

## **National Sentinel Stroke Audit**

A further request was made for the data for the total process and organisational audit scores for 2006-2010 to be in the same format as sent to the Strategic Health Authorities which the applicant suggested would be to 2 decimal places. In addition the applicant requested the data for Wales, Northern Ireland and the Islands.

As seen in the tables below, the hospitals participating in the audit did not receive the scores to 2 decimal places except in 2010 for the organisational audit (Table 1). The data as sent to the SHAs was sent to 2 decimal places apart from 2008 clinical and 2010 organisational audits (Table 2).

The files sent in the initial response for the FOI for this data i.e. the spreadsheets sent to the SHA (anonymised by code) were therefore appended with the additional data (as in Table 2) and with Wales, Northern Ireland and the Islands to 2 decimal places apart from 2010 and 2008 clinical audits.

The data are kept in an anonymised form for governance procedures and each time the file has to be decoded from the site code and checks need to be undertaken to ensure that this linkage has been correctly completed. Similarly every time an Excel file has data appended it has to be re-checked.

**Table 1 Number of decimal places in trust reports**

2006 Clinical	0
2006 Organisational	0
2008 Clinical	0
2008 Organisational	0
2010 Clinical	0
2010 Organisational	2

**Table 2 Number of decimal places in SHA report**

2006 Clinical	2
2006 Organisational	2
2008 Clinical	0
2008 Organisational	2
2010 Clinical	0
2010 Organisational	2

## Sentinel Audit 2006 -2010 - Summary of scoring ranges as presented to clinicians in their trust reports

Dr Stevenson asked for the ranges used to calculate the overall position regarding these total scores. The following is taken from the figures to each of the participants within their individual reports for each year and whether the report contained clinical or organisational data.

The description and values for the overall position was described in the reports as follows:

### Org 2010

2010 Organisational audit total score	25% scored <60.29	50% scored 60.29 – 74.29	25% scored 74.30 - 100
---------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

The median total organisational score was 67.13.

The trust was provided with their individual score to 2 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.

### Clinical 2010

2010 process of care score	25 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Median	75 <sup>th</sup> percentile
	72.1	77.7	84.0

The trust was provided with their individual score to 0 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.

### Org 2008

2008 Organisational audit total score	25% scored 15 - 61	50% scored 61 - 77	25% scored 78 - 95
---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The median total organisational score was 69.

The trust was provided with their individual score to 0 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.

### Clinical 2008

2008 process of care score	25% sites score below	Median score	25% sites score above
Range	62.0	69.9	76.6

The trust was provided with their individual score to 0 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.

## Organisational 2006

2006 Organisational audit total score	25% scored 7 - 54	50% scored 55 - 70	25% scored 71 - 89
---------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The median total organisational score was 63.

The trust was provided with their individual score to 0 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.

## Clinical 2006

2006 process of care score	25% sites score below	Median score	25% sites score above
Range	58	67	76

The trust was provided with their individual score to 0 decimal places for comparison and told which quartile they fell into.