

Adults, Health & Public Protection Policy & Scrutiny Committee

Date:	22 nd June 2016
Classification:	General Release
Title:	Annual Work programme 2016/17
Report of:	Director of Policy, Partnerships and Communications
Cabinet Member Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health and Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Chairman
Wards Involved:	All
Policy Context:	City for Choice / Aspiration
Report Author and Contact Details:	Muge Dindjer x2636 <u>mdindjer@westminster.gov.uk</u>

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report presents to Committee the draft work programme for the municipal year ahead for your approval. It is ambitious and needs to be prioritised in order for each subject to be given due consideration. Officers advise that as currently attached, this programme will be very demanding to support and risks Members not being able to give proper consideration to each item. The report also provides some criteria that the committee may wish to consider in prioritising its work programme.

2. Key Matters for the Committee's Consideration

- 2.2 The Committee is asked to:

- Discuss the criteria suggested for prioritising items
- Discuss and agree a version of the work programme that is achievable, bearing in mind the need for some flexibility throughout the year.

3. Background

3.1 What makes 'Health Scrutiny' important?

3.1.1 The Adults, Health and Public Protection Committee is Westminster's 'statutory health scrutiny committee' and looks at the work of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and National Health Service (NHS) provider trusts (such as Imperial (St Mary's Hospital), Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, Central London Community Healthcare and our local Mental Health Trust (CNWL).

3.1.2 The Committee acts as a 'critical friend' by suggesting ways that health related services might be improved but also has a formal power to refer any variation in health services to the Secretary of State.

3.1.3 The Committee also looks at the way the health service interacts with our social care services, the voluntary sector, independent providers and other council services to jointly provide better health services to meet the diverse needs of Westminster residents and improve their well-being.

3.2 What makes the scrutiny of 'Public Protection' important?

3.2.1 The Adults, Health and Public Protection Committee also acts as Westminster's Crime and Disorder Committee as defined in the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 and carries out the scrutiny of decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions – such as the Safer Westminster Partnership and any decisions or strategies taken.

3.3 Health Urgency sub committee

3.3.1 The Council established the Health Urgency Sub-Committee in June 2014. Its purpose shall be to specifically consider any matter in respect of statutory functions relating to consultation with health partners which requires an urgent response/ where the committees work programme doesn't allow timely consideration.

4. Devising a Scrutiny Work Plan

4.1 The Centre for Public Scrutiny published a report called "A cunning plan?" in 2011 which discusses the ways and criteria that may be used to devise a work programme which adds value to the authorities work. The report highlights a set of criteria used by South Cambridgeshire which the committee are asked to consider and apply if agreed.

Public Interest: the concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny (City for All annual resident survey)

Ability to change: priority should be given to issues that the committee can realistically influence.

Performance: priority should be given to the areas in which the Council or other agencies are not performing well. (Consideration of KPI's and other performance data)

Extent- priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the City

Replication: work programmes should take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort.

4.2 Appendix 2 provides guidance previously provided to this committee to help you establish a work programme. This guidance is still relevant today.

5. Draft Work Programme

5.1 This is attached as Appendix 1 for discussion. This programme attempts to redress the identified imbalance between the different portfolios that the committee covers.

If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the Background Papers please contact Muge Dindjer x2636

mdindjer@westminster.gov.uk

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1- Guidance on establishing a work programme

Appendix 2 -Draft Work Programme for 2016/17

BACKGROUND PAPERS

A cunning plan? Devising a scrutiny work programme –published 2011 by the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

<http://www.cfps.org.uk/publications?item=113&offset=0>

ESTABLISHING A WORK PROGRAMME - SELECTION CRITERIA

The following guidance on selection criteria has been designed to assist the Committee in its task of choosing topics for the work programme, in terms of both judging the individual issues proposed and the shape of the overall programme of topics being scrutinised. It is intended as guidance only and is not prescriptive.

Judging an individual suggestion

- Is the suggestion **specific** enough? For effective scrutiny to take place, a task group/committee will need to pin down exactly what they are scrutinising.
- Is the suggestion **achievable**? Consider what resources are required and assess whether the limitations of time; the O&S budget; and Officer and Member capacity will prevent a suitable outcome being achieved.
- Will scrutiny of the suggested item produce **tangible results**?
- Is the suggestion appropriate for **engaging the public**? Is this an issue of importance to Westminster residents? Is this an area where a lot of bad press or complaints are received?
- Will scrutiny of the suggested item have sufficient **impact**? To maximise outcomes it is often better to concentrate on issues of concern that impact upon the well-being of a large number of people.
- Does the suggestion **duplicate** work that is already being carried out? Is the service about to be inspected by an external body? Are there any major legislative or policy initiatives already resulting in change or about to impact on the service?

Assessing the Committee's Overall Programme

- Is the work programme **balanced**? Is the planned work evenly spread over the municipal year and are the topics balanced in terms of the scope of the Committee's remit?
- Is the work programme too **onerous**? It is important to hold some capacity in reserve for any urgent issues that might arise.

Appendix 2

ROUND ONE (22 JUNE 2016)		
Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. Reviewing the Community Independence (CIS) review 1 year on-	One year on review of performance to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personalised budgets and relevant KPI's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imperial Chris Neill Anne Elgeti
2. Holding to account the work of the Westminster Health and Wellbeing Board including the Sustainability and Transformation Plans.	To assess and review the work of the Westminster Health and Wellbeing Board and to review performance against Health and Wellbeing Strategy. To understand the purpose and progress of the Sustainability and Transformation Plans in Westminster.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Neill Liz Bruce Meenara Islam
3. Public Protection data requirements	For committee to agree the set of data they wish to receive regularly following consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muge Dindjer
4. Work programme	To agree the annual work programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muge Dindjer

ROUND TWO (21 SEPTEMBER 2016)		
Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. Review Service outcomes in Public Protection	To assess the outcomes for service users /assess how new service is meeting its objectives following reconfiguration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Aiken Stuart Love
2. Safeguarding Adults- Annual Review to include update on Safer Recruitment.	The Committee needs to assure itself annually that the Adult's Safeguarding Review report is robust. To include safer recruitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helen Banham
3. Cumulative Impact (Stress) Areas for Licensing	To receive a report on current cumulative impact areas and whether any new areas are being considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Wroe

4. Update on the work of the Safer Westminster Partnership	Annual Review as per the committees statutory obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Aiken Mick Smith
---	---	--

ROUND THREE (23 NOVEMBER 2016)

Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. UCC and A & E progress report from Northern Doctors	To consider a progress report and receive information on mental health specialists in A & E in ST Mary's.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial • CCGs?
2. Imperial - Planning Process and Strategic interests	To review and interrogate their plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial

ROUND FOUR (1 FEBRUARY 2017)

Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. End of Life Care	To assess whether services in Westminster meets best practice standards and whether funding is being spent in the most effective way. Nationally 65% of healthcare spend occurs in the last 6 months of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCG's
2. Better Care Fund	Review post Council Tax funding increase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachel Wigley • Liz Bruce • Chris Neill • CCGs

ROUND FIVE (29 MARCH 2017)

Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. Children's healthy weight Information item	To assess whether the Council and our partners are doing all we can to improve children's healthy weight in the light of the new JSNA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eva Hrobonova • Gayan Pereira

ROUND SIX (8 MAY 2017)		
Agenda Item	Reasons & objective for item	Represented by:
1. Review of core drug and alcohol services	To assess the new service one year after implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaynor Driscoll
2. Dementia	To examine the current provision of services for those living with dementia and their carers and understand how the service is planning for the increase in demand. 45% increase in incidence of dementia is expected over the next 15 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Robinson • Liz Bruce • Stella Baillie
Health Urgency Sub Committee- tbc		
A new service model for NHS 111 and wider integrated urgent care.	The Committee have been asked to contribute to the development of this new service	At the request of the NWL CCG

Other Committee Events & Task Groups		
Briefings	Reason	Type
Safer Westminster Partnership	To assess the work of the Safer Westminster Partnership. Please note that this is one of the statutory duties of the Committee.	On-going
NHS Provider Complaints	To assess complaints from local Provider Trusts as a result of the Francis Inquiry and new Health Scrutiny powers.	A potential briefing

Unallocated items	
MOPAC priorities and Funding Post 2017?	Public Protection and Police- we have £1m worth of funding which is not secure beyond 2017
Shield Pilot concludes October 2016?	Does Scrutiny want to review this pilot in dealing with gang related work
Two thematic Public Protection meetings to be agreed.	To help achieve balance across the portfolios of this committee.
To assess and review GP's awareness of and levels of referral to community services	Are GP's maximising their role in reducing pressure on hospitals? To seek assurance on this especially in relation to children.