

Multi-Source Feedback Report

Professor Olaf Wendler

MSF Jan 2016

This report covers the following components

Self Assessment Yes
Colleague Feedback Yes
Patient Feedback Yes

PDF generated on 27 Jan 2016 at 14:09

Dear Professor Olaf Wendler,

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 less patient or colleague questionnaires are returned no report will be issued for that survey component.

THIS REPORT IS BASED ON RETURNS FROM:

- Yourself
- 23 colleagues
- 25 patients

Please contact SARD JV on 0844 585 2395 or info@sardjv.co.uk if you require further information about your results.

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

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

Patient: Demographics

Your patient feedback is based on responses from 25 patient with the following characteristics:

Gender

male	female	not reported
18	6	1

Age

under 15	15 to 20	21 to 40	40 to 60	60 or over	not reported
0	0	1	7	16	1

Patient: Distribution and frequency of ratings

		poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	good	very good	does not apply	spoiled	not reported
4a	Being polite	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0
4b	Making you feel at ease	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0
4c	Listening to you	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0
4d	Assessing your medical condition	0	0	0	0	24	0	1	0
4e	Explaining your condition and treatment	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0
4f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	0	0	0	0	24	1	0	0
4g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	0	0	0	0	22	3	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	1	6	15	3	0	0
5b	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	0	0	0	5	19	1	0	0

		yes	no	don't know	spoiled	not reported
6	I am confident about this doctors ability to provide care	25	0	0	0	0
7	I would be completely happy to see this doctor again	25	0	0	0	0

Patient: Mean percentage scores and benchmarks (Q4 Q5)

			Benchmark data (%)				
		Your mean score (%)	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	100	61	94	97	98	100
4d	Assessing your medical condition	100	68	93	96	98	100
4e	Explaining your condition and treatment	100	65	93	95	98	100
4f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	100	67	92	95	97	100
4g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	100	68	93	96	98	100
5a	This doctor will keep information about me confidential	91	59	90	93	95	100
5b	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	95	65	91	94	96	100

	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means
	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means
	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means

Patient: Comments

Very reassuring- answered all questions and gave clear explanations.

Wonderful to have time spent to discuss at no time did we feel rushed.

First visit to this doctor.

I had an excellent consultation and am happy.

Very confident and gave the advice in the way we all understanding.

First class.

Dr Wendler gave me an entirely credible assessment of my condition and the proposed treatment is clearly desirable.

Pleasant, trustworthy, good listener, professional.

Very caring.

Friendly and informative.

Overview: Colleague Feedback

Colleague: Demographics

Your colleague feedback is based on responses from 23 colleagues with the following characteristics:

Gender

male	female	not reported
16	6	1

Age

16 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 or over	not reported
0	0	3	9	8	2	1

Professional Role

doctor	other healthcare professional	not reported
19	4	0

Colleague: Distribution and frequency of ratings

		poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	good	very good	dont know
1	Clinical knowledge	0	0	0	0	23	0
2	Diagnosis	0	0	0	0	22	1
3	Clinical decision making	0	0	0	0	23	0
4	Treatment	0	0	0	0	23	0
5	Prescribing	0	0	1	1	14	7
6	Medical record keeping	0	0	0	3	18	2
7	Recognising and working within limitations	0	0	0	1	22	0
8	Keeping knowledge and skills up to date	0	0	0	0	23	0
9	Reviewing and reflecting on own performance	0	0	0	1	20	2
10	Teaching	0	0	0	6	14	3
11	Supervising colleagues	0	0	0	4	19	0
12	Commitment to care and wellbeing of patients	0	0	0	0	23	0
13	Communication with patients and relatives	0	0	0	2	20	1
14	Working effectively with colleagues	0	0	0	3	20	0
15	Effective time management	0	0	0	1	22	0
16	This doctor respects patient confidentiality	0	0	0	1	22	0
17	This doctor is honest and trustworthy	0	0	0	0	23	0
18	This doctors performance is not impaired by ill health	0	0	0	0	22	1

		yes	no	don't know
19	This doctor is fit to practice medicine	22	0	1

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

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

	Your mean score for this question falls in the highest 25% of all means
	Your mean score for this question falls in the middle 50% of all means
	Your mean score for this question falls in the lowest 25% of all means

Colleague: Comments

Excellent surgeon on all fronts with great clarity in dealing with complex and high risk cases

Professor Wendler is an exceptional Consultant Cardiothoracic surgeon. He is held in the highest regard by both his colleagues and his patients. I have referred many patients to Professor Wendler over the years they consistently report back a caring, conscientious and high competent doctor.

A great colleague. Thorough, caring and technically excellent. I have every confidence in him and frequently refer him patients. Sharing operations with Olaf is a real pleasure.

A truly outstanding surgeon and a great colleague. A real asset to the hospital.

Prof Wendler is a very professional medical practitioner. He has good clinical decision making and clinical knowledge and is a very competent surgeon.

A great colleague, an honor to work with and one of the best skilled surgeons I've met.

Professor Wendler is an excellent colleague and easy to work with.

Gifted surgeon, outstanding doctor, very good with colleagues. Great asset to Kings.

A pleasure to work with. He obviously has some exasperations with the management structure and restrictions within his Trust but this never impacts on his clinical performance and relationship with colleagues, other staff, and patients.

Professor Wendler is an excellent colleague with outstanding medical performance. His surgical skills are outstanding and his medical knowledge is excellent.

I have found Olaf to be both an excellent surgeon and colleague.

Very good surgeon and good team player. easy to work with. Well organised surgeon. Very good time management. Good teacher.

Prof Wendler is a role model for all of his colleagues. His passion for work and professionalism is outstanding. He is a good Trainer and encourages his junior colleagues to take an active part in academic activities as well. It is a pleasure to work with him.

An extremely supportive colleague to all members of the MDT, always wanting to improve services and the pathways for patients - they are his first priority. He is very approachable, understanding and diplomatic - he understands the service and the needs of the service and strives to drive the team towards being the best we possibly can be

Excellent surgeon and colleague needs to do more to train the juniors

An excellent and highly skilled senior CT surgeon, team player/leader and strategist.

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	5	5.0
3b	Making you feel at ease	4	5.0
3c	Listening to you	5	5.0
3d	Assessing your medical condition	4	5.0
3e	Explaining your condition and treatment	5	5.0
3f	Involving you in decisions about your treatment	5	5.0
3g	Providing or arranging treatment for you	4	5.0

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	5	5.0
1b	Diagnosis	5	5.0
1c	Clinical decision making	5	5.0
1d	Treatment	5	5.0
1e	Prescribing	4	4.8
1f	Medical record keeping	4	4.9
1g	Recognising and working within limitations	4	5.0
1h	Keeping knowledge and skills up to date	5	5.0
1i	Reviewing and reflecting on own performance	4	5.0
1j	Teaching	4	4.7
1k	Supervising colleagues	4	4.8
1l	Commitment to care and wellbeing of patients	5	5.0
1m	Communication with patients and relatives	4	4.9
1n	Working effectively with colleagues	4	4.9
1o	Effective time management	4	5.0

		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

Personal comment