1. **Introduction**

Traditionally, the presence of animals in health care facilities has been discouraged on the basis of Control of Infection and Health and Safety issues.

Although infections acquired from animals (zoonoses) are well described there is, however, very little evidence to suggest that this risk is significant in a controlled setting.

Over the last few years certain groups of patients (the elderly, children and the terminally ill) have been shown to benefit from contact with specially trained animals. In addition, employees with a disability rely on their service animal.

The purpose of this policy is to set out the Control of Infection parameters under which animals may be permitted on Trust premises.

2. **Scope**

This procedure applies to all healthcare professionals and visitors/patients working across acute services within Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. This includes medical staff, nurses, allied health professionals and students.

3. **Aims**

The aim of the policy is to give specific guidance on what animals are allowed on hospital premises

4. **Duties (Roles and responsibilities)**

- The Chief Executive has overall responsibility for the implementation, monitoring and review of this procedure
- This responsibility is delegated to the Director of Infection Prevention and Control (DIPC)
- The Infection Prevention and Control Committee (IPCC) will review the procedure and any new evidence base within the time frame set out in the procedure
• It is the responsibility of the Trust to ensure that policies, education, training and procedures are in place to enforce the policy.

• It is the responsibility of the Trust/line managers and service heads to ensure that policies, procedures and access to education and training are made available to all staff.

• It is the responsibility of all staff to ensure that they understand and implement this policy and attend training sessions as specified in their role.

5. Definitions

• IPC Infection Prevention and Control
• DIPC Director of Infection Prevention and Control
• IPCC Infection Prevention and Control Committee

6. Animals on Hospital Premises

6.1 Purpose Trained Assistance Dogs (Guide dogs, hearing dogs, assistance dogs)

Assistance dogs are usually allowed on hospital premises for short visits for example outpatients, with the exception of the restricted areas listed in the Appendix 1.

If a patient who relies on their Assistance Dog is admitted to hospital, it is not usually appropriate for their dog to accompany them. However alternative means of support will need to be provide and this will need to be clearly explained to the patient. Support will need to be put in place before a patient is asked to come to the hospital. Discharge will need to be coordinated to make sure the assistance dog is available on the arrival home. In very exceptional circumstances this may be permitted following consultation with Infection control.

6.2 Ward Pets (caged birds, rodents, fish, etc.)

These types of pets are inappropriate in acute healthcare settings, owing to the potential risks associated with microbiological contamination from bedding etc. and difficulties associated with the continuity of their care.

In certain areas, for example in long stay units physically separated from the acute hospital sites; ward pets may be permitted following consultation with Infection Control. In practice however, considerations such as cost, responsibility for pet care, visits to veterinary surgeries, etc., will probably preclude their purchase.
6.3 Other Visiting Animals

Organised visits from agencies such as PAT Dogs, etc., should be discussed with Infection Control in advance. These animals must be fully immunised and be healthy on the day of the visit which should take place in a non-clinical areas such as a day room. Visits to restricted areas (Appendix) may only take place following consultation with Infection Control and senior nursing staff for that area. Patients and staff must be instructed to wash their hands following any contact with the animals. Any urine or faeces should be decontaminated in accordance with the Trust Spillage Policy.

There may be occasions when a long stay or terminally ill patient would gain benefit from a visit from their own pet. If appropriate, this visit should take place outside, but if this is not possible it can be arranged in the day room or patient cubicles. As household pets are not trained to cope with the noise, sights (and smells!) of a hospital, the visit should be arranged at a quiet time and if small enough, the animal should be carried in a purpose built carrier and always accompanied by a friend or relative of the patient who is familiar with the animal. All such visits must be agreed with Infection Control in advance, and advice given regarding handwashing etc.

7. Training

There are no specific excess training requirements other than those in place through BREEZE.

8. Equality and Diversity

The Trust is committed to ensuring that, as afar as is reasonable practicable, the way we provide services to the public and the way we treat our staff and the public entering our premises reflects their individual needs and does not discriminate against individuals on any grounds. This document has been appropriately assessed.

9. Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard / process / issue</th>
<th>Monitoring and audit</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients bringing in animals</td>
<td>Need will be assessed on an individual bases</td>
<td>Infection Prevention and Control Team</td>
<td>Infection Prevention and Control Committee</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Consultation and Review

This policy has been circulated amongst members of the IPCC.
11. **Implementation**

Matrons/Sisters/Charge Nurses and Clinical Leads should ensure that staff are aware of this procedure.

This procedure is available for staff to access via NUTH intranet.
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Appendix 1

Restricted Areas/Patients

1. Intensive Care and High Dependency Units
2. Special Care Nurseries
3. Areas in which food preparation takes place
4. Patients being barrier nursed*
5. Patients in protective isolation
6. Patients who are neutropaenic or who are receiving augmented immunosuppression

* There is a small risk that the animal could become colonised/infected with a communicable human pathogen. Please discuss with Infection Control.
THE NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT – SCREENING FORM A

This form must be completed and attached to any procedural document when submitted to the appropriate committee for consideration and approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Title:</th>
<th>Animals on Hospital Premises</th>
<th>Policy Author:</th>
<th>Professor Gould</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the policy/guidance affect one group less or more favourably than another on the basis of:</td>
<td>Yes/No?</td>
<td>You must provide evidence to support your response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic origins (including gypsies and travellers)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual orientation including lesbian, gay and bisexual people</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability – learning difficulties, physical disability, sensory impairment and mental health problems.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is there any evidence that some groups are affected differently?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sensory impairment – registered blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>If you have identified potential discrimination, are any exceptions valid, legal and/or justifiable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually inappropriate to keep Assistance Dogs on wards 24 hours a day if owner an in-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(a).</td>
<td>Is the impact of the policy/guidance likely to be negative? (If “yes”, please answer sections 4(b) to 4(d)).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(b).</td>
<td>If so can the impact be avoided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Explanation and support to patient needs to be provided. Support will be put in place prior to patient’s admission and discharge will be co-ordinated to ensure Assistance Dog is available upon discharge of the patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(c).</td>
<td>What alternatives are there to achieving the policy/guidance without the impact?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(d).</td>
<td>Can we reduce the impact by taking different action?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Not Applicable

Action Plan due (or Not Applicable): Not Applicable

Name and Designation of Person responsible for completion of this form: Prof FK Gould, Consultant Microbiologist Date: September 2012

Names & Designations of those involved in the impact assessment screening process: Prof FK Gould, Consultant Microbiologist

(If any reader of this procedural document identifies a potential discriminatory impact that has not been identified on this form, please refer to the Policy Author identified above, together with any suggestions for the actions required to avoid/reduce this impact.)