

THE SPENCER PRIVATE HOSPITALS

ADMISSION CRITERIA

SPHOP 01

Goal: To ensure that the risks for patients have been identified prior to admission to Spencer Private Hospitals.

Relevant To: Ward
Outpatients
Consultant's
GP's

Measurement: Datix Reporting System

Policy:

Pre-admission assessment is in place to identify any risk that may mean that a patient is not suitable for admission to The Spencer Private Hospitals.

The following criteria mean that the patient **is not** suitable:

- Myocardial Infarction (MI) within the previous 6 months
- Patients with **ICD** should NOT have general anaesthetic performed at Spencer Private Hospitals
- Cerebral Vascular Accident (CVA) within the previous 12 months without recent review and documented evidence of fitness to proceed
- Severe Aortic Stenosis as indicated on echocardiogram and / or clinic letter
- Patients with BMI >50 are not suitable for any surgery with Spencer Private Hospitals
- Uncontrolled atrial fibrillation (AF)
- Previously undiagnosed atrial fibrillation (AF)
- Termination of Pregnancy (TOP).
- Patient with a HbA1C of more than 69 will not be considered for surgery
- Patients with **CKD** stage 4 or 5

Equality Analysis

This Equality Analysis should be attached to any Policy, Strategy or Business Case for decision	
Name of the Policy, Strategy or Business Case	SPHOP 01
	Admission Criteria

Details of person completing the Analysis	
Name	Cheryl Lloyds
Job Title	Hospital Director
Department	Senior Manager
Telephone Number	

What are the main aims, purpose and outcomes of the Policy, Strategy or Business Case?	The purpose is to provide clear and accurate guidance of medical conditions that cannot be accommodated at SPH.
Does it relate to our role as a service provider and/or an employer?	Relates to SPH role in the care for elective care patients

Is the Policy, Strategy or Business Case relevant to the aims of the equality duty? Guidance on the aims can be found in the EHRC's PSED Policy Guidance	
Aim	Answer Yes or No
Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation.	No
Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.	No
Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.	No

Assess the relevance of the policy to people with different protected characteristics and assess the impact of the policy on people with different protected characteristics.		
When assessing relevance and impact, make it clear who the assessment applies to within the protected characteristic category. For example, a decision may have high relevance for young people but low relevance for older people; it may have a positive impact on women but a neutral impact on men.		
Protected Characteristic	Relevance to Decision High/Medium/Low/None	Impact of Decision Positive/Neutral/Negative
Age	None	Neutral
Disability	None	Neutral
Gender reassignment	None	Neutral
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	Neutral
Pregnancy and Maternity	None	Neutral
Race	None	Neutral
Religion or Belief	None	Neutral
Sex	None	Neutral
Sexual Orientation	None	Neutral

Mitigating Negative Impact	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where any negative impact has been identified, outline the measures taken to mitigate against it. 	None due to being about medical condition only
Information and Research	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the information and research that has informed the policy. Include sources and key findings. Include information on how the policy will affect people with different protected characteristics. 	<p>Based on medical conditions that SPH cannot provide safe care due to being an elective surgery site.</p> <p>This policy does not effect specific individuals</p>
Consultation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been specific consultation on this policy? What were the results of the consultation? Did the consultation analysis reveal any difference in views across the protected characteristics? Can any conclusions be drawn from the analysis on how the policy will affect people with different protected characteristics? 	Consultation with consultant anaesthetist due to medical condition only and safety of patients requiring specific care

Conclusion	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how due regard has been had to the equality duty, from start to finish. There should be no unlawful discrimination arising from the decision. (see PSED Policy Guidance). Advise on the overall equality implications that should be taken into account in the final policy, considering relevance and impact. 	None

Signature of person completing the Analysis	
Name	Cheryl Lloyds
Signed	<i>C. Lloyds</i>
Date	24.01.2025
Approval and sign-off Head of Department/Director	
Name	Cheryl Lloyds
Signed	<i>C. Lloyds</i>
Date	24.01.2025