

## NCAT review

To: North East NHS

King's College Hospital  
Denmark Hill  
London  
SE5 9RS

### North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust

Date of Visit: 29 January 2013  
Venue(s): Hartlepool and North Tees Hospitals

Administrator – Judy Grimshaw  
Tel: 020 3299 5172  
Email: Judy.grimshaw@nhs.net

NCAT Visitors: Dr Chris Clough  
Dr Mike Jones

## 1. Introduction

1.1. NCAT was asked to clinically assure reconfiguration proposals for North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust (NTHFT) involving the University Hospital of Hartlepool (UHH) and University Hospital of North Tees (UHNT). The request for clinical assurance was initiated by Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group as part of their service change assurance process as the Trust and Clinical Commissioning Group move towards public consultation.

1.2. Information reviewed - list of information received is shown in Appendix 1

1.3. Agenda and list of people met is shown in Appendix 2

## 2. Background

2.1. The background to this reconfiguration is lengthy and complex starting with the Tees Service Review in 2003, followed by the acute services review for Hartlepool and Teeside in 2005, the recommendations of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel 2006 and the development of the strategic plan Momentum – pathways to healthcare 2007. The details of these various recommendations and strategic plans will not be summarised here, but the conclusion of the most recent Independent Review Panel (IRP), the Momentum programme, is that there should be a single new hospital, built between Hartlepool and Stockton, to replace the current services provided at UHH and UHNT. Additionally there should be a number of other work-streams to ensure that health services were as near to patient homes as possible, with the development of community services.

- 2.2. As part of the health service reform/redesign in North of Tees and the shared vision originating from the recommendations of the IRP, the new hospital capital project was consulted on in late 2008, leading to a final draft of the outline business case. As part of the spending review undertaken by the new coalition government following the general election in May 2010, the approval for public dividend capital (£464m) was withdrawn in June 2010. The Trust, with support from the then PCT (NHS Tees) and now NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group, is exploring alternative options for securing the required finance and, by the end of 2013 hope to identify an appropriate financial partner. A new hospital at the Wynyard site is expected to be in service by 2017.
- 2.3. In advance of and as anticipated in the new NHS with a strive for greater quality and safety standards that move to the new hospital the Trust is experiencing clinical problems of sustainability to keep abreast of escalating standards with the continued provision of two site acute medical and critical care services. It is the case for change for these services that NCAT has examined, but we have also reviewed the overall strategic direction of the Trust plans. Within the accompanying paperwork, plans to close the stand alone midwife led birthing unit (MLBU) at UHH were advanced, but we understand these are being reconsidered in an overall assessment of the provision of midwife-led services that exist within the community, or are hospital based. Whilst NCAT can understand that there may be concerns about the affordability and sustainability of a small stand-alone MLBU (approximately 300 births per year) we have not addressed the issue of maternity services directly, and these are not further discussed within the following report.

### **3. Case for change**

- 3.1. Presently acute medicine and critical care (intensive care and high dependency care) are provided on the two sites of UHH and UHNT. Whilst UHNT is the major provider of acute medical services and critical care, UHH continues to admit acutely ill medical patients. Patients suffering from a possible stroke are already taken to UHNT (patients identified by the FAST test are transferred by the ambulance services to UNHT, other patients can self-present or be referred by GPs), and secondly patients

with acute coronary syndromes (ie those so-called STEMI patients) are taken directly or transferred to James Cook University Hospital for percutaneous coronary intervention. About 30 patients a day present to the acute medical unit (emergency medical unit) at UHH and a significant proportion of these will be ambulatory.

- 3.2. UHH is supported by a small critical care service with two ITU beds and two high dependency beds. Over recent years the bed occupancy has been 50% on average. Most of the activity using this service is referred on by the acute medical team. It is supported by anaesthetists with intensive care skills who are able to do a once daily ward round but are not able to offer the full panoply of intensive care support such as haemofiltration and routine tracheostomy can only be performed on mornings when the consultant is there. Such services are available routinely on the UNHT site. Patients for surgical tracheostomy need to be transferred to UNHT. It has been difficult to recruit and retain anaesthetists and medical staff to the UHH. In addition the nurses feel isolated within the unit and insecure about the level of care they are practicing.
- 3.3. The acute medical unit does run well and there are plenty of beds to which patients may be admitted , but again is not supported by the full panoply of services one would expect in a modern AMU. Patients need to be transferred to UNHT for endoscopy or other specialist opinion or interventions.
- 3.4. Thus the case for change here is predominantly clinically based, driven by the need to close the critical care unit at UHH which may potentially be unsafe, and secondly to provide modern fully supported acute medical care which certainly could not function without on-site critical care facilities. In the present situation patients may be left at UHH following their admission when it would have been better to transfer them in the first place to UNHT.
- 3.5. The proposal is to create a larger acute medical unit at UHNT, which would then be supported by a larger group of medical staff and other clinicians with specialist skills. The intensive care/critical care unit at UHH would

close and the capacity at UHNT would be expanded to accommodate the increased activity. Again there are likely to be efficiencies of scale and quality dividends by bringing all the individuals with intensivists skills onto one site.

- 3.6. The proposal will mean that the number of beds at UHNT will need to be expanded, and the figure given was of 100 extra beds committed to acute medicine. Within this present move there would also be some movement of plain X ray and diagnostic services to support acute medicine and critical care but these services would also remain on the UHH site to support outpatient services. Patients requiring elective surgery on the UHH site would undergo appropriate assessment to ascertain their ASA grade. Low grade patients (ASA 1 and 2) would be deemed fit enough to undergo surgery at the elective care centre. Those with higher ASA grades would be treated at UNHT in case of the need for critical care.

#### **4. Views expressed on the day**

- 4.1. The Trust and the CCG both have clear and creditable plans to develop high quality care for the people of Stockton and Hartlepool. It is important that the plans that emerge are evidence based and can be supported by our clinicians.
- 4.2. The Trust took on community services some time ago and would like to deliver integrated care, but there has been less investment in the community services at the Stockton side to enable us to do this.
- 4.3. There are now three short-listed bidders which have emerged to compete for the development/funding of the new hospital, and we would expect a recommendation by the end of the year
- 4.4. There has been a renaissance in community services. The single point of access has been a great success with signposting of appropriate services for the first time. However staff working at the SPA centre can feel stressed when attempting to make a decision about what is the appropriate patient pathway to recommend, and the default position may well be to admit.

- 4.5. We need to plan for the future, particularly the management of the frail elderly. It will be important to have integrated services with social services. A large proportion of these patients will have dementia who require appropriate care.
- 4.6. These plans will mean that 97% of the healthcare contacts that occur presently will remain in Hartlepool. We recognise that transport needs to be a key project. We are suggesting there needs to be a shuttle bus between the two hospitals. We know the public is worried about transport and it will be important to enhance both public transport and ensure that the ambulance service has sufficient capacity to make swift transfers if need be.
- 4.7. We are an upper decile performer with regard to average length of stay (3.6 days) for the acute medical service. We are trying to run an 85% bed occupancy, but often the occupancy is over 90%, particularly at the Stockton end (UHNT). Surgery runs at much lower occupancy rates (77-78%). Overall there will be 100 extra beds at North Tees to accommodate the increase in medical activity and this can be provided by refurbishing wards as at present. Additionally it would be relatively easy to reprovide the intensive care beds by some creative utilisation of space within the present ITU.
- 4.8. We must try to concentrate our elective surgical activity on the UHH site. Out of hours there will be a resident medical officer supported by advanced care nurse practitioners.
- 4.9. There are problems treating patients safely in the present UHH ITU. The number of beds is small, with low bed occupancy, and the medical cover relies on general anaesthetists some with intensivist skills. There is no dedicated intensivist presence on the ITU.
- 4.10. There is a growing disparity between the two sites because of the increasing isolation of the acute medical service and supportive critical

care. This can lead to an unwillingness to transfer patients from UHH which may not be in the patients' best interests. It is difficult to get specialist advice re haemofiltration and other specialist interventions for the patients in ITU. We have difficulty recruiting anaesthetists because of the low ITU throughput and facilities at UHH.

- 4.11. It would be difficult to justify training of junior anaesthetists in the ITU, and it is unlikely that the Deanery would support this at the UHH site. Increasingly we rely on locums which are difficult to find, and locum behaviour is worrying. Whilst what we are doing is adequate, this is not the model of care we want to see in the future.
- 4.12. One of the biggest challenges we have is working with the social services. However we do think we can preserve the relationships that have developed at UHH with community and social services if the acute services were to transfer to UHNT.
- 4.13. We want to develop consultant-led surgical care and this plan would assist that direction of travel. In the main UHH, as a surgical elective centre, would be dealing with orthopaedics (lower limb arthroplasty, spinal anaesthesia), breast surgery and paediatric day case surgery. There have been rare occasions when it has been necessary to open up the theatre out of hours for a deteriorating surgical patient using the UHH team. In future this occurrence must be kept to a minimum but in an extreme case it may be necessary to stabilise patients on the UHH site before transfer to UHNT.  
We must utilise the capacity at UHH because without those 3 operating theatres we would not have the capacity to deliver all the surgical activity at UHNT.
- 4.14. There are concerns about equipment transfer between the two sites, and this needs to be clarified. We also need to do further work about understanding what competencies the out of hours team must have to support the level of elective care we would predict.

- 4.15. The acute medical team is comfortable with the assumptions about the rising level of admissions. We would expect this to be no more than 1% per year if integrated care and management of the vulnerable patients is developed within the community. We have work streams in mental health, substance misuse which aim to look at those care pathways carefully to identify patients at risk and prevent them being admitted unless absolutely necessary.
- 4.16. The local GPs are happy with the quality of care presently delivered at the two hospitals. We recognise the challenges faced by the Trust and support the movement of acute care to one site at UHNT.
- 4.17. We are not happy with the numbers of patients presently attending the ambulatory care unit at the Trust, and think these numbers need to be reduced over time by better provision of primary and community care. We recognise that GP services need to be more accessible, with 7 day working and extended hours. Presently there are a lot of zero day admissions; these need to be prevented wherever possible.
- 4.18. We are not happy with the paediatric assessment unit at UHH. We expect our children who are identified as being sick to be assessed by a paediatrician, at best a consultant, and presently this is mainly being performed by a nurse practitioner. Hence many of us are diverting children to UHNT anyway.
- 4.19. Whilst we recognise that community care needs to be developed, we must accept there has never been sufficient investment in the community services. It is worrying that the Trust re-admission rate is high, better community provision would help improve that.
- 4.20. Transport issues are key factors for patients.
- 4.21. The local Hartlepool Council has passed a vote of no confidence in the Trust management. Many people in Hartlepool do not support the building of a new hospital at Wynyard.

- 4.22. We would like to challenge the logic of the Momentum proposals. Why it is necessarily Stockton is the acute site rather than Hartlepool?
- 4.23. Patients do have concerns about the interim plans. Many of us took some convincing about the Momentum plans but have come to the view that the plans are acceptable as long as we develop community plans, and we would strongly support all attempts to keep care close to home.
- 4.24. We think the staff on both sites are good, and when we access care it is generally of a good quality. There are problems with access to some of the GPs locally, with up to 48 hours wait for an urgent appointment.

### **5. Discussion**

- 5.1. Prior to the NCAT visit, both visitors were provided with a good deal of information about the background to the reconfiguration and the considerable political and other difficulties that the Trust and Commissioners have had over the past few years in making change happen with the North East. Thus it wasn't always clear from the paperwork what the substance of the proposal was, and what operational steps had been taken to achieve that. We fully understand the political difficulties in making change happen. Nevertheless we think the supportive paperwork could be considerably simplified, and certainly this would be necessary for public consumption, so that everybody is clear exactly what the proposal is about, the clinical case for change and what are the objectives and hoped-for outcomes to be achieved.
- 5.2. The core of this reconfiguration proposal is relatively straight-forward and that is the consolidation of the acute medical service on one site at Stockton and the transfer of the critical care services (ITU and HDU) to the Stockton site. This is the proposal we have clinically assured. As above, we have not reviewed plans for any changes in maternity services but did express our concerns about the viability of small standalone midwife led birthing units. We have not clinically assured any plans for a single site for all services, as envisaged with the new hospital build. Nevertheless we would like to make some broad strategic comments about the movement to



a possible new hospital at Wynyard, as this needs to be seen in the context of a national movement to create hospitals able to deliver care 24/7 with round the clock working for the acute team and supportive diagnostics.

- 5.3. We recognise that the public see a linkage between the interim plans and the final plans, but we think there is a pressing need to do something about what is happening to the acute services presently, no matter what the plans are for the future. Thus we see no need to link our decision with the decision making processes required for the acute hospital.
- 5.4. The clinical case for change can be strongly supported. What we witnessed today was dedicated and hard-working clinical teams at both sites, endeavouring to create a first class service but hampered by the present configuration. The key to what must happen is the provision of critical care. The present critical care service at UHH is inadequate, poorly staffed and does not meet the standards required for a modern intensive care unit. Its size and level of use mean that it will never be able to achieve these standards, thus it is not surprising that anaesthetists feel uncomfortable about working there, and there are problems with recruitment of anaesthetists and support staff. We heard that at times the nursing staff, particularly at night, feel unsupported and concerned in case a clinical error occurs. Certain practices are unacceptable, for instance the level of support for tracheostomy, the lack of haemofiltration and the ability to call on other specialist services. It is difficult to envisage how these deficits may be corrected. Massive investment in the service is not justified on the level of patient use, and it would be unlikely to be supported by the local education and training board (previously deanery). Thus we can see no alternative other than to transfer this service to UNHT. We believe there is capacity at that site to accommodate the increasing activity, and there will be the opportunity to bring together all the available staff and develop a dedicated intensivist workforce at UNHT.
- 5.5. The inevitable consequence of decommissioning critical care at UHH is that acute medical care can no longer be provided. Acutely sick patients need the availability of on-site resuscitation and critical care facilities. This must trigger the movement of acute medical care to UNHT. Not only that,

the present service is relatively small and does not have the full panoply of acute specialist care that is required to deliver high quality acute medicine. The bringing together of the two units under a single roof will undoubtedly enhance the level of support required for acute medicine and ensure there are viable specialist rotas, for instance in gastroenterology, respiratory medicine etc. It should also enhance the ability of elderly medicine to play an important part in identifying the frail elderly who require a comprehensive geriatric assessment and subsequent multi-disciplinary management.

- 5.6. When we spoke to the public and to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee members there was a significant majority in favour of the clinical argument for reconfiguration of the service. Not surprisingly the strongest support did come from those members of the public residing within the Stockton end of the patch. Nevertheless there were others from Hartlepool who also supported the plans. Understandably there are great concerns from the Hartlepool population about any changes to the services at UHH. They had two main concerns; firstly, whilst recognising that only a small part of the hospital services were being transferred to UNHT, and that the majority of services were remaining, it was felt that this could be the beginning of the end for UHH. Secondly, there are considerable concerns about transport – this has two components, firstly the extra travelling that relatives and carers would have to make in order to see their loved ones at UNHT when they were admitted acutely, and secondly was there sufficient capacity within the ambulance services to absorb the increased activity that inevitably would result from this transfer. From a clinical standpoint, the potential for small increases in travel times does not pose a significant clinical risk.
- 5.7. The Trust and its partners need to explain clearly the clinical case for change here, which is strong and can be strongly supported, but also reassure the Hartlepool public in particular that there is a continuing future for their hospital as a centre for elective care and other cold site services such as diagnostics and outpatients. Indeed there is a potential within the plans to develop intermediate care at UHH which would improve the care pathway for patients and ensure that once Hartlepool patients in particular had been treated at UHNT, they would be rapidly stepped down to

appropriate intermediate care facilities at UHH. The development of intermediate care at UHH will be an important component in managing the throughput of patients at the acute end.

- 5.8. Not enough has been done to describe patient narratives which I tell the story of what happens now and what will happen in the future. Overall we would expect these changes to deliver better patient outcomes, and all the OSC representatives and members of the public we spoke to agreed that some increased travel times was a necessary price to pay for better quality of care.
- 5.9. We were concerned about the lack of clarity about capacity planning for the enlarged Stockton unit. The assumptions used to model the bed numbers need to be robustly challenged and risk-assessed. Whilst it is very commendable that the CCG is emphasising the importance of providing adequate community services, and are putting plans in place to enhance admissions avoidance, it would be unwise to make any great assumptions that this necessarily will result in lowering the rise in hospital admissions. The Trust does need to plan for worse-case scenarios and risk-assess appropriately. It is possible that levels of admissions continue to rise and the planned achievements or reduction in average length of stay are not realised. We think the public need to be reassured that capacity planning has been carried out rigorously and the new service will be able to run efficiently and provide beds when they are needed. It would be best practice for the acute medical unit to assume a bed occupancy of 75% rather than the higher levels it has been achieving presently. The proposed bed/ambulatory care spaces in the acute medical unit on the UHNT site must be carefully modelled on present numbers and the time of day when patients present to ensure that the high quality care provided at the moment will not be compromised by the introduction of patients queues
- 5.10. There is much to be gained by developing primary care services and utilising community care. A community approach that utilises case registers for elderly patients with multiple morbidities, who are then appropriately risk stratified, would hopefully identify those patients in danger of needing admission so that they can receive targeted care within the community. Whilst we cannot guarantee that this would drive down

hospital admissions, the health economy can only thrive in the future if it reduces the reliance on hospital services, where the majority of costs are; the approach must be to concentrate on provision of high value interventions and decommission those healthcare interventions that have low value.

- 5.11. Removal of the acute services and critical care services from UHH will mean the Trust is able to focus on the provision of elective care on the UHH site. This can have considerable advantages in improving efficiency, patient flows and lowering rates of hospital acquired infection. Elective sites should be run to maximally utilise those resources, ensuring high levels of bed occupancy and theatre utilisation with low rates of cancellation and short waiting times. Patients will need to be appropriately risk-stratified, we were pleased to hear that the surgeons and anaesthetists fully recognise this. Consideration should be given to all the specialties that could potentially provide services on the UHH site as part of an elective care centre to ensure maximal utility of this site.
- 5.12. So far there has been very little debate about what the clinical support will be like following reconfiguration, and the key clinical competencies that must be provided in and out of hours within the on-site clinical team. This will be an important issue to resolve in advance of the transfer, and will determine exactly what the case-mix of patients who will be treated at UHH should be. There are a number of modern practices which can significantly enhance post-operative care of patients within daytime and early evening hours to ensure safe post-operative recovery and identify those patients who need further care (ie if they deteriorate surgically or have medical complications). This will require that appropriate protocols are put in place with physiological tracking schemes which provide an early warning of those patients who might need further care or indeed transfer to UHNT.
- 5.13. We would suggest that the clinicians, i.e. the surgeons and anaesthetists, get together very quickly to discuss these issues and agree on what the protocols of care should be, and what this might mean for the design of the clinical services. A lot can be safely done out of hours with the provision of a clinical team consisting of advanced care nurse practitioners with

resuscitation skills (ALS) but we suspect, following the discussion of the proposed case-mix of patients, there will need to be a medical presence on site overnight. This was described as a resident medical officer, or alternatively as a surgical trainee. The key to unlocking this problem is to look at the competency base of the whole team required to be on site in and out of hours. This will identify the skills and competencies of the individuals required. For instance we have seen similar plans where it was thought the most appropriate individual was an anaesthetist in training. Senior level support can be via telephone, presumably the on-call team at UHNT. Further thought should be given to whether telemedicine connections have anything to offer; for instance a video link might enable a consultant at distance to see and evaluate a patient, and watch a clinical exam. Digital imaging information can be easily transferred between the two hospitals. Our conclusion was that more work needs to be done to define the level of clinical support which would reside in and out of hours at UHH.

5.14. Turning to the more strategic issue of the long-term future of acute hospital services within the North East. This is of course a very large question, but it is one we feel we must raise. Whilst we wouldn't want to hold up the planning that is moving at a pace for the new acute hospital at Wynyard, we would point out that, within the North East, there are probably too many small DGH style hospitals. It would be appropriate to consider the consequences of planning a new hospital as above, but also to recognise that there may be an opportunity to configure services advantageously for the North East which in this case we would define roughly as that area between the Tyne and the Tees. It is clear that the two fixed points for acute hospital services are the Royal Victoria Infirmary at Newcastle and the James Cook University Hospital Middlesbrough. These are both large tertiary and, secondary care style hospitals which provide most services. What then is the requirement for other acute care providers? Whilst we recognise that the Healthcare Act provides for more qualified providers coming into the marketplace, acute care is extremely complex and costly and requires a strategic plan with partnership working between commissioners and providers.

5.15. The challenges ahead are a health economy which will not be growing as in previous years, and a requirement for year on year significant efficiency

savings. The major brunt of this inevitably will fall on the acute services, especially as there is a drive to improve primary and community services and deliver more care closer to patients' homes. The inevitable result of this is that there will be a requirement for fewer acute hospitals, and that these will cater for larger populations. The other side of the coin is that clinical care is becoming increasingly specialised within the acute sector, and needs to be provided by larger teams of clinicians who are available around the clock to ensure that patients' conditions are diagnosed speedily, and that there is immediate access to diagnostics and treatment in order to improve clinical outcome and produce shorter stays in hospital. Other drivers to change include a coming together of more specific services, for instance paediatrics, with the drop in the need to admit children and a requirement to provide 24/7 high quality inpatient care from dedicated paediatricians. This inevitably means there will be fewer paediatric inpatient units in the North East. We are aware that there are discussions within the North East to determine where these may be placed. The inevitable consequence of fewer paediatric units is fewer neonatal intensive care units and that will define where obstetric units will be placed (unless the size of the maternity unit justifies having its own standalone NICU).

- 5.16. We raise these issues because we think that there needs to be a broader strategic assessment of the requirement for acute hospital services within this geographical area and that CCGs need to come together to future-proof any plans they may have for new capital investment in acute hospital services. In the case of the proposed new hospital at Wynyard for instance, there may be a critical cut-off level for the population catchment area which will mean that the business case is challenged. If for instance this geographic site means that more patients from Hartlepool, through choice, are drifting down to the James Cook University Hospital, that could reduce the patient catchment to about 300,000, which will lead to a potential fall in income to fund the complex acute hospital care we would envisage as above. We would estimate (and here the evidence base can be challenged) that a larger population base of 500,000 and above, would lead to a more sustainable and affordable model. Nevertheless there are many other factors to consider including geographical variation, population clusters, travel times and political factors. Despite this, we think that this issue must

be raised with the commissioners and addressed speedily prior to proceeding with the new hospital build.

### 6. Conclusions

- 6.1. The clinical case for change is accepted. NCAT can support the move of the acute medical services and critical care services to UHNT. The timescale, whilst challenging, is supported and necessary in view of the potential for clinical risk at the UHH site
- 6.2. Capacity modelling needs to be robust and ensure that the reconfigured acute medical service aims to operate with an average bed occupancy of 75%.
- 6.3. The Trust needs to describe clearly what these changes will mean for the public and what services can be expected on both sites. A number of clinical narratives describing patient journeys need to be put forward to explain the change.
- 6.4. The public needs to see action taken about their concerns regarding transport and availability of appropriate public services between the two sites. Additionally the North East ambulance service needs to ensure they have sufficient capacity to deliver the increased numbers of transfers that might arise.
- 6.5. The residual clinical support (including medical on call) needs to be described on the UHH site. The approach should be one whereby the clinical competencies for the out of hours and in hours teams are defined to support the acutely ill patient.
- 6.6. The CCG and Trust need to work together to define patient pathways which ensure the right patient is treated in the right place first time, the aim being to reduce the number of patients who are admitted to secondary care and to improve overall quality of care delivered to patients, particularly those with multiple morbidity and long-term care needs.

- 6.7. The bigger questions of acute hospital strategy for the North East need to be addressed (see above).

**7. Recommendations**

- 7.1. The Trust proceeds to public consultation regarding the changes described above as soon as possible.
- 7.2. The CCG and Trust working together to respond to the conclusions as above and gives a written response to NCAT and NHS North of England within 3 weeks.
- 7.3. The CCG and Trust consider the need for external clinical review of the plans for the new hospital beyond the element of review built into the next steps of commissioning the new hospital to ensure that the model of care and facilities proposed will meet the needs of the local population and wider strategic direction of healthcare in the North East.



Appendix 1 Documentation Received

**1 Covering Letter**

**2 Strategic Options**

2.1 Strategic Options – 4 May 2012

Previous versions available if required

2.2 Presentation Transition Plan Summary of Options 12 June 2012

**3 Cases for Change**

3.1 Transition Plan 17 October 2011

3.2 Transition Workshop outcomes

**4 Project Management of Service Reconfiguration**

4.1 Presentation Strategic Options for Future Configuration of Services – 24 April 2012

- Transition Board Agenda – 17 January 2012
- Transition Board Agenda – 17 October 2011
- Service Transformation Project Group – Agenda of 7 December 2012

4.2 Service Transformation Project Group – Terms of Reference

4.3 Service Transformation Project Group – Project Initiation Document

4.4 Service Transformation Project Plan

5 North of Tees Partnership Board Agenda 20 December 2012

4.5 North of Tees Partnership Board Terms of Reference

5 North of Tees Partnership Board Agenda 21 June 2012

4.6 Minutes of the North of Tees Partnership Board – 21 June 2012

4.7 Service Transformation Presentation to North of Tees Partnership Board – 21 June 2012

**5 Communication and Stakeholder Engagement**

5.1 Communications Strategy and Implementation Plan

5.2 £40 m Challenge / Transition Plan – Engagement Schedule

5.3 Report to Executive Team: future service model 28 August 2012

5.4 Report to Trust Board: future service model 13 September 2012

5.5 Presentation to Trust Directors Group 19 October 2012

Report to Trust Executive Team 27 November 2012

Audit Trail of Current Engagement relating to Service Transformation.

**6 Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

6.1 Presentation to demonstrate the Trusts' commitment to developing services in Hartlepool – February 2012

6.2 Presentation by NHS Hartlepool on the proposal to transfer Outpatient Services to One Life

Hartlepool – 23 August 2012

6.3 (a & b) Presentation by NHS Hartlepool and Stockton and Tees Clinical Commissioning

Group and North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust – October 2012

6.4 Report to outline the potential impact of Outpatient moves into Community settings –

December 2012

6.5 The Positive Moves discussed with Hartlepool OSC on 15 December 2011

## **7 Clinical Evidence**

- Links to Clinical Evidence documents

## **8 Guidance and Service Reviews**

8.1 Guide to Service Change – Incorporating the NHS Yorkshire and the Humber Service Change Assurance Process

8.2 Reconfiguration Proposals That Have Passed The Lansley Criteria (HSJ Online (19/11/10))

8.3 Tees Review Acute Services – Report by Professor Sir Ara Darzi 2005

8.4 Independent Reconfiguration Panel Report (IRP) – Advice of Proposals for changes to Maternity and Paediatric Services in North Tees and Hartlepool 2006

## **9 Clear and Credible Plans**

9.1 NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG

9.2 NHS Durham Dales, Easington and Sedgefield CCG

## **10 Activity and Performance and Additional Information**

10.1 Annual Report

10.2 Annual Plan

10.3 Operational Efficiencies Report 2011/12

10.4 Operational Efficiencies Report 2012/13 to date

10.5 Board of Directors Report – Operational Efficiencies – November 2012

10.6 Board of Directors - Winter Resilience Report – October 2012

Appendix 2

**PROGRAMME FOR VISIT**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Venue</b>
9.15 am	Introduction to NCAT by Dr Chris Clough	Board Room University Hospital of Hartlepool
9.20 am	Expectations of the Visit and NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Clear and Credible Plan – led by Dr Boleslaw Posmyk and Mrs Alison Wilson.	
9.35 am	Case for Change and the bigger picture – led by Trust Executive Team.	
9.50 am	Discussion	
10 am	Tour of facilities at the University Hospital of Hartlepool including ITU, Ward 7, EAU and Ambulatory Care	Visit General Medicine and Critical Care
11.45 am	Clinical Case for Change	Board Room University Hospital of Hartlepool
12.15 am	Discussion	
12.30 pm	<b>WORKING NETWORKING LUNCH</b> Trust consultants drop in	
1 pm	Meet with Local GPs and CCG Representatives	Board Room, University Hospital of Hartlepool
2pm	Meet with Representatives from Hartlepool, Durham and Stockton Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Board Room, University Hospital of Hartlepool
2.45pm	Meet with Representatives from Patient Carer Groups (LINKs, Hospital User Group)	Board Room, University Hospital of Hartlepool
3.15 pm	<b>TRAVEL TO UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL OF NORTH TEES</b>	
3.50 pm	Tour of facilities on the University Hospital of North Tees including EAU, Ambulatory Care, Short Stay Unit and Critical Care Unit.	Visit General Medicine and Critical Care
4.45 pm	Closing Session	Board Room, University Hospital of North Tees
5 pm	Depart the University Hospital of North Tees	

## National Clinical Advisory Team - NCAT

### People Met

Julie Gillon	Chief Operation Officer/Deputy Chief Executive
David Emerton	Medical Director
Lynne Hodgson	Director of Finance & Information Management
Alan Foster	Chief Executive
Sue Smith	Director of Nursing and Patient Safety
Farooq Brohi	Consultant Anaesthetist & Critical Care
Kevin Oxley	Commercial Director
Narayanan Suresh	Clinical Director Anaesthetics
Cameron Ward	Acting CE NHS Tees Director (Durham, Darlington & Tees) Area Team of NHS Commissioning Board
Ben Clark	Assistant Director (Durham, Darlington & Tees) Area Team of NHS Commissioning Board
Katie Dixon	Strategic Planning Manager
Nick Roper	Clinical Lead, Acute Medicine and New Hospital
Jean Macleod	Clinical Director Medicine
Linda Watson	Clinical Director of Community Services
Peter Tindall	AD Strategic Planning & Development
Boleslaw Posmyk	Chair NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG
Ali Wilson	Chief Officer NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG
Paul Williams	Locality Lead (Stockton) NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG
Mike Smith	Locality Lead (Hartlepool) NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG
Paul Pagni	GP
Nick Timlin	GP
Paddy O'Neill	GP
S Findlay	GP, CCO DDES CCG
Graeme Niven	Chief Finance Officer, NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees CCG
Jed Hall	Vice Chair, Hartlepool Health Scrutiny Forum
Louise Wallace	Director of Public Health, Hartlepool Borough Council/PCT
Keith Fisher	HBC – Member of Health Scrutiny Forum

## National Clinical Advisory Team - NCAT

G Lilley	HBC – Member of Health Scrutiny Forum
J Beall	Deputy Leader, Chair HWB Stockton Borough Council
M Javed	Chairman Health Committee Stockton Borough Council
Peter Kelly	Director of Public Health, Stockton Borough Council
Peter Meenear	Scrutiny Officer, Stockton Borough Council
Cllr Robin Todd	Chair, PWH OSC Durham County Council
Feizel Jassat	OSC Manager, Durham County Council
Chris Greaves	General Manager, Anaesthetics & Critical Care
Sue Piggott	General Manager Medicine & Emergency Care
Chris Tulloch	CD Trauma/orthopaedics
Pud Bhaskar	CD Surgery/urology