Supplementary Material File 3: Case study RAP sheet – template

Case study RAP sheet – template

PART 1 Case study overview and qualitative insights

1.	Trust name						
2.	Category				 		
3.	NHSI Segment				 		
4.	CQC inspections and rating	Inspection dates Report date			 		
		Overall			 		
		Safe			 		
		Effective					
		Caring					
		Responsive					
		Well-led					
5.	Date entered SMQ or CP	Туре	Ent	ry date	Exit d	ate	
		SMQ					
		SMF					
		СР					
6.	Trust type	e.g. acute, general	etc				
7.	Population						
8.	Trust history / background						
9.	Sites (if multi-site)						
10.	Provider economy						
11.	Main areas for improvement identified by CQC inspections and reports						

12. Main areas for	
improvement identified	
by interviewees	
13. Main areas for	
improvement in latest	
Quality Improvement	
Plan / Strategy	
14. Main changes in	
leadership and	
governance	
governance	
15. Interventions delivered	
by NHSI and their	
duration	
16. Improvement Director	
details (if applicable)	
17. Other interventions	e.g. QI methodologies, external management consultants
18. PPI and public	e.g. What has the Trust done / is doing currently to engage with
engagement	
	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidence of	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidence of	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidenceofimprovementsmain	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidenceofimprovementsmainimprovement made since	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples]	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidenceofimprovementsmainimprovement made sinceinspection[qualitative]	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples]	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and recommendations for 	
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and 	
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and recommendations for 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and recommendations for other providers 	local patients and the public? Has this changed over time?
 19. Evidence of improvements main improvement made since inspection [qualitative insights and examples] 20. Challenges and demands 21. Reported impact on staff 22. Perspectives of SMQ or CP regime (support vs scrutiny) 23. Lessons learned and recommendations for other providers 24. Lessons learned and 	

25. Future steps/plans	
26. External collaborations and partnerships to support improvements	
27. Financial context or considerations	
28. Estates	
29. New organizational capabilities for QI or service innovations	
30. Perspectives of external stakeholders	e.g. CCG, Healthwatch, Regional NHSI/E teams and other stakeholders with external knowledge of the Trust and region

PART 2 Cost Consequences Analysis and Opportunity Costs

1.	What NHSI funds did the	
	organisation bid for? By	
	year	
2.	What NHSI funds were	
	awarded? By year	
3.	Opportunity Costs	
4.	Alignment with CQC	
	priorities for quality	
	improvement	

PART 3 Use of data

1	. What have trusts been asked to do that may
	be relevant?
2	. How are trusts using data to address any
	concerns raised by CQC/NHSI?
-	What are they monitoring that relates to
	these concerns?
-	How are they reporting this? (e.g. to Board)

-	Is this something they have always been monitoring/reporting, or only after	
-	concerns were raised? Have they been specifically asked to monitor	
-	certain data? Is there data they could be monitoring but	
	aren't?	
3.	Has the topic of use of data or board	
	accountability been raised by CQC? Where?	
4.	What does the trust think are the important ways of using their data?	
	 How important do the trusts think this is 	
	in relation to their status as challenged	
	or in special measures?	
5.	What other data do they routinely monitor	
	and report?	
6.	How are they tracking improvements in	
	quality?Are they monitoring processes or are	
	they also collecting data?	
	- What gives them assurance that things	
	are on track?What do they do if they do not spot	
	improvements in outcomes?	
	- Are they giving themselves enough	
	time?Are the measures that are used ones	
	that are readily responsive to	
	improvements?	
	Is there sufficient granularity?What techniques do they use?	
	- Have they changed any methodology	
	since being identified as challenged or in	
	SMQ?	
7.	Have they seen improvements in areas of	
	concern?How has use of data assisted in those	
	improvements	
	- What were the important components	
	of their improvements?	

	 Was monitoring outcomes part of the process? What part did it play? Which outcomes? Was it effective and why?
8.	How are they accounting for system factors that are beyond their immediate control? - Is this being recognised?
	 What collaborations are there with other organisations?

Part 4 Trust chronological timeline (key events)

Date	Event

Part 5 Dissemination and feedback