

North Derbyshire Diabetes Patient Survey

Summary of Findings

Introduction

North Derbyshire and Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Groups are undertaking a review of diabetes services which includes looking at improving the current diabetes service provision. To support this work, patients from North Derbyshire were invited to take part in a survey to get their views on current diabetes care.

This report outlines the main findings from the survey. A more detailed analysis can be found in the *Survey Responses* report.

Methodology

The survey took place between 5 May 2014 and 13 June 2014. Patients were invited to complete an online web-based questionnaire or a paper questionnaire which was distributed through a range of services including GP practices, diabetes clinics, Diabetes UK, voluntary organisations and other patient groups. The participating services were also given promotional posters and flyers to hand out to patients.

Participation and characteristics of patients completing the survey

- A total of **473 responses** were received which represents **2.09% of the total North Derbyshire diabetic population**.
- There were **126** responses from Type 1 patients and **326** responses from Type 2 patients. These figures represent **6.8%** of Type 1 patients and **1.57%** of Type 2 patients in North Derbyshire.
- **58%** of patients completed the survey online and **42%** completed paper questionnaires.
- **58%** patients were male and **41%** were female. There was no significant difference in these when broken down by Type 1 and Type 2.
- **27%** of patients who responded had Type 1 diabetes and **69%** had Type 2 diabetes. Others were not sure or did not answer this question.
- The age groups of respondents can be broken down as below:

	Type 1				Type 2			
	20-30	31-50	51-70	Over 70	20-30	31-50	51-70	Over 70
Male	12%	14%	20%	9%	0%	5%	33%	22%
Female	9%	13%	18%	5%	0%	5%	22%	13%

Experience of care received

Patients were asked about their care and the information and support they currently receive:

- In their **understanding of their diabetes**, there was a marked difference in responses in type, with **90%** of Type 1 patients rating it as *Very Good* or *Good* compared with only **55%** of Type 2 patients.
- The ratings for **information and support received** were slightly higher for Type 1 patients with **86%** rating it as *Very Good* or *Good* compared with **75%** of Type 2 patients.
- The **current diabetes care** received was rated significantly higher for Type 1 patients, with **97%** rating it as *Very Good* or *Good* compared with **75%** of Type 2 patients.
- Patients were asked how long they had had diabetes and how they would rate their current care. The responses were as follows:

	Less than 10 years	Between 10 and 20 years	More than 20 years
Very poor	3%	1%	0%
Poor	3%	4%	2%
Fair	19%	16%	6%
Good	45%	40%	43%
Very good	30%	39%	48%

Patients were asked **who provides the majority of their diabetes care and how they would rate that care.**

GP Practice

- More Type 1 patients (**87%**) rated their care as *Very good* or *Good* compared with Type 2 patients (**73%**).
- **13%** Type 1 patients rated their care as *Fair*, whereas Type 2 patients gave ratings of: *Fair* (**21%**), *Poor* (**4%**) and *Very poor* (**3%**).

Diabetic Specialist Nurse

- Ratings were similar for all patients with **84%** of Type 1 patients rating it as *Very Good* or *Good* compared with **83%** of Type 2 patients.

Hospital

- **89%** of Type 1 patients rated the care received at their hospital as *Very good* or *Good* compared with **76%** of Type 2 patients. **24%** of Type 2 patients rated this as *Fair* and there were no *Poor* or *Very poor* ratings from both types.

Foot Care

Patients were asked about their foot care including foot checks, their risk and understanding of developing a foot ulcer, the information they had received on caring for their feet and what changes, if any, they had made as a result of this information.

- **82%** of Type 1 patients had a foot check in the last 12 months compared with **92%** of Type 2 patients.

- Of the patients who had a foot check, **69%** of Type 1 patients had been given a risk factor for developing a foot ulcer compared with **63%** of Type 2 patients.
- Risk scores for both types were similar: *High (65%), Medium (20%), Low (15%)*. These scores fall broadly into the expected distribution of risk level for diabetes patients in North Derbyshire.
- There was a slight difference in responses on who was given information about caring for their feet. **83%** of Type 1 patients said that they had been given information compared with **75%** of Type 2 patients.
- More Type 2 patients (**54%**) reported that they had changed how they cared for their feet as a result of information given at the foot check, compared with Type 1 patients (**38%**).

The majority of changes that patients had made included: more frequent checks; drying and moisturising feet properly; avoiding walking around the house barefoot; and wearing better fitting shoes.

Education and training

People were asked if they had been invited to attend a group education course and whether they had accepted that offer for training.

- **63%** of Type 1 patients had been invited to attend a group education course on diabetes compared with only **32%** of Type 2 patients.
- **65%** of Type 1 patients had accepted this offer compared with **70%** of Type 2 patients.
- Those who **did not accept the offer for training** gave the following reasons:
 - Work commitments (**23%**)
 - Didn't feel necessary to attend **22%**
 - Accessibility/time/location inconvenient (**13%**)
 - **30%** gave other reasons including "*didn't want to attend*", "*looking after sick relatives*" and "*illness*".

Patients were asked to rate their level of satisfaction on the training courses attended:

Diabetes and You (provided for Type 2 patients)

Patients that had attended the training rated it as follows: *Very good (17%), Good (50%), Fair (33%)*. No patients rated the training as *Poor* or *Very poor*.

ASPIRE (provided for Type 1 patients)

Those patients that attended the training rated it as follows: *Very Good (62%), Good (34%)*. No patients rated the training as *Poor* or *Very poor*.

DAFNE (provide for Type 1 patients)

14 patients had attended this course however it is not available to patients in North Derbyshire. They rated the training as: *Very Good (64%), Good (21%), Fair (7%), Poor (7%)*.

Eye screening

- **96%** of patients reported that they had **had their eyes screened in the last 12 months**.
- **47%** of patients had their eye screening carried out at a **hospital clinic** and **51%** through the **diabetes eye screening programme**.

General comments

Patients who completed the survey had the opportunity to provide free text comments. Common themes that emerged were:

Care and access to services:

- Excellent levels of care given by individual healthcare professionals and whole diabetes teams.
- Support and encouragement from diabetes specialist nurses.
- Difficulty in getting appointments with GPs and nurse specialists.
- Lack of continuity of care, ie seeing different staff at each appointment
- More discussion, explanation and advice needed during appointments.
- Services not “joined up” and conflicting information given.
- Blood testing strips not available to patients.

Foot care

- Lack of co-ordination between podiatry teams.
- Not enough regular foot checks and not enough access to foot care.

Education and training

- Those that attended training found it very useful but many had not been invited to attend or were not aware of training available.
- Some felt that refresher courses would be useful.
- Patients felt they would like more education on diet as some of the information available is confusing and/or conflicting.

Eye screening

- Lack of knowledge in this area from nurse practitioners.
- Difficulty in getting appointments.

Please note: The paper questionnaire allowed patients to skip questions, therefore these findings should be taken with caution. Also, for the purpose of analysis, categories, such as *Prefer not to say*, *Other*, or *Not Sure* have not *been* included in some of the calculations and percentages may not always total 100%.