

Annual Health Check 2005/06

1. Introduction

On October 12th the Healthcare Commission released the results of the first annual health check for all NHS organisations in England. This paper outlines the results for Wirral Hospital NHS Trust, and gives an overview of systems being put in place to improve performance. More detailed information is available on the Healthcare Commission's website: www.healthcarecommission.org.uk.

2. Health Check Components

The annual rating is made up of a number of components, which the Healthcare Commission combines to produce scores for 'Quality of Services' and 'Use of Resources'.

- The Quality assessment comprises the declaration against the core standards, performance against existing and new national targets, and assessments from relevant Improvement Reviews conducted in-year.
- The Use of Resources score is based on the Auditors' Local Evaluation' (ALE) assessment, which considers financial management, financial reporting, value for money, internal control, and financial standing.

Organisations are assessed as 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Fair' or 'Weak' for each of the two measures.

3. Results

The results for Wirral Hospital NHS Trust were as follows:

| | Component | Score |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Quality of Services | Core Standards | Fully met |
| | Existing Targets | Fully met |
| | New Targets | Fair |
| | Admissions Management | Weak |
| | Children's Services | Fair |
| | Diagnostic Services | Fair |
| | Medicines Management | Good |
| Overall quality score | | Fair |
| Use of Resources | Financial management | 3 |
| | Financial reporting | 3 |
| | Financial standing | 4 |
| | Value for money | 3 |
| | Internal Control | 3 |
| Overall resources score | | Good |

Wirral Hospital Trust could not achieve an overall score of Good for quality of services because it received a score of Fair in new targets.

Appendix 1 gives details of our performance against the areas that make up the score for quality. National results show the following:

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Weak |
|---------------------|-----------|------|------|------|
| Quality of Services | 4% | 30% | 52% | 14% |
| Use of Resources | 3% | 12% | 47% | 37% |

Out of 570 NHS organisations:

- Only two scored Excellent for <u>both</u> use of resources and quality (both of which were hospital Trusts)
- 33 organisations were Weak for both

Local results show that within the overall score of Fair for quality Wirral Hospital Trust had areas of relatively strong performance – particularly with regards to Core Standards, Existing Targets and Medicines Management:

| | Wirral | Countess of Chester | Royal Liverpool & Broadgreen |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Meeting Core Standards | Fully Met | Almost Met | Fully Met |
| Existing Targets | Fully Met | Almost Met | Almost Met |
| New Targets | Fair | Good | Good |
| Children Services | Fair | Good | N/A |
| Admissions Management | Weak | Fair | Weak |
| Diagnostic Services | Fair | Good | Good |
| Medicines Management | Good | Fair | Fair |

4. 2006/07 Annual Health Check

Systems are in place to improve performance in those areas which most impacted on our score as summarised below:

4.1. New Targets

As shown in appendix 1 all targets were met with the exception of reducing rates of MRSA and data quality on ethnic grouping – as shown many Trusts did not meet these targets.

The Trust has taken immediate steps to implement improved data capture for recording ethnic grouping, though this does of course need to be sensitively handled as patients can feel uncomfortable about being asked to place themselves within a particular ethnic grouping.

The target for MRSA is for Trusts to achieve a year-on-year reduction from the level as at 2003/04. Wirral Hospitals Trust has comparatively low levels of MRSA compared to some Trusts and has found it a challenge to reduce these levels in line with the target. During August the Trust was visited by the national MRSA Improvement Team, who

were very positive about the Trusts Infection Control Team and the steps we have already taken. The Improvement Team made suggestions for areas where we needed to change the way we tackle MRSA and we have used the outcome of this experience to develop an Action Plan to reduce rates.

4.2. Services for Children

This review examined the quality of healthcare for children in hospital, based on the standards in the National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity. The Trust is addressing the issues raised by the review through a multi-speciality action team. Improvements are already happening in many areas – for example the purpose-built children and young persons emergency care area which will be staffed by specialist nurses and is due to open in November.

4.3. Admissions Management

This review examined the efficiency and effectiveness with which the Trust used its beds. The review looked at the experiences of patients who are admitted to hospital for elective surgery (from a waiting list) or in an emergency. The Trust have developed an Action Plan to address the issues raised by this review. Actions have already been taken to address the areas where the Trust scored lowest. As shown in Appendix 1 many of the measures relate to the efficiency with which beds are used. The Trust has already put in place many success measures to reduce lengths of stay and improve the way we use our beds and we will build on this experience to make further improvements.

4.4. Diagnostic Services

The review of diagnostic services looked specifically at endoscopy, radiology and pathology services. It considered, among other things, how long people wait for the results of tests, the efficiency of diagnostic services and the way in which healthcare organisations ensure that the services they provide are accurate and appropriate. As shown at appendix 1 the Trust scored well on clinical quality and the experience of service users but scored less well for efficiency. An Action Plan has been developed to address the issues raised by this review.

Gary Doherty Director of Strategic Development October 2006

Existing Targets

Acute/Specialist

| Acuteropecialist | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|
| Indicators | Level of | Trusts achieving |
| | performance | indicator (%) |
| Total time in A&E: four hours or less | Achieved | 93% |
| All cancers: two week maximum wait from urgent GP | Achieved | 98% |
| referral to first outpatient appointment | | |
| Patients seen at rapid access chest pain clinics within | Achieved | 79% |
| 14 days of referral by their GP | | |
| Patients waiting longer than three months for | Not applicable | 95% |
| revascularisation (coronary artery bypass graft or | | |
| percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty) | | |
| Cancelled operations and patients not admitted within | Achieved | 37% |
| 28 days of cancellation | | |
| Thrombolysis: increasing the proportion of heart attack | Achieved | 47% |
| patients who receive thrombolysis within 60 minutes of | | |
| calling for help | | |
| Delayed transfers of care | Achieved | 84% |
| Convenience and choice: availability of required | Achieved | 100% |
| information about the organisation to help patients to | | |
| use 'choose and book' | | |
| All cancers: one month maximum wait from diagnosis | Achieved | 96% |
| to treatment | | |
| All cancers: maximum two month wait from urgent GP | Underachieved | 59% |
| referral to treatment | | |
| Number of inpatients waiting longer than the standard | Achieved | 83% |
| time for their treatment | | |
| Number of outpatients waiting longer than the standard | Achieved | 92% |
| time for their appointment | | |
| Convenience and choice: booking of elective (inpatient | Achieved | 90% |
| and day case) and outpatient appointments | | |
| | | |

New Targets

Acute/Specialist

| Indicators | Level of | Trusts achieving |
|---|--------------|------------------|
| | performance | indicator (%) |
| Participation in audits | Achieved | 97% |
| Completeness of hospital data on smoking during | Achieved | 84% |
| pregnancy and on initiation of breastfeeding | | |
| Process in place for identifying and managing obesity | Achieved | 64% |
| in secondary care | | |
| Percentage of patients getting access to genito-urinary medicine (GUM) clinics within 48 hours of contacting the clinic | Achieved | 54% |
| Experience of patients: results of 2005 survey of | Satisfactory | 88% |
| inpatients | | |
| Change in hospital bed days (number of patients | Achieved | 89% |
| multiplied by length of stay) following emergency | | |
| admissions | | |
| Patients waiting longer than 26 weeks for an MRI or CT scan at the end of March 2006 | Achieved | 94% |
| Number of MRSA infections compared with the | Failed | 53% |
| planned reductions | | |
| Proportion of data with useful ethnic group coding | Failed | 62% |
| Does the trust comply with key elements of national | Achieved | 68% |
| guidelines on treating people who have self-harmed? | | |
| Smoke-free NHS: recording of smoking status and | Achieved | 75% |
| reducing smoking | | |
| Does the organisation have the right processes in | Achieved | 73% |
| place to help patients who misuse drugs? | | |

Childrens Services

The review examined the performance of healthcare organisations against six service areas:

| Service Area | Score |
|--------------------|-------|
| Inpatient Care | Fair |
| Outpatients | Fair |
| Emergency services | Fair |
| Emergency care | Weak |
| Planned surgery | Fair |
| Day care | Good |

Admissions Management

Each area was given a score from 1-5 with 5 being high performance and 1 being low performance.

| Service Area | Score |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Appropriate use of beds | 2.6 |
| Efficiency – Medical Beds | 3.0 |
| Efficiency – Surgical Beds | 2.0 |
| Elective Access | 1.6 |
| Emergency Access | 2.6 |

Diagnostic Services

Each area was given a score from 1-5 with 5 being high performance and 1 being low performance.

| Service Area | Score |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Clinical Quality | 3.4 |
| Efficiency | 2.0 |
| Experiences of Service Users | 3.5 |