

Minutes



To: All Members of the Health Scrutiny Committee, Chief Executive, Chief Officers, All officers named for 'actions'

From: Legal, Democratic & Statutory Services
Ask for: Fiona Corcoran
Ext: 25560

HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TUESDAY 12 JULY 2016

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

COUNTY COUNCILLORS

J R Barfoot, S A Batson, R H Beeching, D Hart, D J Hewitt, S L C Johnston, L Kercher, S Quilty (Chairman), R G Tindall, C J White

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS

A Alder (East Herts), B Gibbard (St Albans), F Guest (Dacorum), K Hastrick (Watford), M McKay (Stevenage), A Scarth (Three Rivers), F Thomson (Welwyn Hatfield)

OTHER COUNCILLORS IN ATTENDANCE

C B Wyatt-Lowe

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman noted apologies from Gordon Nicholson, Jean Green and David Lambert.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PUBLIC PETITIONS (Standing Order C11)

None

PART 1 ('OPEN') BUSINESS

ACTION

1. SCRUTINY OF HERTFORDSHIRE HEALTH ORGANISATIONS' BUDGETS AND QUALITY OF CARE (FRANCIS REVIEW) FOLLOW UP AND FUTURE YEARS: FEEDBACK

[Officer Contact: Natalie Rotherham, Scrutiny Officer
Tel: 01992 550782]

- 1.1 The Committee received a report providing feedback on the annual scrutiny of Hertfordshire health organisations' budgets and quality of care (Francis Review) and suggestions for the future process.
- 1.2 The Committee was reminded that the focus and themes for next year would be discussed at its Sept 2016 meeting
- 1.3 Members discussed the possibility of including health organisations' quality accounts within the annual scrutiny in 2017. It was noted that the quality accounts set out the progress made in the previous year in meeting the quality priorities and set the priorities for the forthcoming year. Members heard that the quality accounts from all organisations are provided for Healthwatch for comment and feedback.
- 1.4 The challenges around ensuring consistency in the quality, detail and content of written responses from all the health organisations were discussed by Members and it was noted that officers would need to work with organisations to ensure more useful and detailed information was provided in advance for Members' consideration, particularly regarding finance.
- 1.5 In discussion, a Member of the Committee highlighted the need for Members to attend pre-briefings to prepare for the scrutiny café and ensure constructive questioning. It was suggested that the briefings for all Members involved in the scrutiny take place at the same time as the Chairman's briefings. It was also suggested that a 'select committee' approach be taken, allowing Members to continue with a line of questioning until it had been exhausted if appropriate, rather than the Chairman automatically moving on to another Member straight after the initial question had been answered.
- 1.6 Members requested that any financial data be presented with previous years' data and predicted future figures in order to provide context and enable trends to be identified. It was also requested that figures be provided in table format to ensure they would be easy to read and compare. Officers agreed to work with health organisations to implement these suggestions in next year's documents.

C Lambert

C Lambert

- | | | |
|------|---|------------|
| 1.7 | The Committee noted that Healthwatch would be happy to be involved at an earlier planning stage for next year's budget and quality of care scrutiny. The feedback from Healthwatch was that the changes introduced to focus on two trusts for each group improved the process. Scrutiny may have been trying to achieve too much within the given timeframe such that the focus on Francis was lost at times in the group discussion. The suggestion of conducting a more in-depth scrutiny over a longer period of time was offered by Healthwatch and it was noted that officers would take this into consideration but would also need to accommodate resource and timetabling implications. | C Lambert |
| 1.8 | Members raised the issue of ensuring that only the key representatives from each organisation should attend as witnesses and noted that this year had seen an improvement in this regard. Members also requested that officers should check with all organisations to ensure trusts were aware of the date of the scrutiny café and that it did not clash with trust board meetings. | C Lambert |
| 1.9 | At the request of Members, officers requested the whole agenda pack be paginated from consecutively rather than numbering pages for each individual report. | F Corcoran |
| 1.10 | The Committee noted that the 'café' name of this event may not be helpful. It was agreed that a briefing note would be sent to all members and health organisations to explain the purpose of the annual budget and quality of care scrutiny café . | C Lambert |

Conclusions

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| 1.11 | The Committee noted the feedback on the Committee's scrutiny of the Health Budgets and Quality of Care. | |
| 1.12 | The Committee noted the suggestions for improvement in the report and in the minutes above to the Committee's scrutiny of the Quality of Care and Budgets 2017 and future years. | |

2. YOUR CARE, YOUR FUTURE UPDATE

[Officer Contact: Natalie Rotherham, Scrutiny Officer
Tel: 01992 550782]

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 2.1 | The Committee was provided with an update report on the 'Your Care, Your Future' programme, part of the West Hertfordshire Strategic Review. | |
|-----|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 2.2 | The Committee heard that in West Hertfordshire the Your Care, Your Future programme allowed for a plan to be in place that fits the Sustainability Transformation Plan. | C Lambert |
| 2.3 | It was noted that work would take place over the summer using expert panels, the public and WHHT representatives and HVCCG would report back to the Committee with outcomes and draft plans as soon as they were available. It was suggested that the Committee hold a single meeting to focus solely on this in January when the outcome was known. Members suggested that the Committee should also consider this item in September 2016 for the views of Members to be taken into account before a decision is made in December 2016. It was agreed that the Committee would have a single item agenda on this subject at one or two points in the next year (September 2016 and January 2017) and any key decisions needed to be shared with the Committee and the scrutiny officer would ensure this happened. | C Lambert |
| 2.4 | It was agreed that the Programme Director would keep the scrutiny officer informed of progress and any changes to the that may affect when HSC considers Your Care Your Future | |
| 2.5 | There was discussion of which stakeholders would be involved in consultation on the 18 July 2016 at the meeting of the 'key community stakeholders'. It was noted that the forthcoming meeting would provide a start to discussions and a number of further meetings would follow. It was agreed that details of these meetings would be circulated to Members of the committee. In relation to the key stakeholders, Members asked how local residents were selected to participate and it was noted that the aim was to try to engage with as many residents as possible but some were self-selecting. This was a concern to Members who felt it was vital that those involved represented the majority of residents. | C Ward/C Lambert |
| 2.6 | Members were reassured that the CCG had not made any decisions about the options put forward and it wished to be open and transparent in its decision making and planning process. It was noted that it was important to have the debate about which clinical model is best before looking at the best site options. The Committee heard that the trust were committed to having the debate in an open and transparent way but this must also fall within an appropriate timeframe in order to enable the process to move forward efficiently. | |
| 2.7 | Members acknowledged the need to ensure hospital services in the west of the county were equal to the provision in the east and north and supported this aim. | |
| 2.8 | In discussion, Members highlighted the need to move as quickly as possible in terms of decision making and timelines | |

for delivery in order to provide the best health service for residents in west Hertfordshire.

- 2.9 The Committee noted that the plan for the next five years would be challenging and there would be a significant financial shortfall. However, the CCG and the Trust are clear that change is necessary and was looking at examples of good practise in places where a similar plan had been achieved.
- 2.10 It was noted that Healthwatch had been and continued to be involved in this work and had carried out an exercise to capture the public view in the early stages of the process.

Conclusions

- 2.11 The Committee noted the report and agreed to consider this item again as a single item agenda at its meeting in January 2017 and possibly also September 2016.
- 2.12 The scrutiny officer will be kept informed of any changes to the timescale which may affect when HSC considers Your Care Your Future

C Lambert

3. CARE QUALITY COMMISSION (CQC) REPORT MONITORING OF WEST HERTFORDSHIRE HOSPITALS TRUST (WHHT) SCRUTINY TOPIC GROUP UPDATE

- 3.1 The Committee considered a report providing an update on the CQC Report Monitoring of WHHT Scrutiny Topic Group which met on 15 December 2015, 15 February 2016 and 27 May 2016.
- 3.2 It was noted that as the Topic Group was due to reconvene after the CQC visit, the report should be called an 'interim' report.
- 3.3 With regard to paragraph 2.4, it was noted that the word 'monitor' would be changed to 'see.'
- 3.4 Members welcomed the report and the fact that outcomes would be followed up as per recommendation 2.2.
- 3.5 In discussion Members raised the issue of district nurse workloads and heard that heard that vacancies and agency staffing had been considered in depth by the topic group, which had challenged the Trust about issues relating to this. Members noted that the topic group was aware of the ongoing issues around vacancies and agency staff and would continue to consider this.
- 3.6 Members raised the question of the effect of changes in

C Lambert

C Lambert

leadership at the Trust and it was noted that this issue had been discussed at meetings of the Topic Group and the difficulties in recruiting a permanent Chief Executive were acknowledged. It was noted that a permanent Chief Executive had been appointed.

C Lambert

Conclusions

3.7 The Committee noted the report.

4. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

[Officer Contact: Charles Lambert, Scrutiny Officer
Tel: 01438 843630]

4.1 The Committee considered its work programme 2016 – 2017 noting those scrutinies recently concluded and those scheduled for the forthcoming period.

4.2 It was agreed that the 'supported discharge' topic group title would be changed to 'discharge'. It was noted that the Scrutiny Officer was currently working with officers to scope this scrutiny and would report back to the Committee in due course.

F Corcoran/ C Lambert

4.3 A Member of the Committee requested that a topic group on hospital transport be added to the programme and it was agreed that officers would look into this and report back to the Committee.

C Lambert

4.4 The work programme considered at the meeting reflected the decision made by the Committee as to those scrutinies that remained on the work programme and those that would be removed. There were no scrutinies removed from the work programme at this meeting of the Committee. It was agreed that a topic group on the CAMHS transformation programme be added to the work programme for October 2016 and that Members from the Health Scrutiny Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committee take part in this scrutiny if possible.

F Corcoran/C Lambert

Conclusions

4.5 The Committee's work programme was noted.

PART II ('CLOSED') BUSINESS

There were no items of Part II (Confidential) business.

Kathryn Pettitt
Chief Legal Officer