

## CLINICAL GOVERNANCE/WEBSITE REVIEW

make a judgement about the level of quality of the 'purchase' and be able to relate it to 'price'. 'Price' alone does not measure efficiency. Quality is the indicator used in combination with price to assess if something is more efficient. So, cost-effectiveness is a measure of efficiency and suggests that costs have been related to effectiveness.

### Set priorities

Consider if you have service development needs. Discuss whether:

- The current skill mix in your team is appropriate.
- More cost-effective alternative types of delivery of care are available.
- Sufficient staff training exists for those taking on new roles and responsibilities.

Group and summarise your service development and learning needs from the exercises you have carried out. Grade them according to the priority you set. You may put one at a higher priority because it fits in with those established from another section, or put another lower because it does not fit in with other activities needed. Collect information from all the team, the patients, users and carers to feed back before you make a decision on how to progress. Remember to take external influences into account such as governmental priorities, the content of the Local Delivery Plan, and so on.

Select those topics that are tied into organisational priorities, have clear aims and objectives, and are achievable within your time and resource constraints. When ranking topics for action or learning in order of priority consider whether:

- The project aims and objectives are clearly defined.
- The topic is important (a) for the population served (e.g. the size of the problem and/or its severity) and (b) for the skills, knowledge or attitudes of the individual or team.
- It is feasible.

- It is affordable.
- It will make enough difference.
- It fits in with other priorities.

You will still have more ideas than can possibly be implemented. Remember the highest priority – the health service is for patients that use it or who will do so in the future.

### Statements on funding and competing interests

*Funding.* None identified.

*Competing interests.* None identified.

### References

- 1 Wakley G. Evaluating individual performance for clinical governance. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care* 2005; **31**: 46–48.
- 2 <http://www.healthcarecommission.org.uk>.
- 3 Chambers R, Drinkwater C, Boath E. *Involving Patients and the Public: How to do it Better* (2nd edn). Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing, 2003.
- 4 <http://www.dh.gov.uk/assetRoot/04/05/71/84/04057184.pdf>.
- 5 Chambers R, Wakley G. *Clinical Audit in Primary Care: Demonstrating Quality and Outcomes*. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing, 2005.
- 6 <http://www.hms.gov.uk/acts/acts1995/95050--b.htm>.
- 7 <http://www.hsedirect.com>.
- 8 Department of Health. *Effective Commissioning of Sexual Health and HIV Services – A Sexual Health and HIV Commissioning Toolkit for Primary Care Trusts and Local Authorities*. London, UK: Department of Health, 2003.
- 9 <http://www.ffprhc.org.uk>.
- 10 Mohanna K, Chambers R. *Risk Matters in Healthcare*. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing, 2000.
- 11 National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA). *Introduction to 7 Steps for Patient Safety*. 2004. <http://www.npsa.nhs.uk>.
- 12 Wright J. *Health Needs Assessment in Practice*. London, UK: BMJ Books, 1998.
- 13 Wakley G, Cunnion M, Chambers R. *Improving Sexual Health Advice*. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing, 2003.
- 14 Chambers R, Wakley G. *Making Clinical Governance Work for You*. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing, 2000.
- 15 Bee F, Bee R. *Training Needs Analysis and Evaluation*. London, UK: Institute of Personnel and Development, 1997.
- 16 McCulloch D. *Valuing Health in Practice*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2003.

## Website Review

### WOW: WellBeing of Women

This website states that it exists to fund vital research into reproductive health. It quotes: "Our mission is to put an end to fear and suffering from women's reproductive problems".

WellBeing of Women (WOW) raises funds through events, campaigns, corporate partnerships, collaborative activities with like-minded organisations, and an extensive network of branches and supporters across the UK. The website contains pages where you can donate or complete gift aid to the charity. A list of the projects funded is just a click away. The research projects have a strong UK element, but are international. For example, they recently funded research into vulval lichen sclerosis and also into the relationship between chlamydia, ectopic pregnancy and infertility. The research funded by WOW falls into three categories of investigation:

- gynaecological cancers
- pregnancy and birth
- quality of life problems such as polycystic ovary syndrome, endometriosis, troublesome

symptoms of the menopause, painful periods and incontinence.

They will soon be adding sexual health as an area in which more research needs to be done. The subjects that they are interested in supporting are often identified by surveys so that they are those important to women. I was surprised to read that so many women find menstruation such a bad experience, but less surprised by some of the other concerns such as ignorance about sexually transmitted infections (STIs).

Health professionals are too late to apply for funding support for this year, but you might want to start thinking about research funding for 2006 onwards. The charity also allocates funding for research training fellowships.

A 24-page copy of the magazine celebrating their 40th anniversary takes a little time to load as it contains many pictures. It includes information about surveys, research and events.

A section on reproductive health information lists various useful leaflets on some common problems: polycystic ovaries, cystitis, postnatal depression, prematurity, hysterectomy, menopause, ovarian cancer, pregnancy and birth. These can be purchased by post (the website

gives the bulk-buy rates) or downloaded. Contact information for various organisations related to these subjects appears in this section.

My two caveats about the usefulness of this website and of the charity was the lack of information on contraception and STIs and the apparent emphasis on middle-class, Western worries about reproductive health. The first area is, of course, due to my bias – what I think is important! The second area is probably due to marketing considerations. People are more likely to give money to something they think may benefit them or people they know – not the poor, the disadvantaged or problems in the developing countries. Clearly the charity does support research in these areas but the website material came across (to me) as a little parochial.

Recommend this site to well-heeled friends, think about joining in the support, and bear WOW in mind if you need research funds. Website: <http://www.wellbeingofwomen.org.uk>.

Reviewed by **Gill Wakley**, MD, MFFP  
Visiting Professor in Primary Care Development,  
Staffordshire University and Freelance GP,  
Writer and Lecturer, Abergavenny, UK

**Visit the Faculty Website at:**  
**[www.ffprhc.org.uk](http://www.ffprhc.org.uk)**