of this intervention, multi-professional teaching regarding changes to e-handover was provided, with the intention to engage the whole team in supporting communication within and between professional groups, and to improve patient care. **Methods** A survey was designed to measure staff views on their perceived impact of the SOP on the handover, communication and patient care. This was administered over a two week period in September 2017 on paper and electronically. Twenty-seven surveys were completed by doctors, nurses and clinical support workers who use e-handover.

Results Ninety-two percent of those surveyed felt that the handover was easier to read, 100% felt they had a clearer understanding of what information to include on the handover, 92% had a better understanding of escalation status and 47% of nurses felt it was easier to explain this status to a doctor out of hours. Assessing advance care planning, 85% felt they had a better understanding of a patient's preferred place of death. Sixty-six percent of those surveyed felt patient care had improved as a result of these changes. Comments included 'this has been a great development which ensures a more robust and consistent approach to handover. However, 48% felt the changes had resulted in handover being more time consuming.

Conclusion Multi-professional input to support changes in the e-handover led to improved communication between staff, a clearer understanding of escalation status and preferred place of death for patients, leading to improved patient care. Further work is required to understand the cause of time burdens in completing handover.

135 A TALE OF TWO SETTINGS: ARE THERE DIFFERENCES IN HOSPICE INPATIENT INITIAL NEEDS & OUTCOMES DEPENDING ON WHERE THE PATIENT IS ADMITTED FROM?

FA Malik, S Clarke, D Barclay. *St. Wilfrid's Hospice, Eastbourne, East Sussex NHS Healthcare Trust*

10.1136/bmjspcare-2018-ASPabstracts.162

Introduction Understanding patient needs and assessing outcomes are important to improve quality of care. As part of an ongoing evaluation of hospice inpatient (IPU) bed use, the needs & outcomes of those admitted to the IPU from the local hospital trust and from community settings were compared to examine if there were differences depending on settings admitted from.

Methods Cross-sectional retrospective analysis of consecutive IPU admissions from the local hospital NHS Trust (HA) and admissions from the community (CA) to a specialist palliative 14-bedded hospice from August 16–March 17. Data items collected include patient demographics & outcome data e.g. IPU admission IPOS, phase of illness (PoI) & AKPS. All data anonymised. Results analyzed and descriptive statistics utilized.

Results 50 HA and 113 CA admissions during the time period (in addition 24 respite admissions and 6 'out of area' HA not used in analysis). There were no differences in mean age (HA 71.3 yrs, CA 71 yrs) or gender (HA 60%, CA 53% male) and no difference in malignant diagnosis between groups (HA 82%, CA 88%).

IPU admission mean AKPS was worse in HA (33) than CA (44.6) ($p<0.005$) but no difference in mean IPOS (HA 31.2, CA 34, $p=0.1$).

HA patients were more likely to be in the 'dying phase' (PoI) on IPU admission (14/50, 28%) compared to other phases than CA patients (9/110, 8%) ($p<0.001$). Mean IPU length of stay was longer in CA (17.6 days) compared to HA (13.2 days) ($p=0.05$). HA were more likely to die during that IPU admission compared to CA patients (46/50 (92%) vs 69/110 (62%)), ($p<0.05$). 41/110 CA patients were discharged from IPU.

Conclusions Findings highlight potential differences in patient needs and outcomes depending on which setting the patient was admitted from. This will influence development of 24/7 services & bed utilization. Further analysis is beneficial to clarify findings.

136 CARE OF PATIENTS WITH PROGRESSIVE SUPRANUCLEAR PALSY IN THE HOSPICE SETTING: AN AUDIT

Kate Hoddell, Laura Dewhirst, Derek Willis. *Severn Hospice*

10.1136/bmjspcare-2018-ASPabstracts.163

Hospices are increasingly focused on improving services for patients with life-limiting non-malignant conditions. Progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP) is a life-limiting progressive neurological disease which can be mistaken for Parkinson's disease early in its course. Symptoms progress rapidly within 5–7 years. Patients with PSP may have a high number of symptoms and will have a poor prognosis.

This retrospective audit aimed to evaluate care provided to patients with PSP referred to Severn Hospice using the guide 'Pathway of Care for PSP: A guide for Health and Social Care Professionals' as the standard. It included all patients under hospice care since 2015.

20 patients were included, 8 of whom continued under hospice care. 7 patients had died and 5 discharged. Time between diagnosis and referral to our service was usually in the first year. Most patients were referred for 'medical assessment and support' and had more than 3 symptoms at referral. 5 patients were admitted to the hospice, 3 of whom died during admission. These patients had at least 4 symptoms at referral.

7 patients had no advance care planning (ACP) completed (defined as a do not resuscitate order (DNAR), preferred place of care (PPC), preferred place of death (PPD) and/or an advance decision to refuse treatment (ADRT)). Of the other patients 13 had a DNAR, 5 had a documented PPC, 5 had a documented PPD and 2 patients had an ADRT. Of the 7 who died, only 2 had a PPD; both achieved their PPD.

This audit showed that while this is a small number of patients, this is a group with a high symptom burden at referral to palliative services. This suggests that palliative medicine has a role early in the patient journey. ACP was not fully completed in any audited patients indicating that this is an area requiring improvement.

137 IMPROVING ADVANCE CARE PLANNING IN A TERTIARY ONCOLOGY CENTRE

Harriet Radcliffe, Lori Low, Kiara Parag, Rachel Marshall, Aravind Parkash, Eleanor Smith, Alice Dewdney. *Sheffield Teaching Hospitals Foundation Trust*

10.1136/bmjspcare-2018-ASPabstracts.164

Background Escalation planning including decisions regarding CPR and higher levels of care should be made in advance wherever possible. A Treatment Options Form was devised in Sheffield to promote and aid the documentation of escalation planning for patients with life limiting conditions. We sought to increase the use of this form within a tertiary oncology centre, with the hope of improving the number of timely advance care decisions.

Methods We included 135 patients from August 2016 to May 2017. We completed data collection at baseline and then a further four data cycles after each of the following interventions:

- introduction of form into clerking pack for new patients
- training to new junior doctors at induction
- presentation to consultants and questionnaire to glean barriers to usage of form
- ensured all patient notes contained a treatment option form.

We looked at all discharges within the pre-defined data collection window (1 week per data cycle), including only those who had originally been admitted as an emergency. The notes were analysed retrospectively and data analysed using excel.

Results Documentation of escalation plans increased from 13% – 52%; of these, discussions with relatives increased from 50% – 83%. Setting of these plans within 24 hours of admission increased from 7% – 13% and use of the Treatment Options Form increased from 7% – 48%. Feedback from questionnaires suggested that barriers to implementing advance planning included time pressures and reluctance of acute teams to make decisions for patients not under their outpatient follow up.

Conclusions Implementing a Treatment Options Form has improved the numbers of advance care decisions for patients in the oncology setting. We have identified some of the barriers to these decisions being made. Further work to elucidate how best to overcome these is required.

138 A NEW START: REDESIGNING A NOVEL SUPPORTIVE AND PALLIATIVE CARE SERVICE IN AN ACUTE HOSPITAL TRUST

Jayne Winter, Farida Malik, David Barday. *East Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust*

10.1136/bmjspcare-2018-ASPabstracts.165

East Sussex Healthcare Trust (ESHT) is a combined community/ acute hospital trust, with two acute hospitals 20 miles apart and 100 000 admissions a year. In light of workforce changes, the need for joint working across hospital teams and CQC inspection results, a new Supportive and Palliative Care service (SPC) was developed to improve care delivered.

Methods An away day with key stakeholders was organised Dec 2016 to highlight needs of future service and standardise working practices between members of palliative care and EOLC team's cross-site. Both teams amalgamated to become Supportive and Palliative Care Team (CNSs, PDNs, consultants and a specialty doctor). A new nurse team leader role was created and medical clinical lead appointed. Clear unified SPC referral guidelines were developed with one referral point of

contact mobile number on each site being used. A standardised cross-site operating procedure was developed. Video conferenced weekly MDT meetings are held cross-site.

An awareness campaign, including newsletter and team information sheet has been developed. The team are involved in multidisciplinary teaching delivery and regular team and governance meetings. Team KPI's are presented to the Trust EOLC steering group. An online staff feedback survey has been developed and will go out to all staff to influence team development (results to follow).

Results From January – September 2017 there's been a 63% increase in referrals to one site, with a 30% increase cross-site. 90% of patients are seen within 24-hours of referral with 60% reviewed same day. 30% of the caseload is non-malignant, a 10% increase. The team supports all patients identified as being in their last days of life on an individualised care plan (fully embedded in practice).

Conclusion There has been an improvement in cross-site hospital team working. Staff feedback on the team will further influence team development.

139 'PREFERRED PLACE OF DEATH' IN PALLIATIVE CARE PATIENTS - 'RE-AUDIT' USING DATA COLLECTED AT THE ROYAL SURREY COUNTY HOSPITAL MAY – JUNE 2017

Liam Gabb, Sophie Norman. *Royal Surrey County Hospital*

10.1136/bmjspcare-2018-ASPabstracts.166

Choice surrounding place of death (PPD) is a fundamental component of a good death, with NICE quality standards for end of life care stating that all patients should have their needs and preferences regarding this assessed. In an initial audit to determine whether RSCH palliative care inpatients had had an opportunity to discuss preference for place of death, results showed we did not meet our standard (set at 100% of patients having had this opportunity, or a valid reason documented as to why not). Less than 50% had a documented PPD, and less than 75% had a valid reason why not. To complete the audit cycle, this re-audit looked at outcomes following changes made to assessment documentation and team education, and compared to the initial results.

Data collected from palliative care inpatients May 2017 – June 2017 (N=226) regarding PPD documentation, and compared to initial data October 2016 – January 2017 (N=274).

The target of recording a PPD or a valid reason for its omission was achieved in 168 (88.4%) patients, a slight increase compared to initial audit (84.5%). For patients who died, death at their PPD was achieved in 76.0% – an increase from 67.6%.

Though not meeting it, outcomes in the second cohort of patients were closer to the set standard than in our initial data, suggesting successful intervention. Mandatory documentation and discussion of PPD earlier in the healthcare journey are further suggestions to improve this. Despite commenting on numbers of patients meeting their PPD, we did not develop or analyse this information further and feel this could be a point for further audit or QIP.