


Executive Director Lead: Melanie Wilkey
 Commissioning Lead: Krysta Hallewell
 Commissioning Team: Neuro-Sciences
 Date of Escalation Meetings: 28/04/2026
 Date Last Reviewed by Quality & Patient Safety Committee: 27/04/2026


**Service in Escalation:
 Specialist Auditory Implant Device Service**

Current Escalation Level 3

Escalation Trend Level

| Trend | Rationale | Current Trend Level |
|-------|-----------------------------|--|
| ↓ | Escalation level lowered |  June 26 |
| ↔ | Escalation remains the same | |
| ↑ | Escalation level escalated | |

Escalation Trajectory:



Escalation History:

| Date | Escalation Level |
|--------------|------------------|
| October 2025 | 3 |

Rationale for Escalation Status: Due to insufficient progress against agreed improvement actions monitored through the quarterly Service Performance Management meetings since January 2024, and continued underperformance against the RTT position relative to the specific ministerial target for this patient cohort, the Neurosciences, Long Term Conditions and Rare Conditions Commissioning Team recommends escalation to **Level 3 – Escalated Measures**.

The service now requires significant and sustained improvement, with Executive-level oversight and intervention necessary to address performance risks and secure recovery against agreed standards.

Background Information:

The escalation of the Cardiff and Vale Specialist Auditory Implant Device Service to **Level 3** of the NWJCC Escalation Framework was initiated in October 2025 and endorsed by the NWJCC Senior Leadership Team.

The NWJCC assurance and confidence rating remains **Low**. A formal escalation letter was issued to Cardiff and Vale UHB on 6 October 2025. However, delays in confirming a named Executive Lead and Health Board availability resulted in a postponement of the initial escalation meeting.

The first formal escalation meeting was subsequently held on 22 January 2026.

| Action (NWJCC Lead: Director of Commissioning): | Action Due Date | Completion Date |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Escalation endorsed by SLT | Oct 25 | Oct 25 |
| Escalation letter sent to CVUHB | Oct 25 | Oct 25 |
| Escalation meeting to discuss detail and progress against action plan (every 4 weeks) | Ongoing | Ongoing |

Issues/Risks:

February 2026 Update – Commissioning and provider teams to jointly clarify: Historic and current commissioning expectations for CT scans, where clinical interpretation of scans should take place and whether pathway changes created unintended delays.

April 2026 update the pre-surgical CT scan pathway remains an open action. Progress has been made on the Long-Term Agreement (LTA), and the service will share the draft in due course. The service has highlighted the impact of additional activity undertaken to reduce backlog pressures, noting a decline in staff morale. There is a recognised risk that ongoing pressures on staff wellbeing may contribute to increased sickness absence. Escalation meeting planned for the 16th April has been moved to the 28th of April at the request of the service.

June 2026 – There has been significant progress in addressing the 52 week waits in the service and there are no patients currently at 52 weeks working towards a 36-week target. Work ongoing with the review and rebasing of the LTA. The pre surgical scan pathway is still an open action with an SOP in draft. An operational manager has been moved into the service for support but there are still some concerns around stress wellbeing with the service being stretched due to increased activity to reduce the longest waiters.

Executive Director Lead: Adrian Clarke
 Commissioning Lead: Adrian Clarke
 Commissioning Team: Mental Health
 Date of Escalation Meetings: 30/04/2026
 Date Last Reviewed by Quality & Patient Safety Committee: 27/04/2026


Escalation Trend Level

Service in Escalation:
 Caswell

Current Escalation Level 3

| Trend | Rationale | Current Trend Level |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| ↓ | Escalation level lowered | June 2026 |
| ↔ | Escalation remains the same | |
| ↑ | Escalation level escalated | |

Escalation Trajectory:



Escalation History:

| Date | Escalation Level |
|------------|------------------|
| January 25 | 3 |

Rationale for Escalation Status: The service has been placed under formal escalation due to sustained concerns relating to safety and quality within the facility. A site visit by NWJCC representatives in July 2025 identified significant safety and quality concerns. These were reported to the JC in September 2025, which commissioned a full-service review.

The review, undertaken between 15 September and 3 October 2025, assessed compliance with recognised Medium Secure Unit standards and included patient-level review. It identified serious safety and quality issues requiring urgent action.

Similar concerns had been raised in a 2022 NCCU review and were echoed in a June 2025 independent report on Swansea Bay University Health Board’s Mental Health and Learning Disability services, which highlighted compromised care standards and weaknesses in leadership and oversight.

The findings indicate systemic governance and safety risks requiring immediate improvement action and strengthened executive oversight.

Background Information:

The escalation of the Caswell Clinic Service to Level 3 of the NWJCC Escalation Framework was initiated and endorsed by the NWJCC Senior Leadership Team in October 2025, following significant safety and governance concerns.

Following engagement with the Swansea Bay Executive Team, the service was placed in Level 3 escalation, with weekly improvement meetings established with Caswell senior leaders and monthly oversight meetings with the Health Board Executive. A detailed improvement plan aligned to recognised standards was developed, with a number of urgent actions identified. Admissions were paused pending assurance that immediate safety risks had been addressed.

| Action (NWJCC Lead- Director of Mental Health AC) | Action Due Date | Completion Date |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| In Committee update to JCC members | October 2025 | October 2025 |
| Letter to SBUHB Executive team | October 2025 | October 2025 |
| JCC to meet with Caswell SLT on a weekly basis | Complete | Complete |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|
| <p>February 2026 Update</p> <p>Admissions were suspended in September 2025 due to significant staff and patient safety concerns. Immediate risk mitigation actions were implemented over a three-month period. Assurance was received in January 2026, and admissions recommenced on 9 January 2026.</p> <p>Robust oversight remains in place, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly meetings between MHLDVG and Caswell senior leadership to monitor delivery of the action plan, with independent verification of completed actions. Fortnightly meetings between the MHLDVG Director and Swansea Bay Executive Team to seek further assurance and address delivery risks. <p>The service remains in Level 3 escalation. Decisions regarding de-escalation will be taken jointly by the MHLDVG and NWJCC Nursing and Quality teams once sustained improvement and compliance are demonstrated.</p> | Suspension for new admissions to the clinic | Complete | Complete |
| | JCC to meet with Caswell SLT on a fortnightly basis | Complete | Complete |
| | Clinic reopen to admissions | January 2026 | January 2026 |
| | JCC to meet with Caswell Team and Executive Lead monthly | April 2026 | ongoing |

Issues/Risks:


The service remains in Level 3 escalation. Decisions regarding de-escalation will be taken jointly by the MHLDVG and NWJCC Nursing and Quality teams once sustained improvement and compliance are demonstrated.

Caswell Clinic remain in Level 3 escalation. Discussions have been held within JCC to establish what needs to be done in order to reduce the level of escalation in the future. Caswell Clinic have been asked to complete the evidence section of the MHLDVG action plan. This will give the JCC a description of what the service has done in order to resolve or mitigate the issues raised at the time of the initial review. Once that has been received by the MHLDVG division, each action will be reviewed against the evidence supplied with a view to understanding what level of progress has been made and what the ongoing escalation level will be. The current series of meetings between the MHLDVG and SBUHB have been suspended and will be rearranged following receipt of the updated action plan from the service in order to ensure that the ongoing meetings are relevant, with the appropriate personnel, and discuss relevant points of the action plan”.

June 2026 – Following receipt of a consolidated report in late April 2026 evidencing significant progress against the original review findings, commissioning, quality safety and medical teams have undertaken a detailed assessment to identify the remaining actions required for de-escalation to level 2 monitoring. More integrated oversight arrangements are in place, via monthly escalation meetings from April 2026, with ongoing engagement with the service to support delivery. A clear set of outstanding actions are in place with the health board, with a commitment to review and sign off evidence on a rolling basis.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Level 1 ENHANCED MONITORING | <p>Any quality or performance concern will be reviewed by the Commissioning Team. Enhanced monitoring is a pro-active response to put effective processes in place to drive improvement. It is an initial fact finding exercise which should ideally be led by the provider and closely monitored and reviewed by the commissioning team. The enquiry will lead to one of the following possible outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action is required routine monitoring will continue. The concern which raised the indication for inquiry will be logged and referred to during the routine monitoring process to ensure this has not developed any further. • Continued intervention is required at level 1 and a review date agreed. • Escalation to Level 2 if further intervention is required <p>There is the potential for reporting via commissioning team report to Quality Patient Safety Committee and through SLA meetings with provider</p> |
| Level 2 ESCALATED INTERVENTION | <p>Escalated intervention will be initiated if Level I Enhanced Monitoring identifies the need for further investigation/intervention. There should be a Co-ordinated and/or unilateral action designed to strengthen the capacity and capability of the service. At this stage there should be jointly agreed objectives between the provider and commissioner and monitored through the relevant commissioning team. Frequency of meeting with provider should be at least quarterly and possible interventions will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider performance meetings • Triangulation of data with other quality indicators • Advice from external advisors • Monitoring of any action plans <p>A risk assessment should be undertaken, and logged on the Commissioning Team Risk Register. Where appropriate the risk will be included on the JCC Risk Management Framework. Reporting is via commissioning team report to Quality Patient Safety Committee report and SLA meetings with provider. The investigation will lead to on to the following possible outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plan and monitoring are completed within the allocated timeframe, evidence of progress and assurance the concern has been addressed. De-escalation to Level 1 for ongoing monitoring. • If the action plan is not adhered to and further concerns are raised by the Commissioning team or by the provider team or further concerns are identified it may be necessary to move to Level 3 Escalated Measures |
| Level 3 ESCALATED MEASURES | <p>Where there is evidence that the Action Plan developed following Level 2 has failed to meet the required outcomes or a serious concern is identified a service will be placed in escalated Level 3. At this stage the quality of the service requires significant action/improvement and will require Executive input. In addition to routine reporting through QPS a formal paper will be considered by the JCC Corporate Directors Group (CDG) and an Executive Lead nominated. Formal notification will be sent to the provider re the Level of escalation and a request made for an Executive lead from the provider to be identified. An initial meeting will be set up as soon as possible dependant on the severity of the concern. Meetings should take place at least monthly thereafter or more frequently if determined necessary with jointly agreed objectives.</p> <p>Provider representation will depend on the nature of the issue but the meetings should ideally comprise of the following personnel as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair (JCC Executive Lead) • Associate Medical Director - Commissioning Team • Senior Planning Lead – Commissioning Team • JCC Head of Quality • Executive Lead from provider Health Board/Trust • Clinical representative from provider Health Board/Trust • Management representative from provider Health Board/Trust <p>An agreed agenda should be shared prior to the meeting with a request for evidence as necessary.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the meeting a clear timeline for agreed actions will be identified for future monitoring and confirmed in writing if appropriate. Reporting will be through commissioning team to QPS Committee. Consideration of entry on the risk register and summary of services in escalation table for Chairs report to Joint Committee. Consideration to involve and have a discussion with Welsh Government may be considered appropriate at this stage. If there is ongoing concern relating patient care and safety with no clear progress then further escalation will be required to Level 4. On the other hand if progress is made through the escalation Level 3 evidence of this should be presented to CDG/QPS and a formal decision made with the provider to de-escalate to Level 2.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Level 4 DECOMMISSIONING/OUTSOURCING</p> | <p>Where services have been unable to meet specific targets or demonstrate evidence of improvement a number of actions need to be considered at this stage. This stage will require notification and involvement of the JCC Managing Director and CEO from the provider organisation. Both Quality Patient Safety Committee and Joint Committee should be cited on the level of escalation.</p> <p>The following areas will need to be considered and the most appropriate sanction applied to help resolve the issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. De-commissioning of the service 2. Outsourcing from an alternative provider. This may be permanent or temporary 3. Contractual realignment to take into account the potential need to maintain and agree an alternative provider. <p>Involvement with Welsh Government and the Community Health Council is critical at this stage as often there are political drivers and levers that need to be considered and articulated as part of the decision making. Moving in and out of escalation and between Levels In addition to the Levels described above the process has introduced a traffic light guide within each level. The purpose of this is to help demonstrate the direction of travel within the level. It sets out an approach to help identify progress within the level and lays out the steps required for movement either upwards (escalation) or downwards (de-escalation) through the level.</p> <p>At every stage a red, amber or green colour will be applied to the level to illustrate whether more or less intervention is in place. Red being a higher level of intervention moving down to green. It will also help determine the easing of the escalated measures described and inform movement within the stages of escalation. As the evidence and understanding of the risks from a provider and commissioner become evident decisions can be made to reduce the level of intervention or there may be a need to reintroduce intervention should conditions worsen and trigger the re-introduction of measures if progress is unacceptable. In this way organisations will be able to understand what is being asked of them, progress will be easily identified and it will help avoid any confusion. It will also help in the reporting to provide assurance that action is being taken to meet the agreed timescales.</p> |
|--|---|



SERVICES IN ESCALATION

