

Public Trust Board 31.8.21

Safety and Quality in Learning from Deaths Assurance (Quarter 1)

1. Purpose of the report

This report is presented to the Trust Board as assurance of the efficacy of the Learning from Deaths (LfD), Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP), Learning Disabilities Mortality Review (LeDeR), and Serious Incident (SI) processes in adherence to the National Quality Board (NQB) guidance on Learning from Deaths (2017). This Report presents data from April to June 2021 inclusive (Quarter 1: Q1), as well as data reviewed and learning from Quarter 4 (Q4: January-March 2021) at Leicestershire Partnership Trust (LPT).

2. Analysis of the issue

- The information presented in this report is collated by the patient safety team and allocated to each Directorate; LfD meetings are carried out within each Directorate, with the presence of the Trust Learning from Deaths Lead.
- As a means of improving from Q4, it is clear that demographic information is not being completed at a service level. We are now emphasising the importance of this data as a means of better understanding and overcoming potential health inequalities.
- We have welcomed 2 LeDer Practitioner nurses who attend the FYPC/LD LfD meetings as a means of timely insight into Learning Disabilities deaths.
- The Band 5 Governance and Quality Assurance co-ordinator (LfD) deaths is now advertised as a means of assisting with LfD process at LPT.
- Work is underway to standardise family feedback through bereavement letters or personalised phone calls.
- DMH/MHSOP has identified a number of themes which contribute to the deaths of patients which include: (1) Social Circumstance, (2) Chronic physical and mental health problems, and (3) Self-harm. These have been recommended to be added as categorised themes.

3. Proposal

The Board is asked to consider the content of this paper in alignment with Learning from Deaths guidance. The board is also asked to recognise the action and progress being in the LfD process at LPT.

4. Demographics

Demographic information is provided in Tables 1-5 (p.2). After working with our Information Team it is clear that demographic information is not being captured at a service level. In order to overcome gaps in demographic information, an in-depth discussion took place during the Trust wide LfD meeting, where it was agreed that we needed Directorate and Board Level Support to mandate the completion of demographic information at the service leevl, potentially as soon as a referral to LPT was initiated.

Gender	Table 1: Q1 Gender & Age Age Bands									
	1-28 (D)	1-28 (D) Up to 1-10 11-18 19- 25- 45- 65- 80+ Total 12 (M) (Y) 24 44 64 79								
Female	0	1	0	0	1	6	11	16	21	56
Male	0	2	1	0	0	10	11	24	17	65
Total	0	3	1	0	1	16	22	40	38	121

Table 1: 01 Gender & Age

Table 2: Q1 Ethnicity

Ethnicity					
English/Welsh/Scottish/Nor thern Irish /British/Irish	65%				
White & Black Carribean	2%				
Indian	12%				
Bangladeshi	1%				
Pakistani	4%				
Any other Asian Background	1%				
African	2%				
Not Recorded	14%				
Total	100%				

Table 3: Q1 Religion

Religion						
Christian	15%					
Hindu	7%					
Muslim	4%					
Sikh	1%					
Not recorded	74%					
Total	100%					

Table 4: Q1 Disability

Disability				
Disability	33%			
No Disability	6%			
Not recorded	61%			
Total	100%			

Table 5: Q1 Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation						
Heterosexual	21%					
Not Applicable	3%					
Not Disclosed	2%					
Not Recorded	74%					
Total	100%					

5. Number of Deaths reported and reviewed in Q4

In adherence with NHS/I (2017) recommendations, the number and percentages of deaths reviewed through mSJR case record review and the Serious Incident (SI) process across LPT in Q4 are shown in Table 6:

	Total number of deaths	Review		% of deaths	% of deaths subject	
Q4		mSJR	SI	subject to mSJR* Case record review	to an SI investigation	
	127	113	14			
Bre	akdown by Directorate		Number and % of deaths subject to mSJR* case record review completed	Number and % of deaths subject to an SI investigation completed		
CHS		mSJR	SI			
		33		31	2	
		31	2	100%	100%	
DMH/MHSOP	DMH/MHSOP			61	7	
		72	11	85%	64%	
FYPC/LD		11		9	1	
		10	1	90%	100%	

Table 6: Time lag in reviewing of deaths by Directorate

KEY

CHS: Community Health Services; DMH/MHSOP: Directorate of Mental Health/Mental Health Services for Older people; FYPC/LD: Families Young Persons and Children/Learning Disabilities

6. Learning themes and good practice

6.1 Learning themes identified

Learning and discussions associated with deaths in Q4 within the CHS directorate identified the importance of timely reviews as learning can be less effective if too much time has elapsed (themed as: C616: Clinical Care, Investigations). A resulting learning action was to take the learning from the reviews back into Directorate more frequently. Within DMH/MHSOP, Learning from Death discussions focused on the need for increased support for patients to access services outside of DMH/MHSOP, which include the GP, whom if the patients are unwell contact (C718: Clinical Care, multi-disciplinary, and inter-speciality liaison) – which will be fed back into services, as a means of increasing support. In FYPC/LD it was emphasised that there was a need for timely and robust information sharing across multiple agencies (C718: Clinical Care, multi-disciplinary team working continuity of care). A quality review has been organised with AHP/Nursing/safeguarding and Patient safety to develop actions based on the learning. Additional learning from all directorates is provided in Appendix 1 (p.6).

6.2 Examples of good practice

Examples of good practice in the current Quarter (Q1) consisted of:

- **CHS:** Derbyshire Health United (DHU) had thoroughly reviewed and communicated the care provided to CHS EOL patients, as a means of enhancing the use of ReSPECT documentation and to have better informed decision making.
- **DMH/MHSOP:** Actions from CPN in which discussions regarding the end of life and advance care planning were initiated with GP, encouraging connected working to benefit our patients.
- **FYPC/LD:** Diana Team and Physiotherapists went over and beyond to support mother following a patient's death.

7. Number of deaths reported during Q1

Table 7 shows the number of deaths reported by each Directorate for Q1. Formal investigations consist of Serious Incident (SI) investigations and modified Structured Judgement Reviews (mSJR) case record reviews:

- There were 121 deaths in Q1.
- There were a total of 16 deaths which are for Serious Incident Investigation.
- There were 12 adult deaths of individuals with Learning Disabilities which are undergoing LeDer review, and are to be reviewed using the mSJR case record review within FYPC.

Q1 Mortality Data 2021										
	Apr		May			Jun			Total	
Q1	С	D	F	С	D	F	С	D	F	121
Number of Deaths	18	23	7	9	19	2	9	26	8	
		C	onsiderat	ion for f	ⁱ ormal inve	stigati	on			
	С	D	F [†]	С	D	F [†]	С	D	F [†]	
Serious Incident	1	4	0	1	2	0	1	6	1	16
mSJR* Case record review	17	19	7	8	17	2	8	20	7	105
Number completed	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Learning Disabilities deaths	-	-	5	-	-	2	-		5	12
Number of deaths reviewed/investigated and as a result considered more likely than not to be due to problems in care	0	0	0	NK	NK	NK	NK	NK	NK	-

Table 7: Number of deaths (Q1)

KEY C: Community Health Services; D: Directorate of Mental Health/MHSOP; F: Families Young Persons and Children/LD

8. Decision required

The Trust Board is required to confirm assurance on the implementation of the National Quality Boards Learning from Deaths guidance within the Trust.

9. Governance table

For Board and Board Committees:	Trust Board			
Paper presented by:	Dr Avinash Hiremath			
Paper sponsored by:	Professor Al-Uzri			
Paper authored by:	Saydia Razak & Tracy W	ard		
Date submitted:	24.8.21			
State which Board Committee or other forum within the	Learning from Deaths			
Trust's governance structure, if any, have previously	Meeting (27 th July 2021))		
considered the report/this issue and the date of the relevant meeting(s):				
If considered elsewhere, state the level of assurance gained	Report provided to the			
by the Board Committee or other forum i.e. assured/ partially	Trust Board quarterly			
assured / not assured:				
State whether this is a 'one off' report or, if not, when an	Report provided to the			
update report will be provided for the purposes of corporate	Trust Board quarterly			
Agenda planning				
STEP up to GREAT strategic alignment*:	High Standards	\checkmark		
	Transformation			
	Environments			
	Patient Involvement	\checkmark		
	Well Governed			
	Single Patient Record			
	Equality, Leadership,			
	Culture			
	Access to Services			
	Trust wide Quality	\checkmark		
	Improvement			
Organisational Risk Register considerations:	List risk number and title of risk	1, 3		
Is the decision required consistent with LPT's risk appetite:	na			
False and misleading information (FOMI) considerations:	na			
Positive confirmation that the content does not risk the	yes			
safety of patients or the public				
Equality considerations:	considered			

Appendix 1. Examples of Learning

Learning	Learning Impact	Learning Action						
Code/Theme								
CHS Q4								
C514: Clinical Care,	Lack of documentation impacted	Discussed with individual staff						
Clinical documentation	on case review does not	member to promote learning.						
within the clinical record	promote good practice. This is an ongoing theme.							
C24: Clinical Care,	Medical plans are not always	Nurse consultant to monitor via						
Communication,	followed particularly during the	monthly readmission report and						
Management	OOH period. Discussion	learning from death reviews.						
	regarding advocacy of nursing							
	staff for patients.							
C718: Clinical Care, multi-	DMH/MHSOP: Q4	Loorning to be fedback into convince						
disciplinary, and inter-	Learning from Death discussions focused on the need for	Learning to be fedback into services.						
speciality liaison	increased support for patients to							
speciality haison	access services outside of							
	DMH/MHSOP, which include the							
	GP, whom if the patients are							
	unwell contact.							
DMH/MHSOP: Q1 Learning was possible as discussed in most recent LfD meetings								
C927: Clinical Care,	Discussed the succinct follow up	Actions by individual teams						
Monitoring, Recognition	of patients who do not engage	escalated to them by						
& Escalation/Ceiling of	with CAP, and the importance of	representatives of mortality						
Care, escalation / Ceiling	knowing when to escalate or	surveillance group.						
of Care	follow up those patients who							
	exhibit a lack of engagement.							
	FYPC/LD: Q4							
C718: Clinical Care, multi- disciplinary team working continuity of care	The need for information sharing across multiple agencies.	A quality review has been organised with AHP/Nursing/safeguarding and Patient safety to develop actions based on the learning.						
		succes on the learning.						
FYPC/LD: Q1: Lea	FYPC/LD: Q1: Learning was possible as discussed in most recent LfD meetings							
C1030: Clinical Care,	Discussions surrounded a	Themes and Findings are now						
Known to safeguarding	patient's last contact with LPT	shared at Clinical Leadership Forum						
	and how the patient was on a	and DMT Quality and Safety						
	child protection plan.	meeting.						

Abbreviations AHP: Allied Health Professional; CAP: Central Access Point, OOH: Out Of Hospital