



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Jo Partridge
joanne.partridge@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7694

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 10 April 2024

HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD INFORMATION BRIEFING

Meeting to be held on Thursday 18 April 2024

This briefing will only be debated if a member of the Committee requests a discussion be held, in which case please inform the Clerk 24 hours in advance indicating the aspects of the information item you wish to discuss.

- 1 HEALTHWATCH BROMLEY PATIENT EXPERIENCE REPORT - Q3 2023-24**
(Pages 3 - 44)
- 2 UPDATE ON THE JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT** (Pages 45 - 50)

Members and Co-opted Members have been provided with advanced copies of the Part 1 (Public) briefing via email. The Part 1 (Public) briefing is also available on the Council website at the following link: <http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=559&Year=0>

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

This page is left intentionally blank

Q3 Patient Experience Report

Healthwatch Bromley
October – December 2023



Contents

Introduction	3
Q3 Snapshot	4
Yearly Comparison	5
Experiences of Hospital Services	6
Experiences of GP Practices	19
Experiences of 'Other' Services	33
Appendix	37

Layout of the report

This report is broken down into four key sections:

- Quarterly snapshot
- Experiences of Hospital Services
- Experiences of GP Practices
- Experiences of 'Other' Services

GPs and Hospitals have dedicated sections as we ask specific questions about these services when carrying out engagement. They are the two services about which we receive most feedback. Both sections highlight good practice and areas of improvement.

This report functions as a standardised general overview of what Bromley residents have told us within the last three months. Additional deep dives relating to the different sections can be requested and are dependent on additional capacity and resource provision.

Rating Scale Change from October 2023

In response to feedback received during our review of the Patient Experience Programme we have changed our 5-star rating system from 1* = Terrible – 5* = Excellent to 1* = Very Poor – 5* = Very Good. This aligns with the rating scale used by our national body, Healthwatch England.

Questions using a different rating scale remain the same.

Introduction

Patient Experience Programme

Healthwatch Bromley is your local health and social care champion. Through our Patient Experience Programme (PEP), we hear the experiences of residents and people who have used health and care services in our borough.

They tell us what is working well and what could be improved, allowing us to share local issues with decision makers who have the power to make changes.

Every three months we produce this report to raise awareness about patient experience and suggest how services could be improved.

Methodology



Carrying out engagement at **local community hotspots** such as GPs, hospitals and community centres.



Encouraging conversations on **social media** and gathering **online reviews**.



Providing promotional materials and surveys in **accessible formats**.



Training volunteers to support engagement across the borough allowing us to reach a wider range of people and communities

Healthwatch independence helps people to trust our organisation and give honest feedback which they might not always share with local services.

Between October – December 2023, we continued to develop our PEP by changing our 5-star rating system so that it aligns with the rating scale used by our national body, Healthwatch England.

Q3 Snapshot

This section provides a summary of the experiences we collected during October – December 2023 and a breakdown of positive, negative and neutral reviews per service. We analysed residents’ rating of their overall experience to get this data (1* and 2* = negative, 3* = neutral, 4* and 5* = positive)



640 reviews


of health and care services were shared with us, helping to raise awareness of issues and improve care.

58 visits

were carried out to different local venues across the borough to reach as many as people as possible.

Top 5 Service Types	No of Reviews	Percentage of positive reviews
Hospital	287	77%
GP	209	68%
Dentist	73	89%
Community Health	40	75%
Optician	13	92%

Sentiment of Reviews



Yearly Comparison

To judge whether experiences of health and care services are improving we compare our data throughout the year. The chart below highlights the percentage of positive feedback each service has received during 2023-24 so far. The total number of positive reviews has been included next to the percentage.

Percentage of positive reviews for each service type

Service Type	Q1 (Apr-Jun 23)	Q2 (Jul-Sep 23)	Q3 (Oct-Dec 23)	Q4 (Jan-Mar 24)
Hospital	81% (250)	81% (201)	77% (221)	
GP	60% (114)	67% (132)	68% (141)	
Dentist	91% (61)	94% (77)	89% (65)	
Community Health	56% (19)	71% (35)	75% (30)	
Optician	74% (25)	82% (23)	92% (12)	

What does this tell us?

- We have seen an increase in the percentage of people sharing positive feedback about GPs and Community Health services over the past nine months.
- Hospital services have seen a small decrease (4%) in positive reviews when comparing Q3 and Q2. This service receives the largest number of patient reviews because of the high level of community engagement visits we carry out in hospitals.
- Experiences of Dental services, Opticians and Community Health services remain generally positive.
- Mental Health services received the smallest number of reviews (6) and the lowest percentage of positive responses (33%).

Experiences of Hospital Services



What people told us about Hospitals

"The treatment plan has been well explained and executed."

"Not sure who to contact, need better clarity over the phone and email. Knowing who to contact for questions after the appointment.."

"Things have improved a lot in the last few years. Car park is good now."

"Communication between departments and GP could be better."

"Nice and clean. Lots of smiling staff. Facilities for getting a tea and coffee."

"Can't get through to a department over the phone for a week. Hard to get appointments."

"The quality of treatment that I have received is very good."

"On a 2 week urgent referral, but it took 4 weeks to get an appointment. Waiting times can be too long."

Hospital Services

No. of Reviews	287 (relating to 5 hospitals)
Positive	77%
Negative	12%
Neutral	11%

Questions we asked residents



As part of our new patient experience approach, we asked residents a series of questions which would help us better understand experiences of access and quality.

The questions were:

Q1) How did you find getting a referral/appointment at the hospital?

Q2) How do you find getting through to someone on the phone?

Q3) How do you find the waiting times at the hospital?

Q4) How do you find the attitudes of staff at the service?

Q5) How good do you think the communication is between your hospital and GP practice?


Q6) How would you rate the quality of treatment and care received?

Participants were asked to choose between 1-5* (Very Poor – Very Good) for all questions.




Access and Quality Questions


Q1) How did you find getting a referral/appointment at the hospital?




Q2) How do you find getting through to someone on the phone?




Q3) How do you find the waiting times at the hospital?




Q4) How good do you think the communication is between your hospital and GP practice?



Q5) How do you find the attitudes of staff at the service?



Q6) How would you rate the quality of treatment and care received?



Thematic analysis

In addition to the access and quality questions, we ask two free text questions (**What is working well? and What could be improved?**), gathering qualitative feedback to help get a more detailed picture of hospital services.

Each response we collect is reviewed and up to five themes and sub-themes are applied. The tables below show the top five positive and negative themes mentioned between October – December 2023 based on these free text responses.

The 'top five' positive and negative themes in each section are those mentioned most often by respondents, not necessarily those with the highest numbers of positive and negative assessments. This demonstrates which aspects of health and social care are most important to local residents but does mean that the same theme can appear in both positive and negative lists.

Top five positive Issues	Total count and % of positive reviews	Top five negative Issues	Total count and % of negative reviews
Staff attitudes	158 (93%)	Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	65 (35%)
Quality of treatment	137 (88%)	Getting through on the telephone	34 (33%)
Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	89 (48%)	Facilities and surroundings – car parking	29 (45%)
Communication between services	80 (64%)	Communication between services	28 (22%)
Booking appointments	73 (82%)	Communication with patients (treatment explanation, verbal advice)	17 (53%)


Reviewed Hospitals

Bromley residents access a variety of different hospitals depending on factors such as choice, locality and specialist requirements. During the last three months we heard about experiences at the following hospitals:

Hospital	Provider
Princess Royal University Hospital (PRUH)	King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Orpington Hospital	
Queen Mary's Hospital	
King's College Hospital	
Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital	Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust

Between October – December, the hospitals which received the most reviews were PRUH and Orpington. Healthwatch Bromley visits both weekly. Additional patient experiences were collected by the Patient Experience Officer and volunteers, through face-to-face engagements and online reviews.

Total reviews per hospital (%)



To understand the variety of experience across the hospitals we have compared the ratings given for access and quality in the previous section. Please note that each question has been rated out of five (1 – Very Poor 5 – Very Good)

Positive ■ Neutral ■ Negative ■

Hospital	ACCESS (out of 5)			QUALITY (out of 5)		
	Referral/ appointment	Getting through on the phone	Waiting times	Communication between GP and Hospital	Staff attitudes	Treatment and care
Princess Royal University Hospital	4.1	3.2	3.2	3.5	4.3	4.1
Orpington Hospital	4.5	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.5	4.5

We have also identified the top three positive and negative themes for these two hospitals.

HOSPITAL	Overall Rating (out of 5)	Top three positive issues	Top three negative issues
Princess Royal University Hospital No of reviews: 195	3.7	1. Staff attitudes	1. Waiting Times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Getting through on the telephone
		3. Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	3. Communication between services
Orpington Hospital No of reviews: 86	4.4	1. Staff attitudes	1. Waiting Times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Getting through on the telephone
		3. Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	3. Communication between services

What has worked well?

Below is a list of the key positive aspects of hospitals reported between October and December 2023.



Staff attitudes

93% of respondents said that staff were kind, helpful and polite. This finding is very similar to the previous quarter (89%).



Quality of treatment

88% of patients expressed high levels of satisfaction, as in Q2 (90%). This finding is very similar to the previous quarter (90%).



Waiting Times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)

Positive reviews increased from 40% (Q2) to 48%. Most patients said they were seen quickly by medical staff.



Communication between services

64% of respondents felt their GP practice and hospital had communicated very well, arranging referrals and follow up appointments (but see next page, point three).



Access - booking appointments

82% of reviews showed high levels of satisfaction. Patients found the appointments system quick, efficient, and working well, as in Q2 (86%).

What could be improved?

Below is a list of the key areas for improvement for hospitals reported between October and December 2023.



Waiting times (punctuality and queuing on arrival)

35% of reviews were negative, as patients said there were insufficient staff, though the negative percentage decreased by 6% from Q2.



Getting through on the telephone

33% of patients reported a negative experience e.g. no one answering the telephone or being given incorrect/inadequate information when trying to contact a department (similar percentage as Q2 -31%).



Communication between services

22% of patients rated this negatively, both communication between hospital departments and between the hospital and GP services, which can delay referrals, medication and treatment explanations (same percentage as Q2).



Communication with patients (treatment explanation, verbal advice)

53% of reviews related to communication with patients were negative. Patients felt communication and treatment explanation was poor and some people felt the appointments were rushed.



Facilities and surroundings - car parking

45% of patients complained about inadequate hospital car parks and said more spaces should be provided – an increase of 6% from Q2.

Emerging or Ongoing Issues

To understand ongoing or emerging issues in the borough we compare the top positive and negative issues throughout the year. We have highlighted in dark pink or bright green any issues repeated in three or more quarters.

Positive Issues

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Staff attitudes	Staff attitudes	Staff Attitudes	
Quality of treatment	Quality of treatment	Quality of treatment	
Communication with patients	Access (booking appointments)	Waiting Times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	
Appointment availability	Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	Communication between services	
Treatment and care experience	Communication with patients	Booking appointments	

Negative issues

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	Waiting times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)	
Communication between services	Communication between services	Communication between services	
Facilities and surroundings - Car Parking	Facilities and surroundings - Car Parking	Facilities and surroundings - Car Parking	
Treatment and care experience	Getting through on the telephone	Communication with patients (treatment explanation, verbal advice)	
Communication with patients	Access (booking appointments)	Getting through on the telephone	

Equalities Snapshot

During our engagement we ask residents to share with us, voluntarily, information about themselves such as gender, age and ethnicity. This allows us to judge whether there are differences in experience provided to people based on their personal characteristics.

This section revealed interesting statistics when we analysed overall experience ratings (1 = Very Poor 5 = Very Good) A full demographic breakdown can be found in the appendix.




Gender

In the last three months 189 women (80%) and 51 men (81%) left positive reviews (80%) – similar data and gender balance to Q2. .



Age

Most feedback was from people aged 65-74 (58), the majority being positive (71%), as were reviews across all age groups. The highest percentage of negative reviews (23%) were from people aged 45-54.



Ethnicity


Of the 246 patients who shared their ethnicity with us, 204 were White British/English/Northern/ Irish/Scottish/Welsh. 84% left positive reviews. The second largest group was 'Any Other White' (only 14, 71% positive) and the third largest group was 'African' (only 5, 80% positive).



Disability and Long-Term Conditions (LTC)

57 people who consider themselves disabled responded, with 88% positive reviews. 136 (83%) respondents with an LTC reported a positive experience. More respondents reported disability and/or LTC than in Q2.

Experiences of GP Practices



What people told us about GP Practices

"Wait times are ok. They answer the phone. Can usually get a same-day appointment."

"Staff can be quite rude and dismissive. Waiting times are long. I wish they could stick to appointment time."

"Not too busy. Staff is friendly. Doctor's make time for patients."

"They need more staff and resources. Waiting times here are too long."

"Online booking system is great. Communication about treatment is great."

"Hard to get through over the phone. Terrible appointment system.."

"Good communication between different GPs. They prioritised my treatment here because of my condition."

"Hard to make an appointment. Everything has to be classified as an emergency to get a same day appointment."

GP Services

No. of Reviews	209 (relating to 42 GP practices)
Positive	68%
Negative	17%
Neutral	15%



Questions we asked residents

As part of our new patient experience approach, we asked residents a series of questions to help us better understand experiences of access and quality.

The questions we asked were:


- Q1) How do you find getting an appointment?
- Q2) How do you find getting through to someone at your GP practice on the phone?
- Q3) How do you find the quality of online consultations?
- Q4) How do you find the quality of telephone consultations?
- Q5) How do you find the attitudes of staff at the service?
- Q6) How would you rate the quality of treatment and care received?

Please note that for Questions 1 and 2 the options we provided matched those of the national GP Patient Survey (Very Easy – Not at All Easy) to allow our data to be comparable with the NHS data.


Participants were asked to choose between 1-5* (Very Poor – Very Good)

Access and Quality Questions


Q1) How do you find getting an appointment?



Q2) How do you find getting through to someone at your GP practice on the phone?



Q3) How do you find the quality of online consultations?




	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Very Good	22%	17%	19%	
Good	37%	41%	33%	
Neither good nor bad	24%	31%	24%	
Poor	14%	8%	16%	
Very Poor	3%	3%	8%	

Q4) How do you find the quality of telephone consultations?




	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Very Good	19%	18%	19%	
Good	41%	45%	43%	
Neither good nor bad	28%	27%	20%	
Poor	8%	8%	14%	
Very Poor	4%	2%	4%	

Q5) How do you find the attitudes of staff at the service?



	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Very Good	33%	31%	35%	
Good	46%	48%	42%	
Neither good nor bad	17%	19%	15%	
Poor	2%	2%	5%	
Very Poor	2%	0%	3%	

Q6) How would you rate the quality of treatment and care received?



	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Very Good	27%	31%	29%	
Good	50%	48%	48%	
Neither good nor bad	17%	16%	18%	
Poor	5%	4%	5%	
Very Poor	1%	1%	1%	

Thematic analysis

In addition to the access and quality questions we ask two free text questions (**What is working well?** and **What could be improved?**) to help get a more detailed picture of GP practices.

Each experience we collect is reviewed and up to five themes and sub-themes applied. The tables below show the top five positive and negative themes between October and December 2023 based on the free text responses.

The 'top five' positive and negative themes in each section are those mentioned most often by respondents, not necessarily those with the highest numbers of positive and negative assessments. This demonstrates which aspects of health and social care are most important to local residents but does mean that the same theme can appear in both positive and negative lists.

Top 5 positive Themes	Total count and % of positive reviews	Top 5 negative Themes	Total count and % of negative reviews
Staff attitudes	118 (87%)	Getting through on the telephone	77 (49%)
Quality of treatment	103 (82%)	Appointment availability	56 (46%)
Getting through on the telephone	62 (39%)	Booking appointments	36 (43%)
Appointment availability	52 (42%)	Quality of appointment – telephone consultation	21 (38%)
Booking appointments	38 (46%)	Online consultation (app/form)	20 (41%)


Primary Care Networks

Primary care networks (PCNs) are groups of GP practices in the same local area which work together to support patients. In Bromley there are **eight PCNs** covering the borough. These are:

- Beckenham
- Bromley Connect
- Crays Collaboration
- Five Elms PCN
- Hayes Wick
- MDC - Mottingham, Downham & Chislehurst
- Orpington
- Penge

In Q3, Beckenham and MDC received the most reviews (Q2, MDC and Orpington, Q1 Orpington and Five Elms).

Total reviews per PCN (%)



PCN Access and Quality Questions

To understand the variety of experience across the borough we have compared the PCNs by their access and quality ratings.

Please note that Access has been rated out of 4 (1 – Not at All Easy – 4 Very Easy) and Quality is out of 5 (1 – Very Poor, 5 – Very Good)

Each **average rating** has been colour coded to indicate positive, (green) negative (pink) or neutral (blue) sentiment. Patient experience of access is almost uniformly negative.

Positive ■ Neutral ■ Negative ■

PCN	ACCESS (out of 4)		QUALITY (out of 5)			
	Getting an appointment	Getting through on the phone	Telephone consultations	Online consultations	Staff attitudes	Treatment and Care
Beckenham	2.7	2.5	3.6	3.6	4.3	4
Bromley Connect	2.4	2.4	1.2	3.2	3.7	3.9
Crays Collaboration	2.2	2	3.2	3.5	3.6	4.1
Five Elms	2.2	2	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.9
Hayes Wick	2.2	2.3	3	3.4	3.9	4
MDC	2.8	2.7	2.2	4	4.3	4.1
Orpington	2.4	2.4	3	3.2	3.8	4
Penge	3	2.9	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.1

PCN Themes

We have identified the top three positive and negative themes for each PCN.

PCN	Overall rating	Top three positive issues	Top three negative issues
Beckenham No of reviews: 49	3.8	1. Staff attitudes	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Appointment availability
		3. Appointment availability	3. Booking appointment
Bromley Connect No of reviews: 19	3.5	1. Staff attitudes	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Booking appointment
		3. Booking appointments	3. Waiting Times (punctuality and queueing on arrival)
Crays Collaboration No of reviews: 16	3.6	1. Staff attitudes	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Booking appointments
		3. Booking appointments	3. Appointment availability
Five Elms No of reviews: 25	3.6	1. Staff Attitudes	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Appointment availability
		3. Appointment availability	3. Booking appointments
Hayes Wick No of reviews: 19	3.8	1. Quality of treatment	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Staff Attitudes	2. Appointment availability
		3. Getting through on the telephone	3. Getting through on the telephone
MDC No of reviews: 30	4	1. Staff Attitudes	1. Getting through on the telephone
		2. Quality of treatment	2. Appointment availability
		3. Getting through on the telephone	3. Booking appointments
Orpington No of reviews: 25	3.6	1. Quality of treatment	1. Appointment availability
		2. Staff Attitudes	2. Getting through on the telephone
		3. Getting through on the telephone	3. Booking appointments
Penge No of reviews: 24	3.5	1. Staff Attitudes	1. Appointment availability
		2. Getting through on the telephone	2. Getting through on the telephone
		3. Appointment availability	3. Booking appointments

What has worked well?

Below is a list of the more positive aspects of GP practices reported between October and December 2023.



Staff Attitudes

87% of reviews were positive. Patients said that GPs and their reception teams are professional, friendly, and caring, as in Q2 (82%).




Quality of treatment

82% of reviews were positive. Patients were very pleased with treatment received and felt that GPs listened to their concerns, as in Q2 (83%).



Getting through on the telephone

Only 39% of reviews were positive. Many patients prefer to use the telephone to book appointments and the percentage of positive reviews has dropped by 6% since Q2 (45%).



Appointment availability

42% of reviews were positive; some patients were satisfied with the new online booking systems and found it easy to book an appointment, but the percentage of positive reviews dropped by 5% from Q2 (47%).



Booking appointments

46% of reviews were positive; some patients were satisfied with booking appointments and said face-to-face appointments were more readily available.


What could be improved?

Below is a list of the key areas for improvement relating to GP practices between October and December 2023.



Getting through on the telephone

49% of reviews were negative; patients commented on long 'on hold' times up to 45 minutes. Responses were similar to Q2 (47%).



Appointment availability

46% of reviews were negative, as in Q2. Some patients waited weeks for a face-to-face appointment, others commented on the need for more appointments and GPs and suggested that receptionists needed further training.



Booking appointments

43% of reviews were negative, an increase of 13% on Q2. Patients commented on the difficulty of booking appointments and expressed dissatisfaction with the new system.



Quality of appointment – telephone consultation

38% of reviews were negative, a considerable increase on Q2 (14%). Some patients strongly preferred face-to-face appointments and commented that a telephone consultation could mean missed details.



Online consultation (app/form)

41% of reviews were negative. Some patients found e-consultations convenient for minor illnesses but felt that GPs did not explore all possible treatment options and expressed a strong preference for face-to-face consultations.

Emerging or Ongoing Issues

To understand ongoing or emerging issues in the borough we compare the top positive and negative issues throughout the year. We have highlighted in dark pink or bright green any issues repeated in three or more quarters.

Positive Issues

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Staff attitudes	Staff attitudes	Staff attitudes	
Quality of treatment	Quality of treatment	Quality of treatment	
Communication with patients	Getting through on the telephone	Getting through on the telephone	
Staff attitudes – health professionals	Appointment availability	Appointment availability	
Booking appointments	Quality of telephone consultations	Booking appointments	

Negative issues

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Getting through on the telephone	Getting through on the telephone	Getting through on the telephone	
Appointment availability	Appointment availability	Appointment availability	
Booking appointments	Booking appointments	Booking appointments	
Communication with patients	Quality of telephone consultations	Quality of appointment – telephone consultation	
Staff attitudes	Quality of treatment	Online consultation (app/for	

Equalities Snapshot

During our engagement we ask residents to share with us, voluntarily, information about themselves such as gender, age and ethnicity. This allows us to judge whether there are differences in experience provided to people based on their personal characteristics.

This section revealed interesting statistics when we analysed overall experience ratings (1 = Very Poor 5 = Very Good) A full demographic breakdown can be found in the appendix.




Gender

We received the majority of reviews from women (156), with few from men (36). A large majority of both left positive reviews, women (69%), men (72%), similar to Q2.



Age

The majority of reviews (34) were left by people aged 55-64, 56% were positive. The second largest group was people aged 75-84, with 84% positive too (84%). The age profile is slightly different to Q2, where most reviews were from people aged 25-34 and 55-64.



Ethnicity

Of the 177 people that shared their ethnicity, 137 were White British (69% positive). The second largest group was 'Any Other White' (only 12, 67% positive). We noted that the third group of six was Asian/Asian British but 67% of their reviews were negative. Whilst this is a small number of people, it's important to identify this finding and see if this changes over the next three months.



Disability and Long-Term Conditions (LTC)

Of the 43 people who consider themselves disabled, 67% left positive reviews. Of 83 people with an LTC, 67% left positive feedback.

Experiences of 'Other' services




Experiences of 'Other' services

In addition to asking specifically about GPs and hospitals, we ask people to share experiences about any other public health or care service, asking what is working well and what could be improved.

This section provides details of positive, neutral and negative reviews by service. We analysed respondents' rating of their overall experience to get this data (1* and 2* = negative, 3* = neutral, 4* and 5* = positive)

Service Type	No of Reviews	Percentage of positive reviews
Dentist	73	89%
Community Health	40	75%
Optician	13	92%
Pharmacy	12	58%
Mental Health	6	33%

Service Type by Sentiment



Below is a list of good practice and potential areas for improvement relating to dental services between October and December 2023.

Dentist – What has worked well?



Treatment and care – experience

48 patients gave positive feedback about their experiences of dental services. Comments included satisfaction with customer service, friendly staff and good communication.



Quality of staff – health professionals

38 patients rated the quality of staff positively. Most comments were related to friendliness, treatment explanation, information and professional competence.

Dentist – What could be improved?



Treatment and care – experience

Four people left negative feedback, including comments about long waiting times – over three months – and poor treatment standards.



Administration – management of service

Three people shared their dissatisfaction, with a focus on long waiting times for appointments, rude reception staff and lack of communication around cancelling and rescheduling appointments.

Below is a list of good practice and potential areas for improvement relating to community health services between October and December 2023.

Community Health – What has worked well?



Staff attitudes

15 people gave positive reviews related to staff attitudes across multiple community health services, including community centres, wellbeing cafes, and children and family centres. Comments included that both health professionals and administrative staff were friendly and attentive. This feedback is very similar to Q2 (18 respondents).



Treatment and care – experience

17 people left positive reviews of community health services. Feedback mentioned supportive staff, good communication and a great range of health and wellbeing activities for service users.

Community Health – What could be improved?



Staff attitudes

Only three people were unhappy with staff attitudes at community health services, mentioning rudeness and poor communication.



Treatment and care – experience

Only four people left negative feedback, related to poor standards of service and unfriendly staff.

Appendix



Demographics

Gender	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Man(including trans man)	25%	125
Woman (including trans woman)	75%	383
Non-binary	0%	1
Other	0%	0
Prefer not to say	0%	1
Not provided		130
Total		640

Age	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Under 18	2%	8
18-24	3%	12
25-34	10%	47
35-44	12%	56
45-54	12%	57
55-64	17%	82
65-74	20%	96
75-84	19%	91
85+	6%	30
Prefer not to say	0%	1
Not provided		160
Total		640

Ethnicity	Percentage %	No of reviews
British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	85%	386
Gypsy or Irish Traveller		0
Any other White background	6%	26
Asian British	1%	5
Bangladeshi		0
Chinese	1%	3
Indian	1%	5
Pakistani	0%	1
Any other Asian background/Asian British Background	2%	11
Black British	1%	5
African	2%	9
Caribbean	0%	2
Black African and White	0%	2
Any other ethnic group	0%	3
Black Caribbean and White	0%	2
Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups background	1%	4
Not provided		176
Total		640

Unpaid Carer Status	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Yes	12%	54
No	88%	396
Prefer not to say	0%	1
Not provided		189
Total		640

Demographics

Long-term condition	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Yes	50%	235
No	49%	232
Prefer not to say	0%	2
Not known	0%	2
Not provided		169
Total		640

Sexual Orientation	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Asexual	1%	3
Bisexual	0%	2
Gay Man	0%	0
Heterosexual/ Straight	95%	447
Lesbian / Gay woman	0%	2
Pansexual	0%	2
Prefer not to say	3%	14
Prefer to self describe	0%	1
Not provided		169
Total		640

Religion	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Buddhist	1%	4
Christian	50%	229
Hindu	1%	3
Jewish	0%	2
Muslim	1%	6
Sikh	0%	2
Other religion	1%	4
Agnostic		0
No religion	45%	205
Prefer not to say	0%	2
Not provided		183
Total		640

Pregnancy	Percentage %	No of reviews
Currently pregnant	2%	8
Currently breastfeeding	1%	5
Given birth in the last 26 weeks	3%	14
Prefer not to say	0%	2
Not known	3%	11
No	31%	131
Not relevant	60%	259
Not provided		210
Total		640

Demographics

Employment status	Percentage %	No of Reviews
In unpaid voluntary work only	0%	2
Not in employment & unable to work	7%	34
Not in employment/ not actively seeking work - retired	45%	206
Not in employment (seeking work)	2%	7
Not in employment (Student)	2%	9
On maternity leave	3%	14
Paid: 16 or more hours/week	33%	149
Paid: Less than 16 hours/week	7%	32
Prefer not to say	1%	3
Not provided		241
Total		640

Disability	Percentage %	No of Reviews
Yes	23%	108
No	77%	301
Prefer not to say		0
Not known		0
Not provided		172
Total		640

Borough ward	Percentage %	No. of reviews
Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	14%	68
Bickley & Sundridge	1%	3
Biggin Hill	8%	4p
Bromley Common & Holwood	7%	34
Bromley Town	13%	62
Chelsfield	2%	11
Chislehurst	7%	236
Clock House	0%	1
Crystal Palace & Anerley	0%	2
Darwin	0%	1
Farnborough & Crofton	1%	3
Hayes & Coney Hall	2%	10
Kelsey & Eden Park	0%	1
Mottingham	1%	4
Orpington	17%	84
Penge & Cator	2%	9
Petts Wood & Knoll	3%	14
Plastow	0%	0
Shortlands & Park Langley	1%	6
St Mary Cray	2%	11
St Paul's Cray	2%	12
West Wickham	2%	12
Out Of Borough	12%	59
Not provided		157
Total		640

healthwatch

Healthwatch Bromley
Waldram Place
London
SE23 2LB

www.healthwatchbromley.co.uk


t: 020 3886 0752

e: info@healthwatchbromley.co.uk

 @HWBromley

 [Facebook.com/healthwatch.bromley](https://www.facebook.com/healthwatch.bromley)

 @healthwatchbromley

 [healthwatch-bromley-09ba67229](https://www.linkedin.com/company/healthwatch-bromley-09ba67229)

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ACH24-024

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Date: 18th April 2024

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: Update on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

Contact Officer: Chloe Todd, Consultant in Public Health
Tel: 020 8313 4708 E-mail: Chloe.Todd@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Dr Nada Lemic, Director of Public Health

Ward: Borough-wide

1. Reason for decision/report and options

1.1 To provide an update on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Health and Wellbeing Board is asked:

- 2.1 To note update on JSNA steering group and its terms of reference, chapters that are ready for publication, chapters that are agreed for subsequent development and additional work that aligns with the JSNA.
- 2.2 To give an opinion on inclusion of chapter content as suggested by the JSNA steering group.
- 2.3 To note a review of the platform and software used to host and present the JSNA is proposed.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: Needs assessments aim to identify inequalities and as such are concerned with identifying vulnerable cohorts of the population and the reduction of inequalities.
-

Transformation Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. Making Bromley Even Better Priority (*delete as appropriate*):
 - (1) For children and young people to grow up, thrive and have the best life chances in families who flourish and are happy to call Bromley home.
 - (2) For adults and older people to enjoy fulfilled and successful lives in Bromley, ageing well, retaining independence and making choices.
 - (5) To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley's residents.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Not Applicable
 4. Total current budget for this head: Not Applicable
 5. Source of funding: Not Applicable
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (*current and additional*): Not Applicable
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Not Applicable
-

Property

1. Summary of Property Implications: Not Applicable
-

Carbon Reduction and Social Value

1. Summary of Carbon Reduction/Sustainability Implications: There is a social impact of health and wellbeing toward which the JSNA contributes an understanding.
-

Impact on the Local Economy

1. Summary of Local Economy Implications: Not Applicable
-

Impact on Health and Wellbeing

1. Summary of Health and Wellbeing Implications: The JSNA is an assessment of the current and future health and wellbeing needs of the population over both the short term (three to five years), and the longer term future (five to ten years) to inform strategic planning commissioning services and interventions that will achieve better health and wellbeing outcomes and reduce inequalities.

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users or customers (*current and projected*): The JSNA is relevant to a large proportion of the Bromley population.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The JSNA steering group has been re-established following interruptions due to the pandemic. The first meeting since May 2021 took place in January 2024. The meeting reviewed membership of the steering group and the terms of reference which are attached in background documents.
- 3.2 The following JSNA chapters have been completed and will be uploaded to the JSNA page shortly ([What is the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment? - Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(bromley.gov.uk\)](https://www.bromley.gov.uk/what-is-the-joint-strategic-needs-assessment/)):
- Demography update
 - Covid-19 summary chapter
- 3.3 The following chapters are to be completed in the coming year. Timescales where known are indicated, otherwise to be determined by steering group:
- Morbidity and Mortality (Current)
 - Children's JSNA update (In stages throughout 2024/25)
 - Brain Health
 - Armed Forces
 - Gypsy, Roma and Traveller
 - Mental Health Needs Assessment (commissioned)
- 3.4 There is additional related completed content the Health and Wellbeing Board must be informed of as it links together with the JSNA and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy which has also recently been refreshed:
- HEA's: Cervical Screening; Health Checks; HIV review.
 - Needs assessments: Substance Misuse; Alcohol; Homeless Health; Obesity; Suicide and Self Harm review.
 - Primary Care Network profiles
- 3.5 The steering group has suggestions regarding additional chapter content of the JSNA. Could we have the Board's opinion on inclusion of chapters covering:
- Refugees and asylum seekers.
 - Carers.
- 3.6 The JSNA is currently hosted on the London Borough of Bromley website in the form of PDF documentation. It is recognised that technology continues to develop and there may be tools already at our disposal that might improve professional and public engagement with the JSNA. It is proposed to undertake a review of platforms and software used to host and present the JSNA and to report back to the Health and Wellbeing Board after the summer.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

Needs assessments aim to identify inequalities and as such are concerned with identifying vulnerable cohorts of the population and the reduction of inequalities.

5. TRANSFORMATION/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The JSNA is concerned with health and well-being across the life course.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The JSNA is a statutory document assessing the current and future health and wellbeing needs of the population over both the short term (three to five years), and the longer term (five to ten years) in accordance with the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

9. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

10. PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

11. CARBON REDUCTION/SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS

There is a social impact of health and wellbeing toward which the JSNA contributes an understanding.

12. IMPACT ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY

Not Applicable

13. IMPACT ON HEALTH AND WELLBEING


The JSNA is an assessment of the current and future health and wellbeing needs of the population over both the short term (three to five years), and the longer term future (five to ten years) to inform strategic planning commissioning services and interventions that will achieve better health and wellbeing outcomes and reduce inequalities.

14. CUSTOMER IMPACT

Likely to impact thousands in the consideration of needs and inequalities, both directly and indirectly

15. WARD COUNCILLOR VIEWS

Not Applicable

Non-Applicable Headings:	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS; PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS; PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS; PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS; IMPACT ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY; WARD COUNCILLOR VIEWS
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	 BROMLEY%20JSNA %20Steering%20Gro

This page is left intentionally blank