



Multi-Source Feedback Report

Professor Michael Hanna

MSF Oct 2024

This report covers the following components

- Self Assessment** ✓
- Colleague Feedback** ✓
- Patient Feedback** ✓

PDF generated on 16 Oct 2024 at 15:30



Dear Professor Michael Hanna,

Thank you for participating in SARD's Multi-Source Feedback survey.

The principal purpose of MSF is to help you to identify your strengths and areas that you might want to work on as part of your personal and professional development. The issues covered by the SARD MSF module are difficult to measure by other means. You might decide to discuss your results confidentially with a trusted colleague and/or incorporate the report into the appraisal folder that you keep for your employer.

The results have been illustrated in tables with associated benchmarks where applicable. Please see the important notes regarding how the benchmarks were generated. Your self-assessment data, if completed, has been included for reference.

In the eventuality that 5 or fewer patient or colleague questionnaires are returned no report will be issued for that survey component.

THIS REPORT IS BASED ON RETURNS FROM:

- Yourself
- 14 colleagues
- 20 patients
- Benchmarking used in this MSF Report: Original

Many thanks for your participation - we hope that you find the results and feedback of interest.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Monk

Managing Director, SARD JV Limited

Introduction

SARD:360

The SARD:360 Multi-source Feedback system is based upon the patient and colleague feedback questionnaires provided by the GMC. The GMC patient and colleague questionnaires were designed to help you gain an insight into how your professional behaviour and practice are viewed by your patients and colleagues. Multi source feedback has been found to be a useful way to assess doctor's performance and is valuable to support appraisal and to help prepare for your revalidation.

This report outlines the information that has been collected and analysed from a sample of your patients (if your current role includes direct consultations with patients) and a range of your colleagues, in the form of a series of tables. Full explanation on how to interpret this information can be found in the report and benchmarks are provided where applicable. We hope that this report will offer you clear guidance for your professional development.

Benchmarks

Benchmarks provided are based on data collected from a volunteer sample of doctors working in a variety of clinical settings from the first phase GMC pilot study in 2006 and from the second phase in September 2008 to July 2009. It should be noted that volunteer samples often perform better than an 'average' sample which could make the benchmarks provided artificially high and they may not be representative of your clinical setting.

Your feedback

From the report you will be able to clearly pinpoint areas where you scored well and also those areas where you may feel that improvements may be needed. However, it is advisable to take time to assimilate all the feedback and to avoid scanning the report and noting specific scores on which too much emphasis can be placed. This report may be relevant to your appraisal and enable you to present it as part of your portfolio evidence if desired.

Scoring explanation

Details of score calculation

The score provided for each question in this questionnaire is the mean (average) value of all of the ratings from all patients or colleagues who completed the question. It is expressed as a percentage - so the best possible score is 100%. Non-rated responses (does not apply, don't know, blank or spoilt) are not used in the score calculations.

Example of a score calculation for a given question

Total number of responses = 42

	poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	good	very good	does not apply	spoiled	not reported
Number of ratings	0	1	3	7	30	1	0	0
Value assigned to each rating	0	25	50	75	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total of values	0	1 X 25 = 25	3 x 50 = 150	7 x 75 = 525	30 x 100 = 3000	n/a	n/a	n/a

Mean percentage score is:

(number of poor ratings x 0) + (number of less than satisfactory ratings x 25) + (number of satisfactory ratings x 50) + (number of good ratings x 75) + (number of very good ratings x 100)
divided by
(total number of responses excluding 'non-rated' responses)

For the above example the **mean percentage score is 90%**:
 $(25 + 150 + 525 + 3000) / (1+3+7+30) = 3700 / 41 = 90$

Important notes about the benchmark data

Benchmark data source

The benchmarks used in this report are based on all data that is available for the doctors who participated in the two GMC studies up to 2 July 2009. To calculate the benchmarks for each questionnaire item, data has only been included for doctors who had at least six valid responses returned for that particular item.

Please consider the following points when interpreting your results against the benchmark data:

Purpose: These benchmarks are provided to give you a sense of how you are performing in relation to other doctors who have completed the GMC surveys. They are not intended to imply any 'minimum standard' that doctors are expected to achieve for the purposes of revalidation.

Sample size: Patient benchmark data is based upon 935 completed surveys.

Colleague benchmark data is based upon 942 completed surveys.

The benchmark data contained in this report is derived only from the doctors who returned sufficient numbers of patient or colleague responses.

Voluntary participation: It was not mandatory for any doctor to undertake the surveys in the benchmark data. Therefore the benchmarks are based on a volunteer sample of doctors. As such, the benchmarks may be higher than might be expected if all doctors had contributed data.

Range of practice: The doctors who have contributed to the benchmark data work or provide care in a variety of settings and specialties. The above benchmarks relate to the whole sample of doctors who have contributed data, irrespective of their setting or specialty.

Reassessment against future benchmark data

We will update these benchmarks at regular intervals as the number of doctors undertaking these surveys increases. We welcome doctors who wish to have their data reassessed against their colleagues and specialty as that data becomes available.



Overview: Patient Feedback

GMC Patient Questionnaire: Patient Demographics

Your patient feedback is based on responses from 20 patient with the following characteristics:

Gender

Male	Female	Non binary non conforming	Prefer to identify	Prefer not to say	Not reported
11	9	0	0	0	0

Age

under 15	15 to 20	21 to 40	40 to 60	60 or over	not reported
0	0	6	10	4	0

GMC Patient Feedback Form:

Distribution and frequency of ratings

Patient:

Distribution and frequency of ratings

1 questionnaires were submitted online.

19 questionnaires were submitted in paper format.

		poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	good	very good	does not apply	spoiled	not reported
4a	Being polite	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
4b	Making you feel at ease	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
4c	Listening to you	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0
4d	Assessing your medical condition	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
4e	Explaining your condition and treatment	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0
4f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0
4g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	0	0	0	3	16	1	0	0

		strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	does not apply	spoiled	not reported
5a	This doctor will keep information about me confidential	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0
5b	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0

		yes	no	don't know	spoiled	not reported
6	I am confident about this doctor's ability to provide care	20	0	0	0	0
7	I would be completely happy to see this doctor again	20	0	0	0	0

GMC Patient Feedback Form:
Mean percentage scores and benchmarks (Q4 Q5)

		Your mean score (%)	Benchmark data (%)				
			Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
4a	Being polite	100	70	96	98	99	100
4b	Making you feel at ease	100	69	94	97	98	100
4c	Listening to you	99	61	94	97	98	100
4d	Assessing your medical condition	100	68	93	96	98	100
4e	Explaining your condition and treatment	99	65	93	95	98	100
4f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	98	67	92	95	97	100
4g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	96	68	93	96	98	100
5a	This doctor will keep information about me confidential	99	59	90	93	95	100
5b	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	100	65	91	94	96	100

Key

	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
	Your mean score for this question falls below a score of 60%.

Patient:
Comments

-
- ... very caring doctor

 - ... excellent Dr

 - ... 1

 - ... I always feel safe and informed after seeing Prof. Hannah. I am grateful for his particular expertise and knowledge.

 - ... He is the best Neurologist

 - ... I was stressed about this appointment but the professors tone was very calming. he has very good bedside manner.

 - ... Never met this Dr before. but felt very reassured he might be able to help

 - ... New patient appointment made as wanted to find out from a clinical specialist

 - ... Prof Hannah is a caring man who looked after me very well

 - ... excellent doctor!

 - ... a thoroughly professional & kind Doctor. answered all my questions and put me at ease. He made a difficult time bearable.

 - ... Very helpful (illegible)

 - ... professor Hannah always puts me at ease, tells me with confidence and explains things in a way appropriate to my level of knowledge.

Overview: **Colleague Feedback**

Colleague: **Demographics**

Your colleague feedback is based on responses from 14 colleagues with the following characteristics:

Gender

Male	Female	Non binary non conforming	Prefer to identify	Prefer not to say	Not reported
9	4	0	0	0	1

Age

16 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 or over	not reported
0	0	1	4	4	4	1

Professional Role

doctor	other healthcare professional	not reported
12	0	2

Colleague: **Distribution and frequency of ratings**

		poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	good	very good	dont know
1	Clinical knowledge	0	0	0	0	13	1
2	Diagnosis	0	0	0	1	12	1
3	Clinical decision making	0	0	0	1	12	1
4	Treatment	0	0	0	0	13	1
5	Prescribing	0	0	0	0	12	2
6	Medical record keeping	0	0	0	3	7	4
7	Recognising and working within limitations	0	0	0	1	12	1
8	Keeping knowledge and skills up to date	0	0	0	1	12	1
9	Reviewing and reflecting on own performance	0	0	0	1	9	4
10	Teaching	0	0	0	5	8	1
11	Supervising colleagues	0	0	0	3	10	1
12	Commitment to care and wellbeing of patients	0	0	0	0	14	0
13	Communication with patients and relatives	0	0	0	0	13	1
14	Working effectively with colleagues	0	0	0	0	14	0
15	Effective time management	0	0	0	1	13	0

		strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	dont know
16	This doctor respects patient confidentiality	0	0	0	0	14	0
17	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	0	0	0	0	14	0
18	This doctor's performance is not impaired by ill health	0	0	0	0	14	0

		yes	no	don't know
19	This doctor is fit to practice medicine	14	0	0

Colleague: **Mean percentage scores and benchmarks (Q1 - Q18)**

		Benchmark data (%)					
		Your mean score (%)	Min	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile	Max
1	Clinical knowledge	100	64	91	95	98	100
2	Diagnosis	98	58	89	93	96	100
3	Clinical decision making	98	55	88	93	96	100
4	Treatment	100	58	88	92	95	100
5	Prescribing	100					100
6	Medical record keeping	93	50	85	90	94	100
7	Recognising and working within limitations	98	50	87	91	95	100
8	Keeping knowledge and skills up to date	98	61	89	93	96	100
9	Reviewing and reflecting on own performance	98	55	85	90	93	100
10	Teaching	90	50	84	91	95	100
11	Supervising colleagues	94	50	83	88	93	100
12	Commitment to care and wellbeing of patients	100	75	93	96	98	100
13	Communication with patients and relatives	100	59	88	93	97	100
14	Working effectively with colleagues	100	35	85	91	96	100
15	Effective time management	98	48	80	87	91	100
16	This doctor respects patient confidentiality	100	69	94	96	98	100
17	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	100	75	94	97	99	100
18	This doctor's performance is not impaired by ill health	100	50	93	96	98	100

Key

	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.
	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means and is a score of 90% or above.

■	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
■	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
■	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means and is a score between 60% and 89%.
■	Your mean score for this question falls below a score of 60%.



Colleague: Comments

••• Mike is a world leading expert in neuromuscular diseases

••• Professor Hanna is a fantastic clinician.

••• Great doctor! Very experienced and always available to answer questions.

••• Prof. Hanna is an exceptional clinician who conducts his professional activities fully in line with GMC and UCLH values and priorities.

••• Inspiration leader.

••• Mike is a world class doctor

••• A leader in his field of muscle disease.

Overview: **Self Assessment**

Self Assessment: **Comparison of self assessed scores with patient scores**

Scores provided on a 1 - 5 scale where 1=Poor, 2=Less than satisfactory, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Good and 5=Very good

		Your Assessment	Patient Assessment
3a	Being polite	4	5.0
3b	Making you feel at ease	4	5.0
3c	Listening to you	4	5.0
3d	Assessing your medical condition	4	5.0
3e	Explaining your condition and treatment	3	5.0
3f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	4	4.9
3g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	3	4.8

Self Assessment: **Comparison of self assessed scores with colleague scores**

Scores provided on a 1 - 5 scale where 1=Poor, 2=Less than satisfactory, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Good and 5=Very good

		Your Assessment	Colleague Assessment
1a	Clinical knowledge	4	5.0
1b	Diagnosis	4	4.9
1c	Clinical decision making	3	4.9
1d	Treatment	3	5.0
1e	Prescribing	4	5.0
1f	Medical record keeping	4	4.7
1g	Recognising and working within limitations	4	4.9
1h	Keeping knowledge and skills up to date	4	4.9
1i	Reviewing and reflecting on own performance	4	4.9
1j	Teaching	3	4.6
1k	Supervising colleagues	4	4.8
1l	Commitment to care and wellbeing of patients	4	5.0
1m	Communication with patients and relatives	4	5.0
1n	Working effectively with colleagues	4	5.0
1o	Effective time management	3	4.9

		Your Assessment	Colleague Assessment
4a	I respect patient confidentiality	5	5.0
4b	I am honest and trustworthy	5	5.0
4c	My performance is not impaired by ill health	5	5.0