

**Minutes of the meeting of the  
Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
held on 12 July 2017**

**Present:**

**Members of the Committee**

Councillors Mark Cargill, Neil Dirveiks, Clare Golby (Vice Chair), Anne Parry, Dave Parsons, Wallace Redford (Chair), Kate Rolfe, Andy Sargeant, Jill Simpson-Vince and Adrian Warwick

**Other County Councillors**

Councillor Les Caborn, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health  
Councillor Alan Webb

**District/Borough Councillors**

Councillor Margaret Bell (North Warwickshire Borough Council)  
Councillor Christopher Kettle (Stratford District Council)  
Councillor Pamela Redford (Warwick District Council).

**Officers**

Ann Gill, Business Support, Public Health  
Chris Lewington, Head of Strategic Commissioning  
Zoe Mayhew, Integrated Older People Commissioning Service Manager  
Janet Purcell, Democratic Services Manager  
Paul Spencer, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**Also Present:**

Chris Bain, Chief Executive, Healthwatch Warwickshire  
Tracey Sheridan, South Warwickshire Foundation Trust  
Andrew Mathews, member of the public

**1. General**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**(1) Apologies for absence**

Councillor Jill Sheppard (Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council)  
Councillor Jeff Morgan, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services  
John Dixon Strategic Director, People Group

**(2) Members Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Margaret Bell declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

**(3) Chair's Announcements**

The Chair spoke of his recent meeting with Councillor Damian Gannon, Chair of Coventry City Council's Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board, to explore joint working with that authority on health service reconfigurations and areas of common interest. He would keep the Committee informed of progress with these discussions, adding that reciprocal arrangements were planned for the

Chair and Vice Chair to attend each other's scrutiny meeting. He also extended birthday wishes to Councillor Rolfe.

#### **(4) Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of the Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 1 March 2017 and 23 May 2017 were agreed as true records and signed by the Chair.

Councillor Webb, the former chair of the committee, reminded members of the delayed engagement on the review of stroke services. The chair assured that this important area would be considered by the Committee.

Councillor Margaret Bell had asked a question to the Portfolio Holder for Health at the March meeting about the NHS 111 service. A response was still awaited from the clinical commissioning group (CCG), which would be pursued. It was considered that the 111 Service might provide a useful topic for the Committee's future work programme.

The Committee had made a submission, following its consideration of the Oxfordshire Health and Care Transformation at the March meeting. A response had not been received and it was agreed to send a reminder letter from the Chair. Councillor Chris Kettle was welcomed as the new representative of Stratford District Council (SDC). He also spoke about the Oxfordshire Transformation, explaining that the consultation arrangements with some 20,000 affected Warwickshire residents were not as reported. The Oxfordshire CCG had not attended a meeting with the SDC. Part way through the consultation some 200 pages of additional information had been produced. This should have been prior to the consultation starting. Representations had been made to the Secretary of State for Health on these concerns and to seek further consultation with those affected. It was suggested that this committee could similarly write to the Secretary of State to offer its support to the points raised and this was agreed.

## **2. Public Question Time**

### Question from Mr Andrew Matthews

Mr Andrew Matthews, a Kenilworth resident had submitted a question following receipt of a circular about data sharing between the NHS, Coventry City Council and Warwickshire County Council.

"What plans does the Council have to ensure that, before the proposed information sharing system is introduced:

1. its citizens are fully informed of their rights to privacy;
2. patients can be confident that their data will be safe if they do not opt out of the sharing arrangements?"

A response had been prepared and circulated to those in attendance:

"The letter was delivered to every household in Coventry and Warwickshire by the Royal Mail a couple of weeks ago. It relates to the sharing of GP records with

health and other professional practitioners. The letter was approved by senior management in the relevant organisations - NHS Trusts, GPs, Ambulance Service and the two local authorities - Warwickshire and Coventry.

- The letter states the intention to share information as required but does not authorise the sharing of GP patient records without patient permission.
- The professional (eg. social care, therapist etc.) will ask the patient for permission to view their information records at the point at which it would be appropriate.
- The information will only be shared for that direct purpose (it would not be used for anything indirect such as research) and the patient can dissent at any point of that journey of care.

In terms of assurance in handling that data, all parties have signed up and operate to stringent information sharing protocols. We carry out regular information governance training with our staff to maintain their awareness.

More information is available on the NHS website which also contains a short video explaining the benefits.

<http://www.coventryrugbyccg.nhs.uk/About-Us/Sharing-Information-to-Improve-Your-Care>

Mr Matthews subsequently submitted additional information, which had also been circulated, together with the following supplementary question:

"Does this committee have oversight of the grouping calling itself 'Coventry and Warwickshire Health and Care Organisations' and, if so, how does it exercise that oversight?"

The Chair confirmed that the additional points had been referred to officers and a written response would be provided to Mr Matthews. Councillor Les Caborn, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health offered to refer this matter to the Council's communications team to see how the points raised could be taken on board. Chris Lewington, Head of Strategic Commissioning explained the current restrictions on data sharing. Many patients would prefer that they only had to advise one body.

### **3. Questions to the Portfolio Holders**

#### Questions to Councillor Les Caborn, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health

Councillor Dave Parsons asked a question to the Portfolio Holder about the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) and the need to ensure there was no further slippage on the redesign of the service. Councillor Caborn gave a verbal update that the new contract had been awarded. He was meeting with the Chief Executive of the Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust to ensure prompt progress with delivery of the service.

Councillor Neil Dirveiks referred to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), specifically to support for children in schools. Councillor Caborn offered to pursue this, also speaking more generally about the MASH including the involvement of health partners.

#### 4. Update on Domiciliary Care

Zoe Mayhew, Integrated Older People Commissioning Service Manager spoke to a circulated report and gave a presentation to the Committee. The Committee had received a comprehensive report at its meeting in November 2016, a copy of which had been appended to provide background and context for newer members. She explained the review process, the extensive consultation undertaken and options considered. Also reported were the feedback received from service users, the engagement with elected members, design of the new model and work with providers, leading to a tender process. There were now 29 contracted domiciliary care providers working for the County Council, across eight geographic zones.

The key achievements and issues since the contract became active in August 2016, were reported. A total of 315 customers had transferred to the new arrangements, with a further 155 opting instead for a direct payment to allow them to stay with their existing service provider. Of the contractors appointed, one had given notice to terminate the contract and Zoe explained how a replacement contractor would be sought.

Questions were submitted and further information was provided, on the following areas:

- The ease for service users of transferring to the direct payment scheme and the obligations for service users on this scheme.
- The process that was followed to remove a contractor if they failed to meet the contract criteria. Significant dialogue would take place to resolve issues before taking such action and in the case reported there were no current service users. There was a difference between failure to meet the contract specification and inadequate service delivery. The vast majority of care providers operating in Warwickshire were rated as 'good' by the Care Quality Commission.
- There was a wealth of information available to identify if services being provided were below the expected level and to enable speedy intervention.
- The use of sub-contractors would only be considered as an option of last resort, but the sub-contractor would still have to meet the same service specification as the contracted service providers.
- There was praise for the work completed and the engagement with customers. Such engagement was ongoing through feedback cards, the 'See, Hear and Act' approach to ensure quality and there were plans for a full evaluation of the service.
- Financial aspects. Some customers received support from the County Council on a means tested basis, whereas others were self-funding. It provided greater stability if the service provider had a mix of funded and self-funding customers.
- The potential for a service provider to reach full capacity. Whilst there was a monthly average of 200 referrals, overall the number of customers was broadly similar and there was more than one provider for each geographic zone to give flexibility.
- Where customers lived in rural areas, there were greater travel distances for the staff visiting them. An explanation was given of the use of 'clusters' to ensure logical groupings for each provider.
- The Council's financial savings targets and those to be met from this service area. A range of measures were being considered and all aspects of the service examined to meet the required savings. An additional £8.3 million

was to be provided for social care services, but the financial aspects were a challenge. There was an increasing reliance on the third sector.

- The monitoring of providers to ensure a consistent service and linked to this recruitment and retention of staff. Monthly returns were made, including staff change data. It was noted that sickness absence wasn't monitored, but good preventative measures were employed to maintain staff health. Close work took place with providers, including sharing good practice. There were plans for a recruitment fair.
- Reducing care packages for people who received support after a period in hospital. In reality, people in receipt of care had an expectation it would continue.

Consideration was given to the timing of a follow up report.

### **Resolved**

That the Committee notes the progress made within the Domiciliary Care Service model and agrees to receive a further update in nine months, to examine the implications of winter pressures.

## **5. Review and Work Programme**

Janet Purcell, Democratic Services Manager introduced the report which reminded members of the role of the Committee and different ways of working. It set out the work undertaken by the Committee over the previous two years and factors the Committee might wish to consider in shaping its future work programme.

It was noted that immediately after this meeting, there would be the opportunity for members to suggest potential areas for scrutiny in the year ahead. These would feed in to a meeting of the Chair and party spokespeople, with a further report back to the next Committee meeting.

### **Resolved**

That the Committee:

- (1) Notes the work of the Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee from 2015 to 2017; and
- (2) Notes that a work programming session will follow to consider areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme 2017/18.

## **6. Any Urgent Items**

None.

The Committee rose at 12.20pm

.....

Chair