

The development of quality circles for quality improvement in Europe: a qualitative study involving 26 European countries





Adrian Rohrbasser, General Practitioner, MSc in Evidence Based Health Care, PHD Student Department of Continuing Education University of Oxford; Ulrik Bak Kirk, EQuip Manager (European Society of Quality and Safety in Family Medicine, Copenhagen, Denmark

INTRODUCTION

Quality Circles (QCs) or Peer Review Groups are small groups of 6 to 12 professionals from the same background who meet at regular intervals to consider their standard practice. Ongoing quality improvement is fundamental to modern family medicine; it is about providing person-centred, safe and effective care, and efficient use of current resources in a fast-changing environment. QCs represent a complex social intervention that occurs within this fast-changing system of primary health care.

BACKGROUND

In March 2015, 32 EQuiP delegates from 21 countries, received questionnaires about QC activities. Answers were collected from 21 EQuiP delegates, representing 16 countries, 11 answers were not returned. In Nyegneber 2015, further questionnaires were sent to the same 32 EQuiP delegates to gather missing information and to validate given information. In addition, 6 new delegates responded: Finland, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Stoyakia, and Slovenia. 9 delegates chose not to respond. In summary, 29 out of 38 delegates (76%) responded and provided quantitative data that is control delegator.



AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- Aim: Provide qualitative data on QC characteristics
- Objectives:
- Gain knowledge about features of QC facilitation
- Gain knowledge about the level of independence QCs enjoy
- Gain insight into supporting materials and data sources QCs use
- Learn about supporting structures in different countries
- > Establish the level of evaluation that is used

METHODS: SURVEY

Experts from 26 European countries, belonging to the European Society of Quality and Safety in Family Medicine (EQuiP), completed an online survey documenting:

- characteristics of facilitation
- didactic methods they use
- sources of information
- level of support and evaluation

RESULTS

	2015	2015	2015
Country	Facilitator's role	Facilitator's profession	Facilitator's training
Austria	E	GP	F
Belgium	E	GP	N
Denmark	ELO	GP O	FN
Finland	ELO	GP O	FO
France	E	GP	0
Germany	E L	GP	F
Ireland	L	GP	FO
The Netherlands	EL	GP	F
Norway	ELO	GP O	FN
Scotland	E	GP O	0
Sweden	ELO	GP O	FN
Switzerland	E L	GP	F
Croatia	X	X	X
Poland	L	GP	0

		2015			
Country	Supporting ma	terial Data sources	Evaluation		
Austria	MFG	C R	N		
Belgium	MFGLE	CRD	1		
Denmark	MGON	CVRDO	IEN		
Finland	0	CRD	I E		
France	MFGLE	CRD	1		
Germany	MFGO	CRO	1		
Ireland	MFGLE	CRD	I E		
The Netherlands	MFGE	CRD	E		
Norway	MFLEO	CVRDO	E N		
Scotland	ME	С	1		
Sweden	мо	CVRO	IN		
Switzerland	N	CVRD	N		
Croatia	M G	C R	N		
Poland	N	CR	N		

Facilitator's role: E: equal among participants; L: leader and manager; O: other

Facilitator's profession: GP: general practitioner; O

Facilitator's training: F: formal training; N: none; O: other

Several countries provide continuous professional training for facilitators

CONTOLLY

Main support materials:
M: educational materials; F: feedback
on individual and/or group
performance; G: guidelines; L: library
resources: E: evidence based

Main data sources: C: cases (own patients); V: video recordings; R: data from own medical records; D: data from external provider; O: other

summaries; O: other; N: none

Evaluation: I: internal; E: external; N: none

RESULTS

2015	Autonomy	Financial support
Country		
Austria	T	N
Belgium	TDFM	E C
Denmark	TDF	EO
Finland	TDFMO	N
France	TDFM	E C
Germany	TDFM	0
Ireland	TDM	E
The Netherlands	TDFM	E C
Norway	TDFMO	ON
Scotland	TDFMO	ON
Sweden	TDFMO	ON
Switzerland	TDFM	ECN
Croatia	х	x
Poland	TDFM	N

Autonomy:

T: topic; D: didactic method; F: facilitator;

M: length and frequency of meeting; O: other

Financial support:

E: at own expense; C: financial compensation;

O: other; N: none

2015	Institutions and their functions					
Country	Support/licence	Supervision	Training (facilitators)	Initiation/motivation	Evaluation	
Austria	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Belgium	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Denmark	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Finland	No	No	No	No	No	
France	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Germany	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
The Netherlands	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Norway	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Scotland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sweden	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	
Switzerland	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Croatia	x	x	x	X	x	
Poland	No	No	Yes	No	No	

CONCLUSIONS

- Facilitators are mostly general practitioners and have successfully completed training
- Educational material, guidelines and individualized feedback are frequent supporting materials. Most popular data sources among QCs are cases/own patients followed by data derived from own medical records. Own practice experience and related material are key in QCs. Internal evaluation is probably therefore more common than external assessment.
- QCs enjoy a very high level of autonomy which seems vital for their performance.
- Only a few institutions provide supervision and hardly any initiate QCs. Their main functions are providing supporting material and training of facilitators.
- In an additional question, countries with no QCs indicated that this fact may depend on the top down system of quality improvement in their countries.