

# Health, Adult Social Care and Social Inclusion Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Monday 18 April 2016

## **PRESENT**

**Committee members:** Councillors Hannah Barlow, Andrew Brown, Joe Carlebach, Rory Vaughan (Chair) and Natalia Perez

**Co-opted members:** Patrick McVeigh (Action on Disability) and Bryan Naylor (Age UK)

**Other Councillors:** Sue Fennimore and Sharon Holder

**Officers:** Chris Neill ASC Whole Systems Lead, Paul Rackham, Sue Spiller and Stephan Falvey

**Other Attendees:** Dr Tim Spicer Chair H&F CCG's, Andrew Pike, CCG, Janet Cree CCG, Sophie Ruiz, CCG, Julie Sands, NHS England, Dr Sarah Wallace, Public Health, Lucy Rumbellow, NHS England, Stuart Lines, Deputy Director Public Health, Vanessa Andreae, Clinical Commissioning, Ian Lawry Chief Executive Officer SOBUS and Joy Houghton-Brown, Bishop Creighton House.

## **61. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 MARCH 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2016 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chair Councillor Rory Vaughan.

**62. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Vivienne Lukey and Debbie Domb.

**63. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Joe Carlebach declared an other significant interest in all items on the agenda as the Vice Chair of the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Trust, Stanmore.

**64. DECISION TO RE-ORDER THE AGENDA**

In view of parties present at the meeting the Chair proposed that the agenda be re-ordered, with which the Committee agreed, and the minutes reflect the order of the meeting.

**65. UPDATE ON CO-PRODUCTION IN COMMISSIONING**

Ian Lawry CEO from Sobus provided an overview of Co-Production in Hammersmith and Fulham. He talked about their vision to transform the process via which services were designed and delivered locally. He also described the way in which residents would be involved in decision making and provided the local context. The key points were:

- Parity of Contribution
- Altering the delivery model of public services
- Offering people a range of incentives
- Engaging peer and personal networks alongside professionals to transfer knowledge
- Removing the distinction between professionals and recipients and between producers and consumers
- Enabling public service agencies to become catalysts and facilitators rather than being the main providers

He also spoke about the two areas which had been chosen for the co-production pilots which were the “Carers Service” and the “Supported Employment Service” and the positive feedback they had received during and since the pilots. He went on to say that Sobus had also been appointed to use a co-production approach with the “Children’s and Families’ Universal Service”.

Ian Lawry in response to questions from Patrick McVeigh stated that embedding change was a learning process and not a finished product. He added he was disappointed with the feedback that things were not working well but found it useful. He also confirmed in response to Bryan Naylor’s question that the charter covered the ground rules for co-commissioning in procurement and was not just about the commissioning process. He also talked about mentoring and buddying for those involved and confirmed that they wanted to and were looking at the best ways to ensure a wide range of

participation. He summarised that with co-production design from start to finish anyone can be involved.

Ian Lawry in response to questions from the Chair, Councillor Vaughan confirmed that they were learning as they went and that once best practice was agreed a list of recommendations would be provided in terms of training. He also stated that there would be measures around levels of engagement and residents feedback and that each service would have specific outcome measurement which would be developed by partners not commissioners. He concluded by stating that they were unpicking and testing at present and that not everything needed to be co-produced.

In response to a question from Councillor Carlebach, it was confirmed by Ian Lawry that there were 500 organisations on their database which included the Police and groups for young people and that they also provided online surveys and focus groups. He also stated in response to Councillor Perez that they had started the pilots off with a light remit which they were looking to expand moving forward. He added that it was about continuous learning and improvement and that the goal in the first year was to get feedback and not to implement change as that would take more time.

In response to questions from Councillor Barlow, Ian Lawry stated that it was a template charter and would provide details of specific services. He gave the example of funding sources for volunteering and stated that outcomes would be related to needs. He also confirmed that it would enable people with valuable skills to contribute and gave the example of ex-carers sharing knowledge as helpline volunteers. He also went on to explain that they were not yet at the point of holding anyone to account but that the group dynamic created an uneasy feeling which promoted doing things differently.

In response to a question from Councillor Brown it was stated by Ian Lawry that they were working on a more holistic approach where everyone would be working together and that they were hoping to achieve a massive shift where in the future instead of holding anyone to account they would be promoting the collective we with everyone taking joint responsibility.

Councillor Barlow commented that it would be interesting to see how service users and residents fitted into the accountability matrix.

Councillor Fennimore thanked Ian Lawry for leading on Co-Production and stated that it was good to have this interesting work shared at Committee.

Councillor Vaughan noted the key points of the discussion for future reporting which were:

1. Having a broad range of participants involved and not just the usual suspects.
2. Seeing the measures of success developed from the pilots.
3. Sharing of the learning, training and behaviour change that the programme looked to deliver.

4. The scrutiny of Co-Production in the future the collective “We” and the shift from the us and them culture.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**66. SOCIAL INCLUSION AND LONELINESS IN THE BOROUGH**

Sue Spiller introduced and summarised the report. She outlined the key challenge which was identifying those most at risk and shared information about successful creative projects such as “Men in Sheds”.

Sue Spiller also talked about the causes of loneliness which were not always consistent or obvious to work out. She also talked about the measures that were in place and the other initiatives that the council was working on, including responding to the duties set out in the Care Act 2014.

In conclusion she discussed the next steps for officers which included a workshop on addressing Loneliness and Isolation being held in April, and a proposal from Bryan Naylor to host a broader conference on the subject later in the year. A range of initiatives are contributing to this area of work, including the 4<sup>th</sup> annual Silver Sunday campaign in October. Further work will be done by officers to look at how improved joining up of services will support a more coordinated prevention strategy across the council, health and voluntary sector.

Bryan Naylor commented that the biggest issues was identifying people and talked about the freedom pass data being a start point. In response Sue Spiller confirmed that freedom pass information was subject to data protection and the council’s ability to use it for broader communication purposes was extremely limited. Sue Spiller also noted that the 2014 Silver Sunday campaign had included distributing a printed Silver Sunday guide to all over 60s through the Older People’s Freedom Pass database. However, the Silver Sunday campaign was expensive to produce (£14,000 for the event programme printing and distribution and £5,000 for small grants for local Silver Sunday events), but the net result was that only 30 new individuals are known to have taken up activities or joined groups as a result of the scheme

Bryan Naylor also noted that the ‘Time of Your Life’ event, was successful in reaching large numbers of local older people, but is an expensive event to run.

Councillor Carlebach gave the example of an elderly person who was locked out of her home and the difficulty in getting her access despite both housing and health partners being aware of her situation.

Councillor Brown stated he felt the issue was not just identifying people but convincing them to join in and making the offer universally interesting enough to appeal to a wide range of audiences. He also suggested that asking people to help was a subtle way to address the issue of loneliness.

Sue Spiller responded that a range of organisations have different approaches which can be successful. She spoke about the Co-op and how they had impacted the local community through noticing isolated customers in their stores and enabling staff to provide broader support and assistance.

Councillor Perez commented that advice centres and agencies as well as third sector organisations were the first places people went for support. Sue Spiller responded that whilst many local organisations are in touch with local residents who enjoy the activities and services they offer, for many, the offer of the more traditional support and activities is perceived negatively, and a new approach is needed which provides isolated residents with opportunities to contribute and help others and by doing so, help themselves.

Bryan Naylor suggested the idea of getting people interested in renovating furniture. He also talked about the avoidance of stereotyping people by offering bingo and canteen food.

Councillor Fennimore commented that she felt it was necessary to go back to basics and that with the campaign to end loneliness there could be digital inclusion. She also felt it was important to look at what was being offered and to consider financial need.

The Chair Councillor Rory Vaughan thanked officers for the report and stated that there was a need to agree ways of identifying those at risk and to help them identify themselves. He also noted the connectivity of services was important and the challenge was to bring about positive change.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

#### **67. ACCESS TO GP SERVICES**

Julie Sands and Vanessa Andrea introduced and summarised the report. They talked about the patient experience in booking an appointment and the national patient survey results. The other areas covered were GP access arrangements and extended out of hours services, patient engagement and the range of commissioned services. They also talked about practice locations, the GP workforce and promotion and awareness of out of hospital services.

Julie Sands in response to questions from Councillor Carlebach stated that data was available for each borough. She agreed to provide this data to the Committee. She also confirmed that when a GP practice closes that vulnerable patients are contacted and given additional support to re-register. Vanessa Andrea also confirmed that residents were able to use walk in services regardless of which part of the borough they lived in and that there was a local pilot to register homeless people which GPs were aware of.

## **Action: JS**

Councillor Brown commented that it was good news to be above the 'London Average' and that the extended hours scheme was a fantastic service. In response to a question on extended hours, Vanessa Andrea confirmed that 80% of availability had been booked and 26 practices were using weekend plus. She added it was an upward trend and that they were currently re-negotiating for the future.

In response to questions from Councillor Barlow, it was confirmed by Vanessa Andrea that workforce planning was an issue. There was no guidance on the number of GP's in a Borough. She added that they were aware of the need to work with partners on this issue and that extended hours were worked by existing GP's. It was also confirmed that the names of services in the report were not customer facing names and the aim was to keep it simple for service users.

Vanessa Andrea in response to questions from Patrick McVeigh stated that it was possible to train receptionists to ask questions to help patients establish how urgent their condition was but that it was essentially up to individual GP practices how they managed themselves. She added that people should not underestimate the nursing resource that was available and that there were also lots of helpful local initiatives.

Julie Sands confirmed in response to questions from the Chair Councillor Vaughan that the GP contract set out what had to be delivered to patients but not how it should be delivered but that they monitored adherence to contracts. . She also confirmed that the patient survey covered the registered patient population. It is difficult to measure the unregistered population but information on how to register with a doctor is given out at local hospitals.

Julie Sands stated in response to questions from Councillor Holder that in order to improve satisfaction levels with same day access constant monitoring of demand and supply for appointments by practices was necessary which could be very challenging. She added that they had captured good practice models for use by practices and sharing. Vanessa Andrea confirmed that urgent care - out of hours and 111 was provided by Central West London (CWL) in Hammersmith and Fulham. CWL was the provider for all opted-out, out of hours services in H & F. She also confirmed that the patient engagement committee and participation groups were looking at the issue of communication that were raised at the Neighbourhood Health Forum. She would keep Councillor Holder informed of progress. She also agreed to provide information on Primary Care Investment to Councillor Holder after the Co-commissioning meeting on Wednesday.

## **Action VA**

In response to a question from Bryan Naylor it was agreed by Vanessa Andrea that she would liaise with him directly on the issue of the homeless night shelter.

## **Action: VA**

Bryan Naylor commented that the issue of vulnerable people having to call first thing in the morning needed urgent attention. He also expressed concerns that GPs were prioritising care plan appointments for which they were paid extra. Julie Sands confirmed that his concern was widely shared with regard to patients having to call at 08.00am to book an appointment. Vanessa Andrea added that the best way to address this issue was via the patient participation groups as GPs were able to decide how they managed their services. She also added that there was no correlation between care plan appointments and getting to see a GP.

Councillor Vaughan stated that the survey was positive although the issue of same day appointments was frustrating for people. He added that the influence of patient participation groups was key to finding solutions. He also added that the take up of extended hours services had also been successful and that the issues raised by the Neighbourhood Health Forum around communications were important to respond to.

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That the report be noted.

#### **68. LEARNING POINTS FROM THE FLU SEASON 2015-16**

Vanessa Andrea introduced and summarised the report. She stated the key areas of success which were with children and pregnant women and that the CLCH had won the most improved award in the national Flu fighters category.

Councillor Brown commented well done for the improvements but expressed concerns on some very poor figures especially with reference to the Imperial and he stated that more improvement was necessary. Vanessa Andrea agreed it was disappointing in other areas and stated she would liaise with the Imperial. She added that the press backlash was unhelpful and the fact there was no outbreak was a factor in the figures. She also asked the PAC to write a letter to NHS England to ask them to allow pharmacists to be permitted to administer the children's flu vaccine. This was agreed by the Committee.

#### **Action Health PAC**

In response to a question from Councillor Carlebach it was confirmed by Vanessa Andrea that there was no contract in hospitals and again asked the PAC write a letter to NHS England. It was agreed.

#### **Action Health PAC**

Vanessa Andrea expressed her thanks to Dr Sarah Wallace for her great work and also introduced Lucy Rumbellow who would be picking up the reins.

The Chair Councillor Vaughan expressed gratitude for the improvements but also was keen to see further improvements. He added it that it was good to see that in comparison to the London figures that Hammersmith and Fulham were bucking the trend in some areas. He also stated it was an excellent paper very clear and pro-active. He confirmed that the Committee were happy to write to NHS England to ask them to allow pharmacists to be permitted to administer the children's flu vaccine and that a letter to the Imperial was also necessary.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

**69. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chair Councillor Vaughan confirmed that the work programme was not complete yet and still in draft format. He also confirmed that reports on vaccinations and the like minded strategy would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

**70. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 14 June 2016.

**71. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Carlebach expressed his concern on behalf of the Committee for Sue Perrin who usually clerked this meeting and was currently very unwell. He wished her a complete recovery and a return to good health.

Meeting started: 7.05 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.58 pm

Chair .....

Contact officer: Kayode Adewumi  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
☎: 020 8753 2499  
E-mail: [kayode.adewumi@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:kayode.adewumi@lbhf.gov.uk)