## THE MORECAMBE BAY INVESTIGATION

Chaired by Dr Bill Kirkup CBE

## SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION AT THE PANEL MEETING

## **THURSDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2014**

The Morecambe Bay Investigation held its fourth Panel Meeting on Thursday 13 February at Park Hotel, Preston.

In attendance were:

Julian Brookes - Expert Advisor on Governance Stewart Forsyth - Expert Advisor on Paediatrics Jacqui Featherstone – Expert Advisor on Midwifery Jonathan Montgomery – Expert Advisor on Ethics Catherine Calderwood - Expert Advisor on Obstetrics Oonagh McIntosh - Secretary to the Investigation Tom Bacon – Deputy Secretary to the Investigation Paul Roberts – Documents and Evidence Manager

No	Item	Lead Person
1	Welcome and opening comments	
	The Investigation's Chairman, Bill Kirkup, was unable to attend the Meeting. In his absence Julian Brookes, the Investigation's expert advisor on governance chaired the meeting.	
2	Apologies	
Apologies were received from the Panel's expert advisor on nursing, Geraldine Walters.		
3	Actions from the last Panel Meeting and matters arising	Oonagh McIntosh
The Panel discussed the recent meeting of a subgroup of the Panel with an academic		

The Panel discussed the recent meeting of a subgroup of the Panel with an academic team in the University of Leicester who regularly undertake case reviews. The purpose of the visit was to understand the methodology they applied and determine whether it could be adopted by the Investigation. The work in the University of Leicester focused heavily on current (and anonymised) cases that are out of scope of the Investigation's work. However the Panel agreed there were some aspects of the methodology that could be usefully employed.

Independent investigation into the management, delivery and outcomes of care provided by the Maternity and Neonatal services of University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay Trust from January 2004 – June 2013

The Panel agreed that when undertaking its case reviews it would be important for them to have a standard set of documents against which decisions could be benchmarked. The Investigation would require this set of documents to be produced in a historically linear format so that conclusions could be drawn against the relevant policies and guidance in place at that time.

The Panel commented that the Investigation should address the question of what training midwifery staff received before joining the Trust. This would be reviewed by a subgroup of the Panel to determine the most appropriate way it should be included in the Investigation

There was a further discussion on the informal visits which took place to the Trust after the last Panel Meeting. These were considered to have been useful in understanding the layout of the units, how care is currently delivered as we as how improvements have been made.

4 Update on the Notice the Investigation placed in local papers. Tom Bacon

The Panel were updated on the Notice the Investigation placed in local papers during the last two weeks of January. The response to this Notice had been good with the Investigation having been contacted by a number of individuals wishing to share relevant information. The Panel agreed these new cases should be considered as part of the Investigation's work but that the individuals concerned would not routinely need to provide the Panel with oral evidence.

The Panel asked the Secretariat to ensure all respondents were informed of whether the Investigation will be considering their information or not within its terms of reference. The Panel also agreed, for the purposes of managing the Investigation's work that a date should be set after which no new cases could be reviewed. This date would be informed by the time taken to review individual cases and the date by which the Investigation intends to report.

5	Neonatal outcomes	Stewart Forsyth

The Panel discussed some of the initial data regarding neonatal outcomes. The Panel considered the potential complexities given the Trust's size of relying too heavily on statistical data to produce recommendations. The Panel reiterated the need to understand both what the statistics show them as well as what the Investigation can reasonably have expected the Trust to have been aware of from both the information and the analytical assessments they had access to.

6	Assessing the evidence	Julian Brooks /
		Oonagh
		McIntosh

The Panel agreed for the purposes of assessing the evidence four subgroups would be formed around the emerging themes. These groups would cover clinical matters, matters concerning Trust management, responses to adverse events in the Trust from external organisations and a final overarching group who would take the lead on the initial composition and drafting of the Report. Each group would take the lead on reviewing the evidence relating to their theme and alert colleagues if and when any evidence they had reviewed would be of relevance to another subgroup considering another theme. The Panel considered that this approach would best allow the Investigation to address its terms of reference within the tight timeframes while avoiding a degree of duplication created by all Panel members reviewing all of the evidence. The Panel agreed that careful coordination would be required should any interviewee have responsibilities that spanned more than one subgroup.

The groups would be comprised as follows, with the lead Panel member in each group (where selected) denoted in bold:

- Clinical: Catherine Calderwood, Stewart Forsyth, Jacqui Featherstone, Geraldine Walters, Bill Kirkup;
- Trust management: Geraldine Walters, Julian Brookes, Jonathan Montgomery,
  Stewart Forsyth, Jacqui Featherstone, Bill Kirkup; [lead member to be assigned]
- External response: Julian Brookes, Geraldine Walters, Jonathan Montgomery,
  Catherine Calderwood, Bill Kirkup; and
- Report: Bill Kirkup supported by the Investigation Secretary and Panel.

7	Evidence	Paul Roberts

The Investigation's Documents and Evidence Manager explained the approach the Investigation would take to store and present the Panel with evidence. The Panel endorsed a draft set of search terms for the Secretariat to use in identifying which sub group the evidence is of initial pertinence too.

8 Presentation on commissioning by NHS England

The Panel were given a presentation on the approach to, and policy on, commissioning from NHS England before, during and after the period included in the Investigation's terms of reference.

9	Any other business	
None were raised.		
10	Date and venue of next meeting	
The next Panel Meeting will take place on Wednesday 5 March, at Park Hotel, Preston.		Hotel, Preston.