

## Analysis of the assessment scores for surgical centres produced by the Independent Expert Panel (chaired by Professor Sir Ian Kennedy)

### Overview

The evaluation process undertaken by Professor Sir Ian Kennedy's Panel, and the scores produced were based on the following broad areas of assessment:

- Leadership and Strategic Vision
- Strength of network
- Staffing and activity
- Inter-dependent services
- Facilities and capacity
- Age appropriate care
- Information and choices
- Ensuring excellent care
- Deliverability and achievability

The pre-decision business case states that *'the criteria for designation were taken from the proposed clinical standards – endorsed by the relevant professional associations and developed in partnership with stakeholders across the country' and '...other criteria were applied to this phase of the assessment process around 'leadership and strategic vision' and 'deliverability and achievability...'*.

It should be noted that criterion 'deliverability and achievability' was never considered by the assessment panel, as the panel did not consider it had the necessary expertise to score this section. The assessment therefore considered 'core' elements of the proposed clinical standards along with details associated with 'leadership and strategic vision'.

The weightings/ maximum scores achievable in the assessment process are detailed in the Table A.

Table A: Criterion and associated weightings

Rank	Criterion	Maximum score / weighting	Percentage of maximum score
1	Staffing and activity	130	21.3%
2	Leadership and Strategic Vision	120	19.7%
3=	Strength of network	70	11.5%
3=	Interdependent services	70	11.5%
3=	Facilities and capacity	70	11.5%
6	Ensuring excellent care	60	9.8%
7=	Age appropriate care	45	7.4%
7=	Information and choices	45	7.4%
	Total	610	100.1%

*Please note: As the criteria around deliverability and achievability were never considered by the Kennedy Panel, the criterion is not included in the above table.*

Within the 'Strategic Vision and Leadership' criterion, the Kennedy panel assessed the following elements:

- Organisation's main aims etc
- IT and estates strategy
- How proposals contribute to key objectives
- Current service delivery arrangements
- Stakeholder groups and contribution
- Critical success factors
- Internal/ external factors
- Constraints and risks
- Benefits
- Opportunities for innovative working
- How the team learns, develops and grows

Within the core standards considered, the Kennedy Panel assessed centres' across three areas:

- current performance against the standards;
- development plans; and,
- the impact of increased activity (i.e ability to meet the minimum of 400 surgical procedures).

### Service Standards

It is clear from the available documentation that in its assessment of quality, the Kennedy Panel took account of 'core standards' within the Service Standards produced by Children's Congenital Cardiac Services in England. While additional standards have subsequently been agreed by the JCPCT, it is understood that the Kennedy Panel assessments reflected the March 2010, Service Standards document.

Based on the March 2010, Service Standards document, the analysis in Table B may be useful:

Table B: Designation standards

<b>Designation Standard</b>	<b>Number of Standards</b>	<b>Number of Core Standards</b>	<b>Percentage of 'Core standards'</b>
A Congenital Heart Network for the Child and Family	28	8	29%
Prenatal Diagnosis	10	1	10%
The Specialist Surgical Centre	68	18	26%
Age Appropriate Care	8	8	100%
Information and Making Decision	13	13	100%
The Family Experience	15	2	13%
Excellent Care	14	3	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>34%</b>

## Re-weighted Criterion

As a result of feedback provided during the consultation period regarding the importance of 'co-location of services', the JCPCT undertook a sensitivity test using re-weighted assessment criteria. The re-weightings used are presented on page 170 of the decision-making business case and have been used to produce Table C, below.

Table C1: Re-weighted criterion

Revised Rank	Criterion	Maximum score		Variance
		Original	Re-weighted	
1	Staffing and activity	130	130	0
1=	Interdependent services	70	130	+60
3	Leadership and Strategic Vision	120	102	-18
4=	Strength of network	70	60	-10
4=	Facilities and capacity	70	60	-10
6	Ensuring excellent care	60	51	-9
7=	Age appropriate care	45	38	-7
7=	Information and choices	45	38	-7
<b>Totals</b>		<b>610</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>-1</b>

*Please note: As the criteria around deliverability and achievability were never considered by the Kennedy Panel, the criterion is not included in the above table.*

Table C2: Criterion and associated re-weightings

Rank	Criterion	Maximum score / weighting	Percentage of maximum score
1	Staffing and activity	130	21.3%
1=	Interdependent services	130	21.3%
3	Leadership and Strategic Vision	102	16.7%
4=	Strength of network	60	9.9%
4=	Facilities and capacity	60	9.9%
6	Ensuring excellent care	51	8.4 %
7=	Age appropriate care	38	6.2 %
7=	Information and choices	38	6.2 %
<b>Totals</b>		<b>609</b>	<b>99.9%</b>

*Please note: As the criteria around deliverability and achievability were never considered by the Kennedy Panel, the criterion is not included in the above table.*

## Comparison of the original and re-weighted criterion

Table D details the differences between the overall Kennedy Panel scores detailed in the original public consultation document and the re-weighted Kennedy Panel scores following feedback around the importance of co-location of services provided during the consultation period.

Table D: Analysis of the application of the original and re-weighted criterion

Original Kennedy Panel scores			Re-weighted Kennedy Panel scores		
<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Score</i>
1	Evelina	535 (88%)	1	Evelina	544 (89%)
2	Southampton	513 (84%)	2	Southampton	513 (84%)
3	Birmingham	495 (81%)	3	Birmingham	507 (83%)
4=	GOSH	464 (76%)	4	GOSH	478 (78%)
4=	Brompton	464 (76%)	5	Brompton	467 (77%)
6	Bristol	449 (74%)	6	Bristol	454 (75%)
7	Newcastle	425 (70%)	7	Liverpool	430 (71%)
8	Liverpool	420 (69%)	8	Newcastle	420 (69%)
9	Leicester	402 (66%)	9	Leeds	414 (68%)
10	Leeds	401 (66%)	10	Leicester	382 (63%)
11	Oxford	237 (39%)	11	Oxford	235 (39%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>610</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>609</b>

## Comparison and analysis of the original and re-weighted criterion

The following tables provide analysis of the original and re-weighted scores.

Table E: Analysis of the scores against the designation standards using the original and re-weighted criterion

Kennedy assessment scores using the 7 designation standards areas (excluding Leadership & Vision)			Re-weighted Kennedy assessment scores using the 7 designation standards areas (excluding Leadership & Vision)		
<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Score</i>
1	Evelina	424 (87%)	1	Evelina	447 (88%)
2	Southampton	417 (85%)	2	Southampton	431 (85%)
3	Birmingham	393 (80%)	3	Birmingham	419 (83%)
4	Brompton	370 (76%)	4	GOSH	395 (78%)
5	GOSH	367 (75%)	5	Brompton	387 (76%)
6	Bristol	359 (73%)	6	Bristol	376 (74%)
7	Liverpool	339 (69%)	7	Liverpool	360 (71%)
8	Newcastle	326 (67%)	8	Leeds	347 (68%)
9	Leeds	323 (66%)	9	Newcastle	335 (66%)
10	Leicester	312 (64%)	10	Leicester	306 (60%)
11	Oxford	184 (38%)	11	Oxford	192 (38%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>490</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>507</b>

Considering quality as the assessment against the 7 [core] designation standards is likely to have an impact on the overall 'total score for quality'.

Using the original and re-weighted criterion, the following tables analyse the Kennedy Panel scores against the 7 core designation standards and:

- (a) centres' current performance against the standards;
- (b) centres' development plans; and,
- (c) the impact of increased activity (i.e. ability to meet the minimum of 400 surgical procedures).

Table F: Analysis of 'centres' current performance against the standards' scores using the original and re-weighted criterion

Kennedy assessment scores: centres' current performance against the standards			Re-weighted Kennedy assessment scores: centres' current performance against the standards)		
Ranking	Centre	Score	Ranking	Centre	Score
1	Southampton	78 (78%)	1	Southampton	81 (88%)
2	GOSH	76 (76%)	2	GOSH	80 (88%)
3	Evelina	75 (75%)	3	Evelina	79 (88%)
4	Birmingham	70 (70%)	4	Birmingham	74 (88%)
5	Brompton	69 (69%)	5=	Brompton	72 (88%)
6	Leeds	68 (68%)	5=	Leeds	72 (88%)
7	Liverpool	66 (66%)	7	Liverpool	70 (88%)
8	Bristol	65 (65%)	8	Bristol	67 (88%)
9	Newcastle	63 (63%)	9	Newcastle	65 (88%)
10	Leicester	54 (54%)	10	Leicester	53 (88%)
11	Oxford	45 (45%)	11	Oxford	46 (88%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>103</b>

Table G: Analysis of 'centres' development plans' scores using the original and re-weighted criterion

Kennedy assessment scores: centres' development plans			Re-weighted Kennedy assessment scores: centres' development plans		
Ranking	Centre	Score	Ranking	Centre	Score
1	Evelina	88 (88%)	1	Evelina	91 (91%)
2	Southampton	86 (86%)	2	Southampton	89 (89%)
3	Birmingham	83 (83%)	3	Birmingham	86 (86%)
4	Brompton	77 (77%)	4=	Brompton	79 (79%)
5=	Bristol	75 (75%)	4=	GOSH	79 (79%)
5=	GOSH	75 (75%)	6=	Bristol	77 (77%)
7=	Leeds	73 (73%)	6=	Leeds	77 (77%)
7=	Liverpool	73 (73%)	6=	Liverpool	77 (77%)
7=	Newcastle	73 (73%)	9	Newcastle	74 (74%)
10	Leicester	63 (63%)	10	Leicester	62 (62%)
11	Oxford	39 (39%)	11	Oxford	38 (38%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>100</b>

Table H: Analysis of 'centres' ability to meet the minimum of 400 surgical procedures' scores using the original and re-weighted criterion

Kennedy assessment scores: ability to meet the minimum of 400 surgical procedures			Re-weighted Kennedy assessment scores: ability to meet the minimum of 400 surgical procedures		
Ranking	Centre	Score	Ranking	Centre	Score
1	Evelina	261 (90%)	1	Evelina	277 (91%)
2	Southampton	253 (87%)	2	Southampton	261 (86%)
3	Birmingham	240 (83%)	3	Birmingham	259 (85%)
4	Brompton	224 (77%)	4=	Brompton	236 (78%)
5	Bristol	219 (76%)	4=	GOSH	236 (78%)
6	GOSH	216 (74%)	6	Bristol	232 (76%)
7	Liverpool	200 (69%)	7	Liverpool	213 (70%)
8	Leicester	195 (67%)	8	Leeds	198 (65%)
9	Newcastle	190 (66%)	9	Newcastle	196 (64%)
10	Leeds	182 (63%)	10	Leicester	191 (63%)
11	Oxford	100 (34%)	11	Oxford	108 (36%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>290</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>304</b>

Table I: Analysis of 'centres' Leadership and strategic vision' scores using the original and re-weighted criterion

Kennedy assessment scores: Leadership and strategic vision			Re-weighted Kennedy assessment scores: Leadership and strategic vision		
Ranking	Centre	Score	Ranking	Centre	Score
1	Evelina	111 (93%)	1	Evelina	97 (95%)
2	Birmingham	102 (85%)	2	Birmingham	88 (86%)
3	Newcastle	99 (83%)	3	Newcastle	85 (83%)
4	GOSH	97 (81%)	4	GOSH	83 (81%)
5	Southampton	96 (80%)	5	Southampton	82 (80%)
6	Brompton	94 (78%)	6	Brompton	80 (78%)
7	Bristol	90 (75%)	7	Bristol	78 (76%)
7=	Leicester	90 (75%)	8	Leicester	76 (75%)
9	Liverpool	81 (68%)	9	Liverpool	70 (68%)
10	Leeds	78 (85%)	10	Leeds	67 (66%)
11	Oxford	53 (44%)	11	Oxford	43 (42%)
<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>120</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>		<b>102</b>