

Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee Meeting held on Thursday 14 April 2016 at 10:00 am in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, Ipswich.

Present: Councillors Michael Ladd (Chairman), Helen Armitage, Terry Clements, Patricia O'Brien and Bert Poole.

Co-opted members present: Councillors Alison Cackett (Waveney District Council), Peter Coleman (Suffolk Coastal District Council), Elizabeth Gibson-Harries (Mid Suffolk District Council), Paul Hopfensperger (St Edmundsbury Borough Council) and Hugh Whittall (Ipswich Borough Council).

Also present: Councillors Tony Goldson and Inga Lockington

Supporting officers present: Theresa Harden (Business Manager, Democratic Services) and Katherine Bailey (Democratic Services Officer).

The Chairman paid tribute to Councillor David Bimson (Forest Heath District Council), a member of the Committee who passed away in February.

**1. Public Participation Session**

There were no applications to speak in the public participation session.

**2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies were received from Councillor Sarah Adams, who was substituted by Councillor Helen Armitage, and from Councillor Siân Dawson.

**3. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations**

Councillor Peter Coleman declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust and Healthwatch Suffolk.

**4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**5. Current and Future Capacity in the Residential and Nursing Care Market in Suffolk**

The Committee was invited to consider and comment upon the role of the County Council's Adult and Community Services (ACS) in forecasting demand for residential and nursing care, and working with providers to ensure there was sufficient capacity in the market. The Committee also examined the arrangements in place for supporting providers who are at risk of business failure and the role of ACS and partners in working together to ensure support was available for residents and their families in the event of provider failure.

The Committee received evidence from the following officers of the County Council's Adult and Community Services, Clinical Commissioning Groups and representatives of residential and nursing home providers:

- Cllr Beccy Hopfensperger, Cabinet Member for Adult Care
- Sue Cook, Corporate Director for Children and Adults, SCC
- Julie Bateman, Assistant Director, Personalisation, Quality and Safeguarding, Adult and Community Services, SCC
- Eric Prince, Assistant Director, Adult and Community Services, SCC
- Ian Patterson, Head of Contract Management and Market Relations, Adult and Community Services, SCC
- Robin Guy, Head of Strategic Planning and Market Intelligence, Adult and Community Services, SCC
- Charlotte Fitzgerald, Adviser, Adult and Community Services, SCC
- Hilary Gibbs, Chair, Suffolk Association of Independent Care Providers (and Residential Home Owner)
- Prema Dorai, Nursing Home and Home Care Agency Owner
- Ian Turner, Nursing and Residential Home Owner
- Vicky Newbery, Operations Manager for NHS Continuing Healthcare, Ipswich and East CCG and West Suffolk CCG
- Nicola Brunning, Community Contracts Lead
- Isabel Cockayne, Head of Communications Ipswich and East CCG and West Suffolk CCG

**Recommendations:** The Committee agreed:

- a) to endorse and actively encourage the joint working approach between Adult and Community Services, the Clinical Commissioning Groups and providers to create a sustainable range of providers and enable choice in the residential and nursing care market;
- b. to give its full support to the proposal that health and social care sector skills should be made a priority area for the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership, and to request for the next meeting a report on the outcome of discussions to this end;
- c. to support proposals for the development of a Nurse Associate role to provide care workers with a clear route for career progression and to request an update on this for a future meeting;
- d. to recommend to Adult and Community Services that further, proactive, work should take place to ensure that all interested stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on the Draft Provider Business Failure Procedure document by mid-May 2016;
- e. to request that a copy of the final Provider Business Failure Procedure be provided to the Committee at its next meeting in July 2016;
- f. to request information bulletins for the next meeting setting out:
  - i. how the additional 2% funding for adult social care is being used in 2016/17;
  - ii. data to demonstrate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of re-ablement and the broader benefits this provides.

## Reasons for recommendations:

- a. The Committee heard that supply of residential and nursing care was meeting demand but there were some quality issues within the market which had limited the availability of beds, particularly in Ipswich, the North of the County and the far West of the County. The Committee was pleased to be reassured that there was a good range of providers in Suffolk, and that all parties were working together to forecast and manage future demand, in a customer focussed way, to ensure sufficient care was available in the correct places.
- b. The Committee was informed that representatives from the care sector were due to meet the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to promote adult health and social care sector skills as a priority, which could invoke additional funding from several sources, including the European Union.
- c. Members heard from provider representatives about difficulties recruiting nurses and the need to recruit from overseas. However, current regulations meant the only organisations with the capability for unrestricted recruitment from outside the EU were the NHS and large providers, and the number of non-EU staff that could be recruited by small providers was capped. This was a problem as providers were unable to recruit sufficient staff locally and employees from EU countries tended to require additional training in language skills. Recruitment from outside the EU was preferred, as there were several non-EU countries where people had English as a first language.

The Committee discussed the long-term benefits of investing in education and skills to support the health and care sector in terms of creating good public health outcomes, including providing opportunities in areas of deprivation, improved employability of local people, leading to improved life-chances, resulting in improved health and wellbeing of the population and thereby also reducing demand for services. Members heard that the LEP's Suffolk Growth Strategy included the development of appropriate skills in the correct areas and if this became a priority area for the LEP, it would feed into education and organisations that were working with young people who needed to be encouraged and trained.

The Committee had received evidence in a number of previous scrutiny reviews that workforce planning was a challenge across the health and care sector and wished to give its full support to the bid to the LEP.

- d. The Committee was concerned that caring was not considered to be an attractive profession and that pay was an issue in recruitment of staff. However, it recognised that other motivations included opportunities for training and progression.

Provider representatives reported that there were opportunities for career progression from carer to senior carer, or care co-ordinator and possibly on to nursing or social work, and that some corporate providers had their own training plans and progression routes. There were also apprenticeships available which provided opportunities to experience working for a range of organisations in the sector, and the Care

Ambassadors Scheme, run by the Suffolk Brokerage, was raising awareness of career opportunities in the sector within schools. However, providers considered there was an opportunity to develop improved infrastructure to support recruitment and development in the sector.

Members heard that consultations were taking place on the creation of a nursing associate role which would provide carers with clear vocational career progression route to registered nurse status, with an element of academic training. They agreed that they wished to receive further information on the outcomes of these discussions.

- e. The Committee heard there had been three care home closures in Suffolk in the last 2 years, and the Council's support to troubled providers depended on the type of provider, the type of service they provided and where they were. Most of the Council's experience was with small and medium providers. Closures could be immediate, or providers could work with the Council over a period of time to keep the care home operating and enable the Council to move residents en-bloc to a new home. The Council made sure that every resident of a closing care home had a nominated social worker to support them throughout the move. Procedures were in place to provide this support, and a debriefing, lessons learnt session took place after every closure. Since the closure of the Council-run care homes, the Council now had less capacity to send in staff, or to take over failing homes, but Members heard that other providers were often willing to help, although they needed to know the real problems, as issues often showing up as poor CQC ratings were usually symptoms and not causes. Provider Performance Panels for the East, West and North of Suffolk were very useful in providing an opportunity for providers to share the early stages of a problem and work together to resolve it.

The Committee heard that a Draft Provider Business Failure Procedure was out for consultation, had been sent to Members of SAICP and the CCGs and was on the SCC consultation website. There had not been much response to date, and the consultation period had been extended. Members considered that further, proactive, work was needed to ensure that all interested stakeholders were aware of the consultation and had an opportunity to comment on the document. Members asked to see a copy of the final document at the next Committee meeting.

- f.
  - i. The Committee requested information on how the extra 2% funding that had been generated by the Council Tax Social Care Precept was being managed and how it would be used to enhance delivery of services;
  - ii. The Committee was informed that the County Council's Supporting Lives Connecting Communities approach was aimed at helping people to live independently, building on support from family, friends and communities so that the Council's resources were focused on those with the highest, most complex needs. Members heard that reablement gave people the opportunity to exercise choice and remain at home for as long as possible, and that it should be

possible to care for people at home to the end of life even if they had complex needs, although many eventually did move into the residential/nursing care sector.

Experience had shown that successful reablement involved giving people more time to get back to the levels of independence they desired. The Committee heard that, generally, reabled people were happier and eventually many required no further additional support.

However, the Committee also heard that not all people wished to remain at home, as some preferred the companionship and security of a care home. It was important that people were able to exercise choice.

The Committee was informed that this approach to care was not aimed at creating savings for the Council as it also provided benefits for the patient. The Committee noted that, in terms of costs, there could be a point at which a home care package for someone with significant complex needs could outweigh the cost of a nursing care placement. The Committee agreed that it would like to receive an Information Bulletin providing data to on the efficacy and efficiency of re-ablement and the benefits provided to people who were enabled to stay at home.

**Alternative options:** None considered.

**Declarations of interest:** Councillor Peter Coleman declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust and Healthwatch Suffolk.

**Dispensations:** None received.

## **6. Information Bulletin**

At Agenda Item 6, the Committee noted the Information Bulletin and received an update from Healthwatch Suffolk. The Committee was pleased to note that Healthwatch Suffolk had been reported as one of the top performers in terms of gaining media coverage for its work.

## **7. Forward Work Programme**

At Agenda Item 6, the Committee considered its Forward Work Programme.

**Decisions:** The Committee decided:

- a. To request for the next meeting an Information Bulletin update on Stroke Services.
- b. To request for the meeting in October, an Information Bulletin update on the latest CQC inspection of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust.
- c. To note the CQC inspection of the East of England Ambulance Service and to seek further information on the performance of the service, possibly working with other Health Scrutiny Committees in the region.

**Reasons for decisions:**

- a. Members wished to receive an update on this matter.

- b. Members noted that the next CQC inspection report on Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust would have been published by the next meeting, and wished to be informed of progress in this matter.
- c. The Committee heard that Cllr Gibson-Harries had attended the last two East of England Ambulance Service meetings and had heard that staff job satisfaction was increasing and there had been less stacking this winter (although the weather had been mild). Members agreed that they wished to consider the issue of the performance of the service, and this was likely to be a matter of interest to the other Health Scrutiny Committees in the Region.

**Alternative options:** None considered

**Declarations of interest:** None received

**Dispensations:** None reported

#### **8. Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

*The meeting closed at 12:30 pm.*

Chairman