



**TRUSTEES REPORT
EXTRACTS – 30 SEPTEMBER 2007**

Significant events

Proposal for a national audit of the management of children with reduced consciousness

It will be recalled from the reports of the trustees for the years 2003 through to 2006 that for the reasons given, the Foundation had financed the development of a national guideline for the management of children with a reduced conscious level at a cost of £96,000. The full guideline is available on line www.nottingham.ac.uk/paediatric-guideline . This guideline includes inter-alia an audit tool kit which identifies six recommendations which can be audited by means of case-note review.

In last year's report to the trustees, Prof. Terence Stephenson (in his capacity as Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, the Medical School, Nottingham) stated that the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH) was submitting an application to the Foundation for an audit of the guideline, including the dissemination process. The application for the grant was duly received in April 2007 and was estimated to cost £73,587. The project methodology was to be undertaken in two phases – phase 1 – scoping i.e. a review survey to establish which aspects of the audit require particular study/investigation (3-4 months) and phase 2 – national audit study itself (9-16 months). The application was sent for comment to Dr John Glasgow, chair of the Foundation's Medical and Scientific Board and to Dr Susan Hall.

Dr Susan Hall has submitted the following statement concerning the application:-

"I was asked to comment on the proposal for a national audit of the management of children with reduced consciousness which had been prepared by individual members of the RCPCH. The first and most important point to make was that it seemed to me to be a project which was eminently suitable for funding by the Foundation. It represented a natural progression from previously funded projects and it clearly is important to determine whether the guideline is being used properly and whether dissemination has been satisfactory. Furthermore the applicants had a proven track record in this type of project. A successful project would in addition be a model or template for future work so the benefits for paediatric practice might extend beyond this particular audit. However in my view there were a number of important points which needed to be clarified before I could recommend that funding be agreed. These were detailed in my submission."

This concludes the report of Dr Susan Hall

The following is a report by Dr John Glasgow:-

Like Dr Susan Hall I considered the application carefully. It seemed right and logical that the proposal should be supported by the Foundation as it is a natural progression to the production of the guideline with Dr. Richard Bowker (the Research Fellow). In a general sense I felt that if we could get the study design clear and precise, it might also provide a basis for audit assessments of other or future RCPCH guidelines.



Proposal for a national audit of the management of children with reduced consciousness (continued)

On 20 July 2007 I wrote to Prof. Terence Stephenson and raised a number of questions and issues which had been raised and which needed to be addressed. These wide-ranging concerns were set out in my letter. A major consideration was that the time required for the two phases of the project seemed to be flexible. My letter to the applicants contained the following paragraph viz: -

“We wonder how you would respond to the criticism that currently there are too many unknowns in the data gathering and analysis phase, so it is hard to know whether you are asking for too much funding or too little. A more realistic, initial approach might be to request funds for phase 1 i.e. restrict the application to the scoping/development phase. This would allow you to spell out in more detail what precisely is entailed here, who would/should do the work, how the methodology would be applied, how long it would take and its costs. Then if and when this has been successful, to submit a more evidence-based application for phase 2 with a clearer plan and more realistic costings. We hope that this possible re-structuring of the proposal might appeal: We feel it has much merit”.

This suggestion was accepted by the applicants. A new proposal for phase 1 was submitted to the Foundation in April 2008.

This concludes the report of Dr. John Glasgow.