

**PPI Forum Warwickshire**  
**Statement on Annual Health Check for Warwickshire PCT**  
**April 2007**

The Warwickshire PPI Forum is split into 3 Locality Committees – North, South and Rugby.

The Rugby and South Warwickshire Locality committees have agreed the below statement. It is indicated when a particular comment is made specifically by one locality group.

On this occasion, the North Warwickshire Locality Committee of the Warwickshire PPI Forum has declined to comment on the performance of the PCT. However, the Committee would like it noted that the Trust has not approached the Committee at any time to invite them to comment.

This submission is based on the reconfigured Warwickshire PCT, since October 2006:

Our overall view is that since October 2006 the PCT has been reluctant and slow to respond to Forum requests and we do not feel they have pro-actively encouraged the Forum.

**First Domain: Safety**

**C2**

We are aware that the PCT board has reviewed their child protection policy recently in line with recent changes to legislation and are working in partnership with the County Council on this issue.

**C3**

NICE guidance recommends that each PCT should have a specialist Parkinson's disease nurse. Warwickshire PCT does not currently have one as far as we are aware. We are disappointed that the PCT has decided not to implement this recommendation.

**Fourth Domain: Patient Focus**

**C13a**

During the PPI Forums' project investigating the views of Young Carers it was strongly indicated that they were not being treated with the appropriate respect they felt they deserved. The Young Carers felt they were trusted to give the care and distribute the medication to the adults they cared for, but were not always credited as mature enough to hear the details of that person's condition or treatment. This relates to GPs and in some cases dentists.

## **C16**

In the Forum's submission to the Annual Healthcheck last year we indicated that we hoped to be invited to review patient literature before publication, we have only had 1 instance of this in last 12 months.

## **Fifth Domain: Accessible and Responsive Services**

### **C14c and C17**

The Forum has been involved with the work of some committees established by the PCT but the Forum is disappointed with the lack of communication and cooperation provided to the PPI by the Warwickshire PCT at a senior level. Furthermore the Forum is dismayed by the lack of substantive response and action from the PCT to reports and information requests, for example:

- i. **Transport Report (South Warks Locality)** - The Forum submitted a substantial report to the PCT in November 2006 on Transport to health services in South Warwickshire. This report was well received by other stakeholders including the Healthcare Commission and local OSC, and we had anticipated a similar positive response and action from our PCT. Initially the Forum received a very short email response, then after prompting for a full response, a letter was received in January 2007. The Forum was disappointed that this seemed to set out to dismiss the report's credibility, without an obvious disposition to take any action with relation to our recommendations, the Forum sent a response to this letter re-explaining the reports findings on 11th January 2007. And on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2007 sent a further letter in light of the publication of the local Acute Services Review (ASR) report, which makes similar recommendations on Transport, clearly placing the PCT as jointly responsible for transport to health services with the Local Authority. No response to this letter has been received as yet. At the last PCT board meeting the PCT's own report on the ASR findings did not explicitly mention transport. The Forum did not expect immediate changes on such a big issue just a genuine intention to look at the recommendations.
- ii. **Young Carers Report** - The local PPI Forums submitted an area wide report to the PCT in November 2006 on the views of Young Carers. The Forum has received an acknowledgement of the report from the PCT but no formal response to its recommendations. Repeating the comment we made in our submission last year, the Forum believes that the PCT is not proactively encouraging the Forum's involvement, and denying the Forum opportunities to influence their decisions.
- iii. **Procurement of Independent Sector Diagnostic and Other Services** – The Forum received a presentation from the PCT on the plans for these new services, but were not involved at the planning

stage or given any opportunity to input into the detailed decisions such as timings and locations to suit the requirements of patients.

- iv. **Local Delivery Plan (LDP)** – The Forum has not been approached to be involved in the development of the Local Delivery Plan as yet (as of 19<sup>th</sup> March). This was promised by the PCT's Chair at their board meetings on 10<sup>th</sup> January and again on 7<sup>th</sup> March.
- v. **Financial Position** – The Forum wrote to the PCT on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007 asking for clarification on the PCT's financial deficits and how these relate to the previous administrations. The Forum did receive a prompt holding letter, but has yet to receive a response to information we feel should be readily available (6 weeks on).
- vi. **Request for PCT Staffing Structure** - The Forum has requested a new organisational structure chart from the PCT in November. The PCT has informed us that one is not yet in place, however the Forum believes most executive posts are in place even as temporary appointments, and the provision of an interim list would be useful to the Forum. We also note that at 11<sup>th</sup> March this information is not available on the PCT website.
- vii. **General** – The Forum has not felt welcomed at the PCT board meetings as it has in the past. On 2 occasions the public element of the board meeting has commenced without the waiting PPI representatives being invited into the room. The Forum feels that insufficient resources have been allocated to deal with PPI. Although the Forum appreciates this may be due to a capacity issue in the new organisation, it still means that the PCT's attitude, even if this isn't the PCT's intention, comes across as dismissive and not fully recognising the functions of the PPI Forum as a statutory body.

The **Rugby Locality** has felt somewhat isolated since the formation of the Warwickshire PCT in October 2006. The Locality feels that this is in stark contrast to the prior relationship that existed with Rugby PCT. Regular meetings with the Chief Executive and Janice Hopkins (PPI Lead) have ceased and to date no other provision has been put into place. In addition, the Locality Members attended a number of PCT Committees e.g. Professional Executive Committee, since the creation of the new PCT these no longer operate and the Locality has not been informed of what will take their place.

The **Rugby Locality** has been pleased to be invited to input into the Practice Based Commissioning Consortium and acknowledges the value of membership.

### **C18**

The Forum is concerned that the ongoing Alcester Hospital development is being further delayed, the Forum appreciates it is important that the business case and contractual arrangements are appropriate. However from the patients' perspective this is just seen as a further delay meaning a potential lack of access to services in that area.

The Forum is pleased with the PCT's general policy of delivering more local services in the community. However we are alarmed after learning that the PCT is considering alternative management arrangements for the valuable community hospitals without consultation with the Forum. The previous South Warwickshire PCT ran a successful pilot to ensure more equitable access to these community hospitals, the Forum has not been informed about the ongoing situation of this network of community beds but hopes it is still running as planned.

### **C19**

The **Rugby Locality** has carried out a familiarisation visit to the Out of Hours Service and would like to report that it appears to be running smoothly.

## **Seventh Domain: Public Health**

### **C23**

The PCT do have programmes in place to address obesity, alcohol abuse and smoking cessation issues.

Following a meeting with the Trust the Forum have decided to make some alterations to the original report. It is the view of the Warwickshire Forum that the submission is factual and correct.

Since the draft report was completed, we have had one meeting with David Rose (Chief Executive). Some of the areas of concern have been addressed. Should this revival of involvement and communications continue then this will be reflected in our report next year. We look forward to working in partnership with the Trust in the coming months.

*Warwickshire PPI Forum  
April 2007*