

Meeting Name and	date	Trust Board – 7	7 April 20)20						
Paper number										
Name of Report - S	AFE S	TAFFING - FEB	RUARY	2020 R	REVIEW					
For approval		For assurance	е	\square	For in	formation				
Presented by	Ar	nne Scott	Aut	hor (s)		Emma Wallis				
Alignment to CQC domains: Safe	S S T E E P P G G R E A T	lignment to LPT STEP up to GRE - High Standard - Transformation - Environments - Patient Involve - Well-Governe - Single Patient - Equality, Lead - Access to Ser - Trust wide Qu	AT): ds n ement ed t Record dership, (vices	Culture	✓					
(Y/N) Report previously re	eviewe	d by								
Committee / Group		Dat	te							
Assurance: What level of assurance does this report provide in respect of the Organisational Risk Registers? Links to ORR risk numbers										
Significant Assuran	ce					4,26				

The Trust Board is recommended to receive assurance that processes are in place to monitor and ensure the inpatient and community staffing levels are safe and that patient safety and care quality are maintained.

Processes are in place to monitor and ensure staffing levels are safe and that patient safety and care quality is maintained.

Recommendations of the report



TRUST BOARD - 7 APRIL 2020

SAFE STAFFING – FEBRUARY 2020 REVIEW

Introduction/Background

- 1 This report provides an overview of nursing safe staffing during the month of February 2020, triangulating workforce metrics, quality and outcomes linked to Nurse Sensitive Indicators (NSIs) and patient experience feedback.
- 2 Actual staff numbers compared to planned staff numbers are collated for each inpatient area, CHPPD and temporary worker utilisation. A summary is available in Annex 1.
- 3 Quality Schedule methods of measurement are RAG rated in Annex 1;
 - A Each shift achieves the safe staffing level 100%
 - B Less than 6% of clinical posts to be filled by agency staff

<u>Aim</u>

4 The aim of this report is to provide the Trust Board with assurance that arrangements are in place to safely staff our services with the right number of staff, with the right skills at the right time. Including an overview of staffing areas to note, potential risks and actions to mitigate the risks, to ensure that safety and care quality are maintained.

Recommendations

5 The Trust Board is recommended to receive assurance that processes are in place to monitor and ensure the inpatient and community staffing levels are safe and that patient safety and care quality are maintained.

Discussion

Trust level highlights for February 2020

Right Staff

- Overall the planned staffing levels were achieved across the Trust in February 2020.
- Temporary worker utilisation rate increased overall this month 4.0%; reported at 34.0% and Trust wide agency usage increased this month by 0.5% to 5.4%. The increased bank and agency utilisation in February 2020 is largely associated with an increase in patient acuity on CAMHS Ward 3 and the Agnes Unit.
- Both areas have required additional staff for increased levels of safe and therapeutic observations. CAMHS ward 3 required unprecedented levels of staffing to maintain patient and staff safety both on the ward and for patients in care at the LRI, due to increased patient needs and challenging behaviours for a number of patients waiting transfer to a CAMHS PICU.

- The following wards utilised above 6% agency staff; Belvoir, Griffin, Watermead, Beechwood, Feilding Palmer, Rutland, St Lukes Wards 1 and 3, East, North and Coalville Wards 2 and 3 (CAMHS). These wards have a combination of factors that have resulted in higher use of agency staff; high vacancy factors, higher sickness levels, increased patient acuity and dependency and/ or hard to fill bank shift areas.
- There are fourteen inpatient 'areas to note' identified either by; exception to planned fill
 rates, high percentage of temporary worker/agency utilisation or by the Lead Nurse due
 to concerns relating to increased acuity, high risk patients, staff sickness, ability to fill
 additional shifts and the impact to safe and effective care. To note twelve of the fourteen
 are due to agency utilisation above 6%.
- There are ten community team 'areas to note' with one new areas identified in February 2020; Charnwood CMHT. Staffing and case-loads are reviewed and risk assessed across service teams using patient prioritisation models to ensure appropriate action is taken to maintain patient safety.

Right Skills

- In consideration of ensuring staff have the 'right skills', a high level overview of clinical training, appraisal and supervision for triangulation is presented. As of 1 February 2020 Trust wide;
 - Appraisal at 93.5% GREEN
 - Clinical supervision at 83.9% AMBER
 - There are 7 AMBER rated compliance clinical and core mandatory training subjects, all with an increased compliance from the previous month

Right Place

- Fill rates for actual HCSWs over 100% reflects the high utilisation and deployment of additional temporary staff due to increased levels of therapeutic observation to maintain safety of all patients.
- The total Trust CHPPD average (including ward based AHPs) is reported at 12.04 CHPPD in February 2020, with a range between 5.0 (Skye Wing) and 50.2 (CAMHS Ward 3) CHPPD. Variation reflects the diversity of services, complex and specialist care provided across the Trust. The increase in CAMHS reflects the additional staff required to provide safe patient care due to acuity this month
- Analysis of CHPPD has not identified significant variation at service level; indicating that staff are being deployed productively across services

In-patient Staffing

6 The overall trust wide summary of planned versus actual hours by ward for registered nurses (RN) and health care support workers (HCSW) in February 2020 is detailed below:

	D	AY	NIC	GHT	
	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Workers%
Dec 19	103.0%	204.1%	111.9%	186.2%	30.2%
Jan 20	102.8%	207.8%	111.2%	189.5%	30.0%
Feb 20	103.6%	221.6%	113.2%	207.8%	34.0%

Table 1 - Trust level safer staffing

- 7 Temporary worker utilisation rate increased overall this month 4.0%; reported at 34.0% and Trust wide agency usage increased this month by 0.5% to 5.4%. The increased bank and agency utilisation in February 2020 is largely associated with an increase in patient acuity on CAMHS Ward 3 and the Agnes Unit.
 - Both areas have required additional staff for increased levels of safe and therapeutic observations. CAMHS ward 3 required unprecedented levels of staffing to maintain patient and staff safety both on the ward and for patients in care at the LRI, due to increased patient needs and challenging behaviours for a number of patients waiting transfer to a CAMHS PICU.
- 8 The following wards utilised above 6% agency staff; Belvoir, Griffin, Watermead, Beechwood, Feilding Palmer, Rutland, St Lukes Wards 1 and 3, East, North and Coalville Wards 2 and 3 (CAMHS). These wards have a combination of factors that have resulted in higher use of agency staff; high vacancy factors, higher sickness levels, increased patient acuity and dependency and/ or hard to fill bank shift areas.

Summary of inpatient staffing areas to note

Wards	Dec 2019	Jan 2020	Feb 2020
Hinckley and Bosworth - East Ward	X		Х
Hinckley and Bosworth – North Ward	Х	Х	Х
Beechwood	Х		Х
Clarendon	Х		
Feilding Palmer	Х	Х	Х
St Lukes Ward 1		Х	Х
St Lukes Ward 3	Х	Х	Х
Coalville Ward 2	Х		Х
Short Breaks - The Gillivers	Х	Х	
Short Breaks – The Grange	Х	Х	
Coleman	Х	Х	Х
Gwendolen	Х		
Welford			Х
Belvoir	Х	X	Х
Griffin	Х	Х	Х
Watermead			Х
Agnes Unit	Х		Х
Langley		Х	
Ward 3 Coalville (CAMHS)	Х	Х	Х

Table 2 – In-patient staffing areas to note

- 9 Coleman, Welford and Feilding Palmer Wards did not meet the threshold for planned staffing across all shifts; on these occasions staffing was reported to be within safe parameters. Skill mix was adjusted due to patient needs and safe staffing supporting with the addition of roles such as the Medicines Administration Technician, Nursing Associate or Meaningful Activity co-ordinator that are not captured in the nurse staffing return.
- 10 Number of occupied beds, vacancy factor, planned staffing levels versus actual staffing levels and percentage of temporary staff utilised is presented in the tables per in-patient area

by service and directorate in Annex 2, together with the NSIs that capture outcomes most affected by nurse staffing levels.

Community Teams

11 The current Trust wide position for community 'areas to note' as reported by the lead nurses is detailed in the table below:

Community team	Nov 2019	Dec 2019	Jan 2020	Feb 2020
City East Hub- Community Nursing	Х	Х	Х	Х
City West Hub- Community Nursing	Х	Х	Х	Х
East Central Hub – Community Nursing	Х	Х	Х	Х
Hinckley and Bosworth – Community Nursing	Х	Х		
Healthy Together – City (School Nursing only)	Х	Х	Х	Х
Healthy Together – East	Х			Х
Health Together - West	Х	Х	Х	Х
CAMHS County - FYPC	Х	Х	Х	Х
Diana service		Х	Х	Х
Charnwood CMHT				Х
City West CMHT - MHSOP	Х	Х	Х	Х
East Leicester CMHT			Х	
Charnwood CNLD			Х	
Outreach LD			Х	

Table 11 - Community areas to note

12 There remain a number of vacancies across community planned care nursing hubs with City East, West and East Central carrying the largest number. Where there is a cross border area, hubs have 'taken' care homes from the teams under pressure to support management of the risk, patient care and staffing.

There are three Band 5 rolling adverts; one aimed at newly qualified nurses, one for City hubs with a recruitment and retention premia, and one for the County hubs to support the ageing well agenda.

- 13 Healthy Together City (School Nursing only), West Healthy Together, County Outpatient and Diana teams are rated to be at Amber escalation level due to only 70% of the established team being available to work. A number of strategies are being used to mitigate staffing gaps including paid overtime, ongoing advert for vacant posts. Locum support recruited to and additional hours in place for existing substantive staff where possible to increase capacity. Risks continue to be monitored within the Directorate on a weekly basis.
- 14 City west, CMHT, MHSOP remains an 'area to note' due to sickness, the team is currently supported by a regular agency nurse and a new starter commences in February 2020. The team have operated on the minimum local agreed staffing levels and there is an established process of reviewing the waiting list and any risks acted upon accordingly.
- 15 AMH/LD have reported one 'area to note' this month; Charnwood CMHT the team has recruited to a band 3 and band 7 vacancy due to start early March 2020.

Conclusion

- 16 The Trust continues to demonstrate compliance with the National Quality Board (NQB) expectations to publish safe staffing information monthly. The safe staffing data is reported to NHS England (NHSE) via mandatory national returns on a site-by-site basis.
- 17 In light of the triangulated review of fill rates, nurse sensitive indicators and patient feedback, the Acting Director of Nursing, AHPs and Quality is assured that there is sufficient resilience across the Trust not withstanding some hot spot areas, to ensure that every ward and community team is safely staffed.

Presenting Director: Anne Scott – Acting Director of Nursing, AHPs and Quality

Author: Emma Wallis – Associate Director of Nursing and Professional

Practice

					F	II Rate Analysis (N	ational Return)			Skill Mix				
	February 2020				Actual H	lours Worked divid	led by Planned H	lours		Met	% Ten	nporary W	orkers/	
					e Day _ate Shift)	Nurse	Night	Al	IP Day	(NURSING ONLY)	(NU	RSING O	NLY)	Overall
Ward Group	Ward name	Average no. of Beds on Ward	Average no. of Occupie d Beds	Average % fill rate registered nurses	Average % fill rate care staff	Average % fill rate registered nurses	Average % fill rate care staff	Average % fill rate registered AHP	Average % fill rate non- registered AHP	(based on 1:8 plus 60:40 split)	Total	Bank	Agenc y	CHPPD (Nursing and AHP)
				>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%	-	-	>= 80%	<20%	-		
	Ashby	21	20	87.9%	138.8%	98.3%	155.2%			75.9%	30.0%	27.2%	2.9%	5.4
	Aston	19	19	87.9%	220.7%	105.2%	362.1%			72.4%	41.4%	39.1%	2.3%	7.9
	Beaumont	21	21	95.3%	141.4%	105.2%	203.4%			88.5%	18.8%	18.3%	0.4%	5.4
	Belvoir Unit	9	9	133.0%	350.0%	189.7%	521.4%			98.9%	57.0%	45.1%	11.9%	24.6
AMH	Bosworth	20	19	87.9%	144.0%	100.0%	155.2%			73.6%	26.0%	25.8%	0.2%	5.7
Bradgate	Heather	17	17	85.5%	172.4%	98.3%	237.9%			63.2%	38.8%	34.8%	4.0%	6.8
	Thornton	20	18	84.9%	181.9%	98.3%	101.7%			69.0%	39.5%	38.9%	0.6%	6.6
	Watermead	20	19	86.8%	177.6%	100.0%	275.9%			75.9%	41.0%	34.5%	6.5%	6.6
	Griffin Female PICU	5	5	176.5%	242.3%	200.0%	158.6%			96.6%	46.2%	26.9%	19.4%	17.8
	HP Phoenix	12	11	97.4%	151.7%	100.0%	150.0%			96.6%	12.5%	12.0%	0.5%	9.8
	SH Skye Wing	30	27	111.2%	160.6%	193.1%	117.2%			96.6%	34.4%	34.0%	0.4%	5.0
AMH	Willows Unit	33	33	138.8%	205.4%	116.4%	231.0%			98.9%	21.6%	21.3%	0.3%	8.9
Other														
	ML Mill Lodge (New Site)	13	11	101.7%	217.2%	94.8%	160.3%			90.8%	35.8%	35.3%	0.6%	11.7
	BC Kirby	24	18	85.8%	231.9%	94.8%	127.6%			66.7%	29.5%	27.6%	1.9%	7.3
	BC Welford	23	22	79.3%	211.9%	94.8%	112.1%			57.5%	19.4%	18.8%	0.6%	5.6
CUS City	CB Beechwood	23	21	85.5%	234.4%	100.0%	101.7%	100%	100%	72.4%	19.5%	12.5%	7.0%	8.1
CHS City	CB Clarendon	23	21	90.3%	241.4%	98.3%	100.0%			73.6%	12.0%	6.7%	5.3%	6.5
	EC Coleman	20	19	61.5%	382.8%	94.8%	265.5%			28.7%	42.5%	42.4%	0.1%	10.2
	EC Gwendolen	20	15	87.1%	358.6%	94.8%	315.5%			72.4%	42.4%	41.2%	1.2%	13.3
	FP General	9	8	162.2%	89.9%	126.8%	-	100%	100%	74.7%	41.1%	27.1%	14.0%	8.1
	MM Dalgleish	17	14	99.1%	128.4%	112.1%	179.3%	100%	100%	94.3%	14.4%	11.0%	3.4%	8.1
CHS East	Rutland	14	11	100.0%	102.3%	96.6%	96.6%			81.6%	22.2%	10.8%	11.4%	6.6
	SL Ward 1 Stroke	17	15	84.9%	199.2%	100.0%	148.3%	100%	100%	71.3%	31.9%	24.9%	7.0%	10.1
	SL Ward 3	12	11	100.0%	135.3%	200.0%	103.4%	100%	100%	94.3%	34.6%	23.0%	11.6%	8.8
	CV Ellistown 2	18	15	100.9%	187.9%	200.0%	103.4%	100%	100%	97.7%	17.4%	11.3%	6.2%	9.4
	CV Snibston 1	14	12	114.8%	157.2%	93.7%	146.6%	100%	100%	79.3%	12.8%	10.4%	2.4%	11.5
CHS West	HB East Ward	22	19	83.2%	203.4%	101.7%	100.0%	100%	100%	65.5%	14.0%	7.1%	6.9%	7.4
	HB North Ward	19	17	124.1%	175.0%	101.7%	119.0%			96.6%	31.6%	22.9%	8.6%	7.4
	Lough Swithland	24	22	99.1%	238.8%	100.0%	200.0%			98.9%	13.4%	11.0%	2.4%	6.1
FYPC	Langley	11	10	100.7%	323.7%	100.0%	181.0%	100%		78.2%	58.4%	55.5%	3.0%	12.1
-	CV Ward 3	7	4	179.0%	532.7%	203.4%	893.1%			98.9%	73.1%	44.3%	28.7%	50.2
	Agnes Unit	12	7	279.3%	1003.4%	200.0%	979.3%			100.0%	49.5%	47.2%	2.3%	40.1
LD	The Gillivers	5	3	110.3%	195.2%	89.7%	148.3%			94.3%	13.0%	13.0%	0.0%	20.9
	The Grange	5	2	-	135.5%	-	200.0%			94.3%	15.6%	15.6%	0.0%	29.6
	Trust Total			103.6%	221.6%	113.2%	207.8%			74.5%	34.0%	28.6%	5.4%	

Annexe 2: Inpatient Ward triangulation staffing, CHPPD, vacancy factor and NSIs.

Trust thresholds are indicated below;

- Planned levels is >80% Green
- Temporary worker utilisation (bank and agency);
 - o green indicates threshold achieved less than 20%
 - o amber is above 20% utilisation
 - o red above 50% utilisation.

Adult Mental Health and Learning Disabilities Services (AMH/LD)

Acute Inpatient Wards

Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planne d shifts RN	NIGHT % of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Work ers%	CHPP D Care Hours Per Patien t Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
Ashby	20	87.9%	138.8%	98.3%	155.2%	30.0%	5.4	15.5%个	1↓	2	1	100%
Aston	19	87.9%	220.7%	105.2%	362.1%	41.4%	7.9	10.4%	1	2	1	80.0%
Beaumont	21	95.3%	141.4%	105.2%	203.4%	18.8%	5.4	4.4%	4↑	7个	1	nil
Belvoir Unit	9	133.0%	350.0%	189.7%	521.4%	57.0%	24.6	25.0%↓	1	0↓	1个	nil
Bosworth	19	87.9%	144.0%	100.0%	155.2%	26.0%	5.7	27.4%个	0→	0↓	0	nil
Heather	17	85.5%	172.4%	98.3%	237.9%	38.8%	6.8	17.7%	4↑	1↓	2个	nil
Thornton	18	84.9%	181.9%	98.3%	101.7%	39.5%	6.6	4.9%	1	0↓	1↑	100%
Watermead	19	86.8%	177.6%	100.0%	275.9%	41.0%	6.6	30.4%个	1↓	3↓	1个	nil
Griffin F PICU	5	176.5%	242.3%	200.0%	158.6%	46.2%	17.8	32.5%个	0	0	0	nil
TOTALS									13个	15↓	8个	

Table 3 - Acute inpatient ward safe staffing

Learning Disabilities (LD) Services

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHPPD					
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Workers %	Care Hours Per Patient Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
Agnes Unit	7	279.3%	1003.4%	200.0%	979.3%	47.2%	40.1	16.2%个	2个	7↓	0	nil
The Gillivers	3	110.3%	195.2%	89.7%	148.3%	13.0%	20.9	4.7%个	0	0\	0	90.0%
The Grange	2	-	135.5%	-	200.0%	15.6%	29.6	-9.3%↓	0	3↑	0	100%
TOTALS									2个	10↓	0	

Table 4 - Learning disabilities safe staffing

Low Secure Services – Herschel Prins

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHPPD					
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Worker s%	Care Hours Per Patient Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
HP Phoenix	11	97.4%	151.7%	100.0%	150.0%	12.5%	9.8	4.1%↓	0	0	0	nil

Table 5- Low secure safe staffing

Rehabilitation Services

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHPP D		•			
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planne d shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Worker s%	Care Hours Per Patien t Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
Skye Wing	27	111.2%	160.6%	193.1%	117.2%	34.4%	5.0	-10.1%	2个	1	0	nil
Willows Unit	33	138.8%	205.4%	116.4%	231.0%	21.6%	8.9	7.7%	0↓	1↓	0	nil
Mill Lodge	11	101.7%	217.2%	94.8%	160.3%	35.8%	11.7	7.6%↓	0	3↑	0	nil
TOTALS									2↓	5↓	0	

Table 6 - Rehabilitation service safe staffing

Community Health Services (CHS)

Community Hospitals

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHPPD					
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Workers%	Care Hours Per Patient Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
FP General	8	162.2%	89.9%	126.8%	ı	41.1%	8.1	30.3%	3个	2↓	0→	100%
MM Dalgliesh	14	99.1%	128.4%	112.1%	179.3%	14.4%	8.1	3.4%↑	0	5个	0	nil
Rutland	11	100.0%	102.3%	96.6%	96.6%	22.2%	6.6	28.9%	0	1↓	0↓	100%
SL Ward 1	15	84.9%	199.2%	100.0%	148.3%	31.9%	10.1	12.0%个	1↓	3	2个	100%
SL Ward 3	11	100.0%	135.3%	200.0%	103.4%	34.6%	8.8	27.6%	1↓	2	0	93.3%
CV Ellistown 2	15	100.9%	187.9%	200.0%	103.4%	17.4%	9.4	7.3%个	0↓	2↓	1↑	100%
CV Snibston 1	12	114.8%	157.2%	93.7%	146.6%	12.8%	11.5	14.7%	1↓	2↓	0	100%
HB East Ward	19	83.2%	203.4%	101.7%	100.0%	14.0%	7.4	2.3%↓	1↓	3↓	0	100%
HB North Ward	17	124.1%	175.0%	101.7%	119.0%	31.6%	7.4	24.7%↓	0	0	1	100%
Swithland	22	99.1%	238.8%	100.0%	200.0%	13.4%	6.1	19.1%	0	4	0	nil
CB Beechwood	21	85.5%	234.4%	100.0%	101.7%	19.5%	8.1	20.7%个	0↓	1↓	1个	100%
CB Clarendon	21	90.3%	241.4%	98.3%	100.0%	12.0%	6.5	14.1%	0↓	5个	1	100%
TOTALS									7↓	30↓	6个	

Table 7 - Community hospital safe staffing

Mental Health Services for Older People (MHSOP)

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHP PD		3			
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	Temp Worker s%	Care Hour s Per Pati ent Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
BC Kirby	18	85.8%	231.9%	94.8%	127.6%	29.5%	7.3	28.1%	1个	13个	0	nil
BC Welford	22	79.3%	211.9%	94.8%	112.1%	19.4%	5.6	19.8%↓	0	5个	0	nil
Coleman	19	61.5%	382.8%	94.8%	265.5%	42.5%	10.2	10.3%	1	4↓	0	nil
Gwendolen	15	87.1%	358.6%	94.8%	315.5%	42.4%	13.3	15.4%个	1	14↓	0↓	85.7%
TOTALS									3↑	36个	0↓	

Table 8 - Mental Health Services for Older People (MHSOP) safe staffing

Families, Young People and Children's Services (FYPC)

		DAY	DAY	NIGHT	NIGHT		CHP PD					•
Ward	Occupied beds	% of actual vs total planne d shifts RN	% of actual vs total planned shifts care HCSW	% of actual vs total planned shifts RN	% of actual vs total planne d shifts care HCSW	Temp Work ers%	Care Hour s Per Patie nt Day	Vacancy Factor	Medication errors	Falls	Complaints	FFT Promoter % (arrears)
Langley	10	100.7%	323.7%	100.0%	181.0%	58.4%	12.1	20.1%个	2	0	0	nil
CV Ward 3 - CAMHS	4	179.0%	532.7%	203.4%	893.1%	73.1%	50.2	-24.1%	2	0	1个	nil
TOTALS									4	0	1个	

Table 9 - Families, children and young people's services safe staffing