

#### 4) Interpreting the most popular system report

In the previous video we looked at data quality, using the data quality report style. Here we will look at the most popular of the system report styles, which is descriptively called PastAndFutureWithRecurringDemand.

Let's start by changing the report style. You don't need to create a new report to do this. Just click the name of the report style, select whichever report style you want, and click Next. Now when we open the report, we'll see the results in the new report style.

And here they are. We're looking at orthopaedics here, and the different report style means that we're seeing different numbers and formatting in the table. In a later video we'll look at how you can customise report styles to do exactly what you want.

Whenever you're looking at results like this, you should always remind yourself of the activity scenario that was used to create this report. The grey text just below the report name is a reminder of which activity scenario was used – in this case it is "Match waiting list targets" – as well as the date range covered by the model. (All the other calculation settings can be viewed in the Calc Settings tab if you want to see them.)

Let's start with the new outpatient service.

The first section is activity, and if activity continued at the same daily rate then we would end up seeing 3,664 new outpatients in the future period. The activity scenario we have selected is to achieve the waiting list and waiting time targets, and in this case the "Future activity selected" is higher than if we continued at the past activity rate.

This is our activity scenario, and this report shows the expected consequences of delivering this activity scenario, in terms of the waiting list, waiting times, and capacity.

This activity scenario is broken down into its recurring and non-recurring parts. The recurring activity is the amount needed to keep up with demand – in this case, 3,947. Then whatever is left over in our activity scenario can be used to shrink the waiting list – in this case we have activity of 223 left over which can be used to reduce the waiting list.

We can see this in the next section. The waiting list grew during the past period, but if we are not only keeping up with demand but treating a lot of extra patients as well, then we can expect the waiting list to shrink in the future period.

We are expecting to end up with a waiting list of 660 patients, and the best waiting time we can expect from a list that big is 6 weeks just for the new outpatient stage of treatment. This should not be any surprise because the target waiting time has been set to 6 weeks, and we have asked for an activity scenario that achieves this.

Looking across to the elective inpatient service towards the right, if we continued at the past activity rate we would treat 386 patients. But to deliver the selected activity scenario, which is to achieve our waiting list and waiting time targets, we need to treat 522 patients in the future period. Everything

else in this report is showing us the consequences of treating those 522 patients.

The 522 breaks down into 407 in recurring activity, which is what is needed to keep up with demand. Then we need to treat an extra 23 patients non-recurringly, which is a consequence of seeing 223 extra outpatients. If we see more new outpatients, then some will convert onto the inpatient waiting list, and the model has quantified that as inpatient demand being 23 patients higher at the current conversion rate.

How much is left over after we have kept up with demand? We have activity of 92 left over, and this can be used to reduce the inpatient waiting list.

In the next section we can see that the inpatient waiting list shrank in the past, and in the future we can expect it to shrink again to only 48 patients which in fact is the waiting list target we have set for this service. The best achievable waiting time we can expect with this list size is a 5 week wait, which is well within our stage of treatment target of 8 weeks. The waiting list target of 48 is more difficult than the waiting time target of 8 weeks, so it has exactly achieved the list size target and done better than target on waiting times.

Scrolling down, the activity scenario we have selected is converted into beds, theatres and clinics. The calculations take account of various performance assumptions like average length of stay for beds, and theatre utilisation, and if we want to take a quick look at these statistics we can click the Editing button above any service.

So for inpatients if we want to see the theatre performance assumptions we go into Editing, select the numbers we want in the theatre data section, and then we can see exactly what assumptions were used to calculate the results.

If we have the right kind of Gooroo licence (i.e. Professional) we are able to try different assumptions. So for instance if we want to see what would happen if theatre utilisation were raised from 63% to 85%, we can try it in the left hand pane, click calculate, and we find it would save 10 hours a week of theatre time. Please note, that any changes will only be saved in the report if we click Save – otherwise the changes are lost when we move away from this screen, or refresh it.

If we want a week by week breakdown of this daycase activity we can click the Profiling icon above the service. The green chart shows how the activity is weighted through the various weeks, and if you have a Professional licence you can click the points and see what happens if you change them.

Then you can see the results week by week at the bottom. Each thumbnail can be blown up into the big chart so you can see how forecast activity, capacity and waiting times break down week by week.

Going back to the main report table, the final icon above each service takes us to the simulator. We saw for the inpatients that we expect to end up with a waiting list of 48 patients and a 5 week wait, and in the simulator we can reproduce this at patient level by clicking the play button. The Delay controls the speed the simulation runs at, and if I slow it down towards the end you can see that we end up with a list size of 48 and a waiting time of 5 weeks, exactly as the model expected.

Don't be too disappointed if it doesn't come in that close, and there is a discussion of the reasons why it might be different in the documentation. The most common cause of a discrepancy is data quality issues around your waiting list movement data.