel discussed that the list size of the APMS practice was important to also consider, alongside how many practices are within a mile, their quality and capacity to take on new patients.

The low scores around renewing and merging represented discussions around the fact that some of these practices are in close proximity to practices which can take on new patients that are of appropriate quality.

If practices within 1 mile had not responded to the CCG indicating if their capacity and willingness to grow their list size then the Panel Assumed that they could not. This is particularly relevant to Marsh Green which scored very high on renewal options and 0 on ending the contract.

4.3 New house planned (within 1 mile radius)

Clarification had been sought from colleagues in Wigan Council Planning Office. We are including here the houses that are already being built and those with planning permission.

Many of the practices had large numbers of houses being built or with planning permission and scored relatively high on renewal and merging options. Tyldesley had fewer houses planned and so scored middle.

Due to the number of houses being built, most of scores against the end of the contract option were low.

4.4 Estates Lease Terms

The Panel reviewed the information we had been able to gather on Estates Lease Terms but felt that they did not have an appropriate level of consistent information to score this.

The Panel had a discussion around risk providers took on if they signed a lease for a longer period than their contract length.

The Panel agreed to discount this criteria and it was therefore not scored.

5. Sense- check of previously scored criteria

5.1 Quality of Building

The Panel reviewed Higher Folds for the Quality of Building Criteria. At the previous session a GP had raised that they were expecting a new build next summer and thus would need to be scored against this. However, upon checking we had clarified that this was not on the schedule. We had received some information via NHS England in the meantime that planning permission had lapsed although the provider was keen to review again. The Panel decided it was not appropriate at this point to score this criteria based on a new build and so amended it based on the current building.

The Panel were satisfied they had been consistent with their other scoring.

5.2 Levels of Deprivation

The Panel was happy with how they had scored levels of deprivation. They decided to re-score Renew: Act as Hub site for Leigh Sports Village down to a 6 though as there are lower levels of deprivation around that area and so there may be a better location for a hub offering extended access closer to more deprived communities.

5.3 Number of patients registered - trends

Upon review of the information the Panel were unsure if they had been consistent in scoring this at the previous session. The Panel reviewed and amended scores to ensure they were consistent in the approach to different APMS sites.

5.4 Patient Choice

The Panel were happy with the consistency applied to this criteria. Most scored 10, which represented the fact that the option to renew or merge, ensuring a practice at that location, would have no bearing on patient choice. More variable scores in the

'end contract' column represent fact that some practices have many practices nearby and some don't.

6. Weighting

The Panel held a discussion around how they may weight the score and potential bearing on outcome of determining a viable option. At the moment, but not assigning a weighting, they all get equal importance.

Feedback from stakeholders last time was around weighting in line with the priority list determined by stakeholders. So Accessibility would be weighted greater than number of new houses planned.

The Panel decided at that point that they would not agree a weighting.

7. Next Steps

This process has given us the list of commissioning options for each site that we will consult the public on – as viable options.