

Clinical Audit Project Abstract

**Audit of Anti Cholinesterase Inhibitors
(NICE Technology Appraisal 111)**

Date of Final Report	December 2010										
Directorate/ Professional Group	Mental Health										
Background Why the project was undertaken	The audit was based upon 'NICE technology appraisal guidance on the use of donepezil, galantamine and rivastigmine for the treatment of mild to moderately severe Alzheimer's disease, published in 2001.										
Aim and Objectives The purpose of the project	To establish compliance with NICE Technology Appraisal 111.										
Methodology	NICE Audit tool completed by Junior doctors and Consultants across the organisation between Dec 2009 and Aug 2010. Each service / consultant was asked to sample 20 cases (10x20) Results analysed by the Clinical Audit Team.										
Standards	Standards have been drawn from NICE Technology Appraisal 111										
Key Results Main results arising from the project	<p>Out of 22 criterion/standards considered:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Score</u></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">90+</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80 – 89</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">50 – 79</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 – 49</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall the results demonstrate good compliance with NICE guidance. One or two team's results suggest there is room for improvement against a small number of questions / standards although this may be down to auditors being able to evidence actions such as patients being offered written information about their illness. There may also have been slight differences around interpretation of the audit tool e.g. patients being <u>offered</u> or <u>given</u> Written information.</p> <p>NICE guidance recommends that patients/carers should be made aware the 'Understanding NICE guidance booklet'. Although the audit scored low against this criterion it should be noted that the service does have its own specific booklet/leaflet that is offered to patients/carers.</p>	<u>Score</u>		90+	6	80 – 89	10	50 – 79	3	0 – 49	3
<u>Score</u>											
90+	6										
80 – 89	10										
50 – 79	3										
0 – 49	3										
Feedback To which Group the results were fed back and in what form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants / services • MH Quality Effectiveness & Risk Group • Medicines Management Committee 										
Actions Actions arising from the results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results to be shared/discussed with consultants in order to review practice and agree targets/standards for the 2011 re-audit. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Prof. Elliott - Dec 10</i></p>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share report / report with Directorate, Quality Effectiveness & Risk Group + Medicines Management Committee. <i>Prof. Elliott /Steven Hazeldine – Jan 11</i> • Revise audit tool to reflect agreed targets (including space for narrative /explanation of non compliance). <i>Prof. Elliott /Steven Hazeldine - March 10</i> • Undertake audit in 2011 <i>Prof. Elliott /Steven Hazeldine - June 11</i>
Improvements / Outcomes	Improvements to be examined through re-audit (2011)
Contact Details of the person to whom further enquiries about this project should be directed	Prof. Elliott – Clinical Director Older Adults Mental Health or Clinical Audit Team – 01785 257888 (5587)