

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

**2008/09 ANNUAL HEALTH CHECK RATING**



**Report of the Director of Information Systems & Analysis and the Head of Performance Intelligence**

**1. Purpose**

1.1 The Board is asked to receive this overview of our expected performance against the Care Quality Commission’s Annual Health Check for the financial year April 2008 to March 2009.

**2. Overview - 2008/09 Annual Health Check**

2.1 The following table highlights the key components of the Annual Health Check. Each area is reviewed in turn.

2008/09 framework of assessment			
Core standards	Existing commitment indicators	National priority indicators	Monitor financial risk rating
			
<b>Annual rating – Quality of services</b>			<b>Annual rating – Quality of financial management</b>
<i>Service reviews/studies do not directly contribute to the 2008/09 rating, but will provide assurance on standards and give a broader picture of performance</i>			

2.2 **Assessment measures:** The core standards and existing commitment indicator components will be measured using the four-point scale ‘Fully met’, ‘Almost met’, ‘Partly met’ and ‘Not met’. All other components, including the overall element ratings for quality of services and financial management, will be measured using the four-point scale ‘Excellent’, ‘Good’, ‘Fair’ and ‘Weak’.

2.3 **Core standards:** The Trust submitted a declaration against the core healthcare standards in April 2009. In-year lapses were recorded for two standards, C4C – Safe reuse of medical devices and C12 - Research Governance, but we declared both as resolved at year end, indicating compliance against all twenty four standards. A declaration of full compliance with the hygiene code was also included. This would constitute a ‘Fully met’ score for the core standards component. This assessment is subject to any third party report or inspection that may arise over the period ending summer 2009. If the latter resulted in an adverse qualification, then a worst case ‘Almost met’ score would apply.

- 2.4 **Existing commitments:** Nine indicators similar to the existing national targets in previous years. Given the published thresholds set by the Care Quality Commission, we know that at least six indicators have been achieved, one underachieved and one failed. Therefore as things currently stand, a 'Fully met' score is not possible for this component, irrespective how we fare against the one remaining indicator.  
At best an 'Almost met' score would apply for this component, and at worst a 'Partly met' score.

However, the Trust is considering whether to submit an extenuating circumstance for the 13-week outpatient waiting indicator (surrounding the inclusion of clinical genetic service breaches).

- 2.5 **National priorities:** Thirteen indicators set to measure performance in key national areas during 2008/09. Only six thresholds have been published, and the remaining seven will not be released until the final ratings are published in October 2009. Therefore a great deal of uncertainty exists for this component, and accordingly we can only be certain that five indicators have been achieved at present. However, given our performance and using the thresholds that were applied last year where applicable, possible best and worst case scenarios can be illustrated.  
At best a 'Good' score would apply for this component, and at worst a 'Weak' score.

[NB The Trust is currently investigating the failed score given to us for the Maternity HES indicator].

- 2.6 **Annual rating – quality of services element:** The Care Quality Commission methodology is based on applying a series of key rules to the individual component scores outlined above. Again, using projections founded on information released to date by the Care Quality Commission, we highlight the two scenarios for the quality element score:

- Best case for Trust overall rating = 'Good'  
Core standards – 'Fully met'  
Existing national targets - 'Almost met'  
New national targets – 'Good'
- Worst case for Trust overall rating = 'Fair'  
Core standards – 'Almost met'  
Existing national targets - 'Partly met'  
New national targets – 'Weak'

- 2.7 **Annual rating – quality of financial management element:** As a Foundation Trust, the quality of financial management element score will again be taken from the financial risk rating that will be agreed with Monitor in August 2009 (i.e. as part of the Trust's annual plan for 2009/10). If Monitor awards us a rating of three, an assessment of 'Good' would be achieved.

- 2.8 Appendix 1 summarises our actual performance against each component, and also outlines projected scores for the Trust based on information released by the Care Quality Commission to date.

### 3. Recommendation

3.1 The Board is asked to note the possible assessment scenarios for our 2008/09 Annual Health Check rating to be published in October 2009.

- Best case for Trust annual rating (quality of services element) = 'Good'  
Core standards – 'Fully met'  
Existing national targets - 'Almost met'  
New national targets – 'Good'
- Worst case for Trust annual rating (quality of services element) = 'Fair'  
Core standards – 'Almost met'  
Existing national targets - 'Partly met'  
New national targets – 'Weak'
- Annual rating (quality of financial management element) - rating 3 / 'Good'