

NHS Patient Survey Programme

2018 Children and Young People's Patient Experience Survey

Identifying outliers within trust-level results

Published November 2019

CQC publication

Contents

Summary	2
Interpreting the results	3
Results	5
Trusts achieving ‘much better than expected’ results	5
Trusts achieving ‘better than expected’ results	6
Trusts achieving ‘worse than expected’ results.....	8
Trusts achieving ‘much worse than expected’ results.....	10
Appendix A: Analysis methodology	11
Identifying worse than expected patient experience	11
Identifying better than expected patient experience.....	11
Weighting.....	12
Scoring	12
Appendix B: Analytical stages of the outlier model	13
Appendix C: Outlier analysis and trust-level benchmark reports	16
Appendix D: Overall experience question – ‘better’ and ‘worse’ trusts	17
Appendix E: Date of published CQC ratings	18
Appendix F: Further information	20

Summary

The 2018 children and young people's patient experience survey collected feedback on the experiences of 33,179 children and young people who received care in 129 NHS acute trusts during November and December 2018. A total of 10,927 young patients aged 8 to 15 told us directly about their experiences through questionnaires designed specifically for them, with additional feedback provided by their parents and carers. For children aged 0 to 7, feedback was provided entirely by their parent or carer.

National results are published on our [website](#). This separate analysis identifies trusts where patients' experiences of care are either better, or worse, than expected when we compare survey results across trusts. The analysis methodology used in this report allows for an overall picture of performance across the survey, considering results for all evaluative (scored) questions simultaneously. It supplements the approach used in the trust level benchmark reporting, which provides results for individual questions.

For more information on the difference between approaches used to explore differences in patients' experiences between trusts, see appendix C [outlier analysis and trust-level benchmark reports](#).

Each trust has been categorised into one of five bands: 'much worse than expected', 'worse than expected', 'about the same', 'better than expected' or 'much better than expected'. We produced two bands for each trust, one for experiences of children aged 15 days to 7 years and another for children and young people aged 8 to 15.

As in 2016, Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust was categorised in the highest band of 'much better than expected' for both age groups. Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust was categorised as 'much better than expected' for the 0 to 7 age group only.

One trust, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, has been identified as achieving 'much worse than expected' results for the 8 to 15 age group, but no trusts were categorised in the 'much worse than expected' for the 0 to 7 age group.

Our Chief Inspector of Hospitals, Professor Ted Baker, has written to all trusts identified as better or worse within the outlier analysis. The trusts identified as worse, or much worse, will be asked to review their results and to outline what actions they will take to address the areas of concern. CQC will review their progress on their next planned inspections.

Interpreting the results

To provide a comprehensive picture of patient experience within each NHS trust, we have calculated the overall proportion of responses that each trust received for the 'most negative', 'middle' and 'most positive' answer option(s) across all scored questions in the survey.^a

The following example demonstrates how responses are categorised as either 'most negative', 'middle' and 'most positive'.

Did hospital staff play with you or do any activities with you while you were in hospital?

- Yes, a lot – **most positive**
- Yes, a little – **middle**
- No – **most negative**

Where people's experience of a trust's care is better or worse than elsewhere, there will be a significant difference between that trust's result and the average result across all trusts. Each trust is then assigned a banding of either 'much worse than expected', 'worse than expected', 'about the same', 'better than expected' or 'much better than expected' depending on how significant that variation is. Consistent with our trust-level benchmarking methodology, the analysis includes both specialist and non-specialist trusts.

For example, a trust's proportion of responses for those aged 8 to 15 breaks down as: 'most negative' 9%, 'middle' 20% and 'most positive' 71%. This is then compared with the trust average of 'most negative' 6%, 'middle' 18% and 'most positive' 76%. The adjusted z-score for the difference between the hypothetical trust's 'most negative' proportion (9%) and the trust's average 'most negative' proportion (6%) is -1.98. This means this trust has a higher proportion of 'negative' responses than average, this is considered significant with a p-value of less than 0.25 but not less than 0.01. As a result, the trust is classed as 'worse'. See [appendix B](#) for methodological details.

To provide more granular analysis, a banding has been assigned for 2018 results to separate the experiences of children and young people aged 15 days to 7 years and 8 to 15 years separately. Feedback for those aged 15 days to 7 years was received entirely from parents and carers, and, as such, the results of the aged 0 to 7 analysis reflect feedback from parents and carers of children aged 0 to 7. In contrast, questionnaires sent to those aged 8 to 15 included sections for both the child and their parent or carer to complete.^b The results of the aged 8 to 15 analysis below

a. Filter questions, such as 'Was your child's visit to hospital planned or an emergency?' were not included in this analysis.

b. This survey used, under licence, questionnaires originally developed and owned by Picker Institute Europe.

therefore reflects feedback from children and young people aged 8 to 15, as well as their parents and carers.

Finally, each table in the report includes the most recent trust-wide CQC rating and, where available, ratings for the core service of 'Services for children and young people' for individual hospital sites.

Results

Trusts achieving ‘much better than expected’ results

Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, was classed as ‘much better than expected’ for experiences of both 0 to 7 and 8 to 15-year-olds. Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust was classed as ‘much better than expected’ for experiences of 0 to 7-year-olds.

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	Core service rating Site 1	
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)			Middle*
Trust average		7	20	73		6	18	76	
Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	MB	3	12	86	MB	2	9	89	G
Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust	MB	3	8	88	B	3	14	83	G

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

*Where a number of options lay between the negative and positive responses, they are placed at equal intervals along the scale. For example ‘Quite clean’ and ‘Not very clean’ are the middle options (scored as 6.6/10 and 3.3/10) for the question ‘How clean do you think the hospital room or ward was that your child was in?’

Trusts achieving 'better than expected' results

Seven trusts were categorised as 'better than expected' for experiences of 0 to 7-year-olds. In addition to Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust, shown in the table above, seven other trusts were categorised as 'better than expected' for experiences of 8 to 15-year-olds.

Four trusts, East Cheshire NHS Trust, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Northern Devon Healthcare NHS Trust and The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, were categorised as 'better than expected' for both age groups.

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	Core service rating		
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)		Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Site 1
Trust average		7	20	73		6	18	76		
Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust	S	4	17	79	B	3	13	83	G	NR^c
City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust ^d	B	5	14	82	S	5	17	78	G	G
East Cheshire NHS Trust	B	5	15	79	B	4	14	82	G	G
Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	B	4	14	81	S	9	17	75	G	O
Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust	S	9	21	70	B	3	14	83	RI	G
James Paget University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	B	5	16	80	S	4	19	77	G	G

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

^c While Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust does not have a rating for services for children and young people, the trust's neonatal services are rated good.

^d On 1 April 2019 City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust and South Tyneside NHS Foundation Trust merged to create South Tyneside and Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust. Sampling for this survey occurred before this merger.

Trusts achieving 'better than expected' results (continued)

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	Core service rating		
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)		Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Site 1
Trust average		7	20	73		6	18	76		
Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	B	4	13	83	B	3	12	85	G	G
Northern Devon Healthcare NHS Trust	B	4	16	80	B	3	14	83	RI	G
Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust	S	5	18	77	B	3	15	82	G	RI
The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust	B	3	16	81	B	1	15	83	O	G

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

Trusts achieving 'worse than expected' results

Three trusts, Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust, North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust and The Pennine Acute Hospitals Trust were categorised as 'worse than expected' for experiences of both 0 to 7 and 8 to 15-year-olds.

Seven trusts were categorised as 'worse than expected' for experiences of 0 to 7-year-olds only. Six trusts were categorised as 'worse than expected' for experiences of 8 to 15-year-olds only.

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	Core service rating		
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)		Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Site 1
Trust average		7	20	73		6	18	76		
Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	W	11	26	62	S	6	21	73	RI	G
Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	W	11	24	65	S	7	21	72	RI	RI
Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust	W	11	24	65	W	9	19	72	G	G
East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust	S	9	22	69	W	9	20	70	G	G
Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust	S	7	22	71	W	9	16	75	G	G
Great Western Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	S	9	26	65	W	9	20	71	RI	G
Kettering General Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	S	8	20	72	W	9	21	70	RI	RI
Medway NHS Foundation Trust	S	10	23	67	W	9	19	72	RI	G
North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust	W	12	23	65	W	10	24	66	RI	RI

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

Trusts achieving 'worse than expected' results (continued)

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	Core service rating			
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)		Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Site 1	Site 2
	Trust average		7	20	73			6	18	76	
Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	S	6	17	76	W	9	16	75	O	O	
Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust	W	10	22	68	S	8	21	71	RI	RI	RI
The Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust	W	11	24	65	S	6	18	75	RI	RI	
The Hillingdon Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	W	11	23	67	S	7	18	75	RI	G	
The Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust	W	12	22	66	W	10	24	66	RI	RI	RI
The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust	W	11	24	65	S	6	18	76	G	G	
University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust	W	11	21	69	S	8	22	70	RI	G	

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

Trusts achieving 'much worse than expected' results

One trust, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, was categorised in the lowest band of 'much worse than expected' for experiences of 8 to 15-year-olds.

	Aged 0-7			Aged 8-15			Overall CQC rating	CYP core service			
	Band	Most Negative (0/10)	Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Band	Most Negative (0/10)		Middle	Most Positive (10/10)	Site 1	Site 2
	Trust average		7	20	73			6	18	76	
University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust	W	12	27	61	MW	10	21	69	G	NR	

Key:	Trust performance	Much worse (MW)	Worse (W)	About the same (S)	Better (B)	Much better (MB)
	CQC rating	Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)	No rating (NR)

Appendix A: Analysis methodology

Identifying worse than expected patient experience

The analytical approach to identifying those trusts where patient experience was 'worse than expected' uses responses for all scored questions (except the overall experience question asked to parents).^e

For each trust, a count of the number of responses scored as '0' (the most negative option) is calculated. This is then divided by the total number of responses scored as 0 to 10 to calculate the trust-level proportion of poor experience. A higher percentage of negative responses indicates poor patient experience.

The analysis uses z-scores to indicate the difference between the proportion of poor experience in a trust and the average.

There are two thresholds for flagging trusts with concerning levels of poor patient experience:

- **Worse than expected:** z-score lower than -1.96
- **Much worse than expected:** z-score lower than -3.09

[Appendix B](#) provides full technical detail of the analytical process.

Identifying better than expected patient experience

To identify 'better than expected' patient experience, we calculate a count of the number of responses scored as '10' (the most positive option) for each trust.

This is then divided by the total number of responses scored as 0 to 10 to calculate the trust-level proportion of poor experience. A higher percentage of positive responses indicates good patient experience.

Our analysis has found that those trusts with the highest proportion of positive responses also have the lowest proportion of negative responses.

There are two thresholds for identifying trusts with high levels of good patient experience:

- **Better than expected:** z-score lower than -1.96
- **Much better than expected:** z-score lower than -3.09

e. Overall experience is excluded from the analysis due to the ambiguity around what should be categorised as the 'most negative' (and 'most positive') option(s).

Weighting

Results have been standardised by the age, length of stay and admission method of respondents to ensure that no trust will appear better or worse than another because of its respondent profile.

Standardisation enables a more accurate comparison of results from trusts with different population profiles. In most cases this will not have a large impact on a trust's results, but it does make comparisons between trusts as fair as possible.

Scoring

Individual responses are converted into scores on a scale from 0 to 10. A score of 10 represents the best possible response and a score of 0 the worst. Trust scores are weighted averages of individual responses. The higher the score for each question, the better the trust is performing.

It is not appropriate to score all questions in the questionnaires as not all of the questions assess the trust's performance. For example, descriptive questions such as "Was your child's visit to hospital planned or an emergency?" and filter questions such as "Did you stay overnight in hospital with your child during their most recent visit to hospital?" are not scored.

Appendix B: Analytical stages of the outlier model

The analytical approach to identifying outliers is based on all evaluative items in the survey, the questions that are scored for benchmarking purposes. The respondent-level scored variables are the source data. These variables take values between 0 (representing the worst rating of experience) and 10 (representing the best rating).

As outlier analysis was conducted on two sub-sets of data (0 to 7 and 8 to 15), the 'PSAweights' used to standardise responses within benchmark reports were normalised. To do this, each respondent weight in the subset of data was divided by the mean weight for the trust in the subset. The impact of this is to ensure that the weighted total responses are equal to the unweighted total.

1. Count the poor-care ratings made by each respondent^f

Count of the '0' responses across the scored questions answered by each respondent (excluding the "Overall..." question).

2. Count the questions given specific (scored) answers by each respondent

Count of all '0 to 10' responses across the scored questions answered by each respondent (excluding the "Overall..." question).

3. Weight the data

Apply the standardisation weight for respondents. The weight adjusts the population of respondents within each trust to the national average proportions for age, length of stay (zero overnight stays vs. one or more overnight stays) and admission type (emergency vs. elective).

f. The analytical approach used to identify positive patient experience uses a numerator count of the '10' responses across all scored questions (excluding the "overall..." question) to calculate the 'good-care ratings'. There are no other differences between the analytical approaches for identifying poor and good patient experience.

4. Aggregate to trust-level and compute proportion of poor ratings

Obtain a weighted numerator and denominator for each trust. Divide the numerator by the denominator to obtain the trust-level proportion of poor care ratings, i.e. the overall percentage of responses which were scored as 0.

5. Compute the mean of the trust-level proportions

Sum all proportions and divide by the number of trusts to obtain the average trust-level proportion of poor care ratings.

6. Compute the z-score for the proportion

The Z-score formula used is:

$$z_i = -2\sqrt{n_i} \{ \sin^{-1}(\sqrt{p_i}) - \sin^{-1}(\sqrt{p_0}) \} \quad (1)$$

where: n_i is the denominator for the trust

p_i is the trust proportion of poor care ratings

p_0 is the mean proportion for all trusts

7. Winsorize the z-scores

Winsorizing consists of shrinking in the extreme Z-scores to some selected percentile, using the following method:

1. Rank cases according to their naive Z-scores.
2. Identify Z_q and $Z_{(1-q)}$, the 100q% most extreme top and bottom naive Z-scores. For this work, we used a value of $q=0.1$
3. Set the lowest 10% of Z-scores to Z_q , and the highest 10% of Z-scores to $Z_{(1-q)}$. These are the Winsorized statistics.

This retains the same number of Z-scores but discounts the influence of outliers.

8. Calculate dispersion using Winsorized z-scores

An over dispersion factor $\hat{\phi}$ is estimated which allows us to say if the data are over dispersed or not:

$$\hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I z_i^2 \quad (2)$$

Where I is the sample size (number of trusts) and z_i is the Z score for the i th trust given by (1). The Winsorized Z scores are used in estimating $\hat{\phi}$.

9. Adjust for overdispersion

If $I\hat{\phi}$ is greater than $(I - 1)$ then we need to estimate the expected variance between trusts. We take this as the standard deviation of the distribution of p_i (trust proportions) for trusts, which are on target, we give this value the symbol $\hat{\tau}$, which is estimated using the following formula:

$$\hat{\tau}^2 = \frac{I\hat{\phi} - (I - 1)}{\sum_i w_i - \sum_i w_i^2 / \sum_i w_i} \quad (3)$$

where $s_i = (p_i - p_0)/z_i$, $w_i = 1/s_i^2$ and $\hat{\phi}$ is from (2). Once $\hat{\tau}$ has been estimated, the Z_D score is calculated as:

$$z_i^D = \frac{p_0 - p_i}{\sqrt{s_i^2 + \hat{\tau}^2}} \quad (4)$$

Appendix C: Outlier analysis and trust-level benchmark reports

The approach used to analyse trust variation in this report is focused on identifying significantly higher levels of better or worse patient experience **across the entire survey**.

This holistic approach is different to the technique used to analyse results reported in [trust benchmarking reports](#), which have been made available to each trust separately. Within those reports, trust results, for each scored question, are assigned bands of either 'better', 'worse' or 'about the same' when compared with the results for all other trusts. However, this technique does not analyse responses to all questions concurrently. As such, it does not provide an overall assessment of the proportion of positive or negative patient experience reported across the entire survey.

Furthermore, being assigned a band of 'better' for an overall experience question is not the same as being 'better than expected' across the entire survey. For comparison, [Appendix D](#) details all trusts that were assigned a band of 'worse' or 'better' for the overall experience question asked for all parents and carers.

Appendix D: Overall experience question – ‘better’ and ‘worse’ trusts

Six trusts were identified as being **‘better than expected’** for the overall experience question answered by parents and carers:

- Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust
- City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust
- Northern Devon Healthcare NHS Trust
- Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
- Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust
- The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust

Eight trusts were identified as being **‘worse than expected’** for the overall experience question answered by parents and carers:

- Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust
- Great Western Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust
- Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust
- Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust
- The Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust
- University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust

Appendix E: Date of published CQC ratings

The following table provides the date the CQC Inspection ratings, provided within [results section](#) of this report, were most recently published. These have been provided for:

- Trust (provider) – overall rating
- Hospital site (location) – Services for children & young people: Core service – overall rating

Provider / location name	Rating	Date
Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	G	23/05/2019
The Queen Victoria Hospital (East Grinstead)	G	26/04/2016
Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust	G	22/02/2019
Royal Brompton Hospital	G	22/02/2019
Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust	G	21/06/2018
City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust	G	23/08/2018
Sunderland Royal Hospital	G	20/01/2015
East Cheshire NHS Trust	G	04/10/2019
Macclesfield District General Hospital	G	12/04/2018
Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	G	23/07/2019
St Thomas' Hospital	O	24/03/2016
Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust	RI	01/06/2018
Hull Royal Infirmary	G	15/02/2017
James Paget University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	G	06/12/2018
James Paget Hospital	G	20/12/2016
Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	G	12/03/2019
Moorfields Eye Hospital	G	06/01/2017
Northern Devon Healthcare NHS Trust	RI	12/09/2019
North Devon District Hospital	G	09/11/2014
Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust	G	01/03/2019
Salisbury District Hospital	RI	07/04/2016
The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust	O	18/09/2018
The Royal Marsden - Sutton	G	19/01/2017
Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	RI	17/10/2019
Blackpool Victoria Hospital	G	17/10/2019
Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	RI	15/06/2018
Bradford Royal Infirmary	RI	24/06/2016

Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust	G	22/08/2019
Darent Valley Hospital	G	02/07/2014
East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust	G	12/02/2019
Burnley General Hospital	G	09/07/2014
Royal Blackburn Hospital	G	09/07/2014
Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust	G	19/09/2019
St Helier Hospital and Queen Mary's Hospital for Children	G	14/05/2018
Epsom General Hospital	G	29/01/2019
Great Western Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	RI	21/12/2018
Great Western Hospital	G	21/12/2018
Kettering General Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	RI	22/05/2019
Kettering General Hospital	RI	27/02/2018
Medway NHS Foundation Trust	RI	26/07/2018
Medway Maritime Hospital	G	17/03/2017
North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust	RI	25/10/2019
North Middlesex University Hospital	RI	25/10/2019
Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	O	16/10/2019
Northumbria Specialist Emergency Care Hospital	O	05/05/2016
Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust	RI	05/04/2019
Sandwell General Hospital	RI	05/04/2019
City Hospital	RI	05/04/2019
The Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust	RI	12/07/2019
Russells Hall Hospital	RI	12/07/2019
The Hillingdon Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	RI	24/07/2018
The Hillingdon Hospital	G	24/07/2018
The Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust	RI	01/03/2018
North Manchester General Hospital	RI	01/03/2018
The Royal Oldham Hospital	RI	01/03/2018
The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust	G	27/06/2018
New Cross Hospital	G	13/12/2016
University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust	RI	31/08/2018
University Hospital	G	31/08/2018
University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust	G	13/02/2019

Inadequate (I)	Requires improvement (RI)	Good (G)	Outstanding (O)
----------------	---------------------------	----------	-----------------

Appendix F: Further information

The results for England and trust level benchmark results are available on CQC's website. You can also find a technical document here, which describes the methodology for analysing the trust level benchmark results:

www.cqc.org.uk/childrensurvey

Full details of the methodology for the survey, including questionnaires, scored questionnaire, letters sent to patients, instructions on how to carry out the survey and the survey development report, are available at:

<https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/01-children-patient-experience/year/2018/>

More information on the patient survey programme, including results from other surveys and a programme of current and forthcoming surveys are at:

www.cqc.org.uk/surveys

More information about how CQC monitors hospitals is available at:

www.cqc.org.uk/what-we-do/how-we-use-information/monitoring-nhs-acute-hospitals

How to contact us

Call us on: 03000 616161

Email us at: enquiries@cqcc.org.uk

Look at our website: www.cqcc.org.uk

Write to us at: Care Quality Commission
Citygate
Gallowgate
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 4PA



Follow us on Twitter: [@CareQualityComm](https://twitter.com/CareQualityComm)

Please contact us if you would like a summary of this document in another language or format.

Corporate member of
Plain English Campaign
Committed to clearer
communication

459

