Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel Agenda

Date: 30th September 2015
Day: Wednesday
Time: 2.00 p.m.
Venue: Council Chamber, Moorlands House, Leek
Contact Officer: Sally Hampton, Member Services Officer  Tel. (01538) 395429

1. Apologies.

2. Notification of substitute Members, if any.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on the 22nd July 2015. (Attached)

4. Minutes of the last meeting of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee held on the 10th August 2015. (Attached)

5. Urgent Items of Business, if any.

6. Declaration of Interests:

   Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

   Other Interests

   (N.B. In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Panels Procedure Rule 18.2, Members must declare whether they are subject to a Party Whip in relation to any item before the Panel and the detail of any whipping arrangements.)

7. Questions to Portfolio Holders, if any.

   (At least two clear days notice required, in writing, to the Proper Officer in accordance with Procedure Rule 15.)

P.T.O.
8. Renal Dialysis Services - Sarah Freeman, Service Specialist, NHS England. (2.10p.m)

9. Community Nursing Update – Mandy Donald, Chief Operating Officer for North Division Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust. (2.40p.m)

10. Cheadle Hospital Update – Mandy Donald, Chief Operating Officer for North Division Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust. (3.10p.m).

11. Work Programme 2015/16 (Attached). (3.40p.m)

   Any additional items to be added to the Work Programme:-

   i) Chairman’s items;
   ii) Members items;

Working Groups:

   i) Crisis Care Working Group
   ii) Hospital Discharge Working Group
## Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel

### 30th September 2015

### A G E N D A (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Panel</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Budget and policy framework, service improvement and performance monitoring; resource allocation; accessibility of services; co-ordination of scrutiny work programme; Strategic Alliance and efficiencies; overview and scrutiny of all functional responsibilities of the portfolios covering finance and resources, customer services and performance management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong>: Cllrs; Alcock, Banks, Davies, Fallows, Gledhill, Grocott, Harrison, Hart, Hawkins, Hughes, K. Jackson, Lea, Pearce, Plant, Scalise, Shaw, A. Wilkinson and P. Wilkinson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td>The delivery of council services including environment, planning (including development and property); housing and regeneration; culture (arts, leisure, sport, parks, countryside, tourism); overview and scrutiny of the portfolio(s) covering regeneration, environment, culture, leisure and planning, development and property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong>: Cllrs; Bull, Davies, Done, Ellis, Emery, Flunder, Herdman, Lockett, M.A. Lovatt, Lucas, McNicol, Ogden, Podmore, Redfern, Roberts, Sheldon, Ward, C. Wood and P. Wood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Scrutiny of health service provision in the Staffordshire Moorlands (as defined in the Code of Joint Working with Staffordshire County Council) contributing to the work of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee, which has overall responsibility for health scrutiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong>: Cllrs; Alcock, Atkins, Fallows, Herdman, Hughes, Jones, Lawson, Lea, Lockett, Malyon, McNicol, Ogden, Pearce, Plant, Redfern, Riley, Sheldon, Walley and P. Wood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Democratic and community engagement, equalities and diversity, sustainability &amp; climate change, community safety, the Council’s Community Leadership Scheme, locality working, the councillor call for action, the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and other partnerships. The commissioning/delivery of services by Staffordshire County Council, parish/town councils and the voluntary/third sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins, Banks, Bull, Ellis, Fallows, Grocott, Hart, Hughes, K. Jackson, P. Jackson, Lea, M.M. Lovatt, Malyon, McNicol, Pearce, Redfern, Riley, Shaw and P. Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel

30th September 2015

A G E N D A (Continued)
STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL

Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Minutes

Wednesday, 22nd July 2015

PRESENT: Councillor B.A. Hughes (Chair)


IN ATTENDANCE: Portfolio Holders: M.T. Bowen (Cabinet Support Member)

Councillor: Councillor M.M. Lovatt

APOLOGIES: Councillors A. Banks, R. Done, I. Lawson and P. Wood

1. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 11TH MARCH 2015 (1)

DECIDED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Panel held on the 11th March be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

2. MINUTES OF THE HEALTHY STAFFORDSHIRE SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON 8TH JUNE 2015

DECIDED: That the Minutes of the Meetings of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee held on 8th June 2015 be noted.

3. URGENT ITEM OF BUSINESS

There were none.
4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Member Declaring Interest</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any matters relating to the NHS</td>
<td>Cllr J. T. Jones</td>
<td>Other – Employed by the NHS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **QUESTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

There were none.

6. **BITE-SIZE BRIEFING – MARK TRILLO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (PEOPLE)**

Mark Trillo, Executive Director (People), introduced a presentation on the terms of reference for this Panel which had recently been changed at Annual Council to solely scrutinise health related matters. The following topics were included:-

- Council’s Decision Making Process and the Forward Plan
- Role of Scrutiny
- Role of Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel and its remit
- Code of Joint Working with Staffordshire County Council
- Developing a Work Programme
- Task and Finish Groups
- Role of Officers
- Conclusion

**DECIDED:** That the presentation be noted.

7. **WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16**

The Panel considered its Work Programme and it was agreed that the following items were to be added:-

- Investigate a charge of £95 for the use of the chair at the Maternity Ward
- The impact of the changes to cancer and end of life care
- Services available and the future of Cheadle Hospital
- Training of Social Care Staff
7. **WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16 (CONTINUED)**

   - Small Pharmacy Scheme and the possible closure of the pharmacy in Cheddleton
   - Outpatients Pharmacy

   It was also agreed that the Panel should receive regular updates on performance and waiting times at the Royal Stoke University Hospital and an annual update from the North Staffordshire Combined Health Care NHS Trust.

**DECIDED:** That the Panel’s Work Programme for 2015/16 be agreed.

8. **WORKING GROUP UPDATES**

   Councillor Bowen informed the Panel that a new Chair of both Working Groups needed to be appointed as he could no longer chair the meetings due to becoming a Cabinet Support Member.

   (a) **Crisis Care Working Group**

      A brief update was provided for by the Chair and the Panel was informed that the date of the next meeting was to be arranged.

   (b) **Hospital Discharge Working Group**

      Members were due to visit the new Hospital Discharge Lounge on 17th July but due to the hospital being on a major incident alert the visit had to be cancelled. A new date to visit would be arranged.

      Members advised that they had received reports that the level of service at the new discharge lounge had not improved and that patients were still waiting for long periods of time to receive medication.

The meeting closed at 2.38 p.m.
Minutes of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee Meeting held on 10 August 2015

Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Greatorex (Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td>David Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cooke</td>
<td>Diane Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Lawson</td>
<td>Colin Eastwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Loades</td>
<td>Brian Gamble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelagh McKiernan</td>
<td>Janet Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Mitchell</td>
<td>David Leytham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Rowlands</td>
<td>Stephen Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in attendance:

Apologies: Kath Perry, Charlotte Atkins, Philip Jones, Conor Wileman, Ann Edgeller and Barbara Hughes

PART ONE

99. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Loades declared his membership of Healthwatch

100. End of Life and Cancer Care Programme

Andrew Donald Chief Accountable officer addressed the Committee and gave a brief overview of the programme. He explained that the programme was intended to transform the experience and outcomes for patients and carers in the areas of end of life and cancer care. In effect that there was two programmes that they had been working on for the last three years. The process was to procure two Service Integrators to work with the NHS procurement to ensure better outcomes for patients and carers. He added that in relation to the four chosen tumour areas for cancer that they were not in the top 20 in Europe, in respect of end of life care the majority of people did not have a choice of where they would end their days. The idea was to integrate services and give a more streamlined pathway to produce a better experience for the patient and the carer. In the area of cancer there would over the next 10 years be an increase of up to 20% in those being diagnosed and living with cancer and more support for patient and carers will be needed.

Justine Palin, Programme Director, gave a general overview of the programme explaining that it was for the procurement of cancer and end of life services. She described the process for mobilisation, strategic engagement to date, communications and media involvement. Members were informed that the procurement for cancer services had been ongoing since March and involved a process of face to face meetings
with bidders, which patients have been involved in. The programme is at the stage of procurement where dialogue is continuing with a consortium of private sector and NHS providers. The next and final stage of the procurement is the receipt of a business case by the Bidder, which will be evaluated in September and it is expected that contracts would be awarded by Christmas. She explained that co-design was on going with patients and carers still involved in the process.

In relation to the “End of Life” procurement she advised that the same principals around choice still applied. She described the process to members, and the involvement of the patient champions in the development of procurement documents, inclusive of the outcomes framework, and in the face to face competitive dialogue meetings with bidders. She added that it was intended that the process would be recommenced in September with a competitive and comprehensive of face to face meetings, workshop assessments, business case evaluation and the continued involvement of commissioner’s patients and carers. The process was expected to be completed by March/April 2016.

Members were advised that the Programme is preparing for the ‘mobilisation phase’, which is the stage when the contracts are let, and how to ensure continued patient involvement. An initial workshop was held in May 2015 to discuss with the Programme partnership group, the continued representation and involvement of patients and carers during the first 2 years following the award of contracts.

Regarding strategic engagement, she informed the members that Staffordshire Health and Wellbeing Board in June unanimously advocated their support for the Programme, and colleagues from the HWB and the Programme are actively seeking a way of aligning the Process to the County Councils “Living Well” programme. In addition to this the Programme is reflecting the recommendations of the NHSE all 5 Year Forward View regarding the integration of services and patient pathways.

Justine Palin explained to members that as one of the first wave National Health and Social Care Integrated Pioneer Sites, the Programme has been asked to ‘host’ the next national Assembly in September at Britannia Stadium. All Vanguard sites and Pioneer sites, as well as colleagues from national arm’s length bodies will be attending. The focus of the event is co-design and the Programme, through writing the agenda, presenting and running workshops will be using the opportunity to show case their work on co-design.

The Programme website has recently been revamped to make the language on it much more patient focussed and the team are currently in the process of uploading all relevant programme documentation.

In relation to the bidding process a member asked had the University Hospital of North Midlands taken part. Andrew Donald advised that they had decided to withdrawn from the bidding process bid, but would continue to provide services. The probable reason being the current levels of activity and the level of risk involved. The Service would be expected to perform at the same level but with a reduction of 10% of the budget. In respect of implementation of the process across the 6 CCGs countywide, members
were informed that South East Staffordshire and Seisdon had not been part of the Programme, the main reasons regarding patient flows outside of County and in East Staffordshire that cancer was not a priority.

Discussion followed concerning the poor performance of Cancer Care when compared with the rest of Europe, how outcomes could be improved the importance of hospice services to the process. Members were advised variations across the county and of the ultimate wish to become a top performer nationally before improving their position in Europe.

A member referred to the bidding process and asked how would the bids be evaluated in terms of cost? Would the contracts put pressure on staff with a demand for more for less? In short was it about making savings?

Andrew Donald responded that as the procurement process was ongoing that he could speak about specifics but that in respect of cancer care it was about using the existing money in the system to better effect. He explained that there would be no additional money and that the service integrator was expected to deliver services without additional funds and that overall there was a need for services to work better together. In respect of the End of Life programme he explained that things were different and the focus has to be on enabling choice about place of death and thus ensuring any efficiency savings could be reinvested in community provision/services closer to home, to enable this to happen. Justine Palin explained the evaluation process for the main bidder’s business case and that the emphasis would be on patient experience, quality and finance. She added that the contract is split into two parts, phase 1 consisting of 2 years and then an eight year contract. In the first two years, both for cancer and end of life care the Service Integrators will be tasked with a range of areas of work, inclusive of establishing a patient monitoring system.

A member raised concerns that dropping down to one main bidder to the consortium described may affect the quality care being provided and asked had the programme been developed for ease of application rather than the quality of care? Also that there was an absence of comment from oncologists, other medical staff and detail of remaining bidders who formed the consortium.

Andrew Donald explained that the complexities of services to be provided put it beyond the capabilities of a single organisation and that Wolverhampton, who is part of the bidding consortium, had supported the procurement and had committed their clinicians to the cancer procurement as they could see the advantages of a 10 year contract. He advised that the remaining two providers were Inter Serve and Phillips Healthcare both from the private sector that brought expertise and analytical capabilities to set up services that would ultimately provide personalised patient care. He explained that the CCGs were the commissioners of service and would ensure that the Service Integrators oversees the services delivered in accordance with the commissioning arrangements. In relation to the issue of clinical engagement Dr Johnny Mc McMahon gave a comprehensive overview explaining the difference between areas of the County, meetings with Governing Bodies, Cannock and Stafford boards. He explained of the need for more clinical dialogue between Primary and Secondary Care providers and of the agreement for the need of a Pan Staffordshire discussion by the Chairs of the CCGs.
Discussion followed in relation to the working relationships between the consortium, other providers and the issues of recruitment of carers. The importance of improved working with community and voluntary groups, training, and an effective IT system was acknowledged by members. Andrew Donald, at the request of members, outlined a model for delivery of contractual arrangements with providers for the period of issue of engagement with the CCGs by the Committee was discussed and the apparent reluctance by UHNM to engage with the process. Members were advised that UHNM fully supported the programme but because of multiple challenges and the dissolution of Mid Staffs Trust could not commit to a meaningful engagement in the process.

A member raised concerns that time and money that had been expended over the past 3 years and asked what would the eventual cost be? Was there a need for a Service Integrator? In the past the functions had been performed adequately by the Primary Care Trust and also in relation to engagement that there was no mention of Staffordshire and Stoke-on- Trent Partnership Trust (SSOTP) or Macmillan

Members were advised that Macmillan were a full partner and member of the Programme Board and had funded the whole programme at no cost to the NHS, they had funded the first two years and that the only cost to the NHS to date were a few small commissioning costs. In two years Macmillan would cease to provide funding and that the Service Integrator would be required to self-finance. He explained that the programme had been in progress for three years as it was outcome based and would have an impact on the delivery of care to the patients and therefore it was important to get it right from the outset. In relation to SSOTP he informed members that the Service Integrators were in conversation with them.

Going forward a member asked how the patient experience had improved over the last 3 years and in respect of any data collected what it would be used for. Members were advised that nothing had changed and that this was part of the reason why the programme was needed. The intention was to model a programme that would meet the needs of patients that have been identified from patient engagement to date. In relation to the collection of data that this created issues as the data currently relied on was predominantly based on National Patient Surveys. These surveys when published are a year out of date and thus not based on real-time data. To make a difference real time data would be required which is the request of the bidder in the first two years of the contract. Discussion followed in relation to cancer patients suffering long-term illness at the time of diagnosis, co-morbidity. The changing rational from numbers based measurement, to outcome based and what would be considered as value money. Dr McMahon explained the importance of the role of the Service Integrator to the process, explained the cost of poor medicine and the value of early intervention.

A member expressed concern that the financial element of the programme in particular end of life care and care pathways could result in future underfunding creating risk to the patient and asked what the Committee could do in order to prevent this.

Andrew Donald explained that each year 2700 people would die in the UMNMM and that 75% could have had a better choice or experience. That there wasn’t a system in place to satisfactorily identify persons near to death. He informed members that on average a person in the last year of life would have on average 3 unplanned visits to hospital and if

- 4 -
just one of the visits could be prevented it would result in considerable savings that could be re-invested in more services such as hospice care.

A member referred to the absence of Social Services in the programme and asked that if involved were they confident they had the ability to perform their role effectively. Members were advised that Social Services were on the Programme Board, and that Social Care as part of the Health Service had a part to play in cancer and end of life care. He advised of the expectancy that the Service Integrator would engage with Social Services and Social Care in the development of true integration of services. It was an opportunity with challenges and risks.

The Committee discussed the contractual implications to the parties concerned and the responsibilities of the Service Integrator and noted that there were clauses in the contract to impose sanctions in the event of underperformance. In terms of the length of contract that it would give the Service integrator confidence to develop services overtime. It was acknowledged that the statutory responsibility to consult over major services was not affected by the programme.

The Chairman referred to the next appearance by the CCGs before the Committee and suggested that it should be following the next milestone in the programme. Andrew Donald responded and asked if it would be possible to return to the Committee in January 2016 or whenever a contract was awarded. He suggested that the Service Integrator and Consortium Members may also be asked to attend.

**RESOLVED:** that the Clinical Commissioning Groups report to the Committee in January 2016 or whenever a contract was awarded

### 101. Joint working between the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee and Healthwatch

The Scrutiny and Support Manager presented the report and asked the Committee to consider and give their views on a joint working protocol which had been developed between the Committee and Healthwatch to enhance the assurance that patient safety was being maintained during the transition of services in Staffordshire. He advised that it would not preclude the Committee from undertaking other work and that there would be no cost to the County Council. It was intended to formalise the work between Healthwatch and the Committee but that Committee and Accountability Sessions would continue to be the main venues for discussion. He advised that the first Accountability Session of new cycle was with the Trust and that Stafford Borough Council had already raised questions concerning transfer of services from Stafford to Stoke.

A member raised concerns about Engaging Communities for Staffordshire (ECS) how they were funded, what was their relationship with Healthwatch and could the Committee scrutinise ECS. Members were directed to an item on the Committees Work Programme yet to be confirmed, for an update from Healthwatch. Members had asked for a presentation from ECS on the role, purpose, funding of Healthwatch and that it was it fulfilling the role that it was originally set up for.
A member asked for reassurance that Healthwatch was not getting any extra funding as a result of the joint working arrangements. Members were advised that there would be no funding provided by the County Council.

A member referred to the concept of the “Mystery Shopper” and questioned viability adding that it was a managerial responsibility to ensure the delivery of care and that the money would be better spent in the provision of care. Basically it was an unnecessary additional cost.

A member referred to previous experience with ECS describing a meetings facilitated by members of Healthwatch ahead of the transfer of services between Stafford and Stoke. That the views expressed by people in attendance around travel, transport and paediatrics had gone unreported and for this reason she had no confidence in them as an organisation.

A member advised that the programme Engaging Communities was initially funded in part by the County Council and was a professionally run company. That it tendered and won the contract for Healthwatch. From experience they had difficulty with outcomes and the publication of reports that they had been commissioned for. Members discussed the complaint procedures available poor marketing and the need for value for money.

**RESOLVED:**

a) that the Committee note the report
b) that the Chief Executive Officer of Healthwatch attend a future meeting of the Committee to be held to account.

### 102. Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee Work Programme 2015/16

The Scrutiny and Support manager presented an updated Work Programme and advised that the dates for the Trusts Accountability Session had now been fixed through to March 2016. Each Trust would be held to account once with the Acute Trusts having two. He advised that the “Better Care Fund” one of the County Councils 14 Priorities and “Living My Life My Way” would be on the Agenda for the September meeting of the Committee and that members had received a briefing note on the proposed transfer of Haematology and Oncology Services from Stafford to Stoke.

Members discussed the proposed meeting with Wolverhampton City Council concerning cross borderer admissions and to this end were advised that arrangements were ongoing. In relation to the responses from Trusts arising from the Accountability Sessions the importance of a response to the Committee within 28 days was noted.

The Scrutiny and Support Manager advised that as requested that the Committees Working Groups membership be included on the Work Programme and Councillor Loades gave an update in respect of Achieving Excellence for Mental Health, Health and Wellbeing Strategy. It was anticipated that the Group would report to the Committee by Christmas 2015.

Members were advised that the visit to Assistive Technologies had been arranged for 14 September 2015, and members wishing to include additional items to the programme
should forward request to the Scrutiny and Support Manager for discussion by the Committee prior to a decision being made.

RESOLVED:- that the Work Programme be confirmed

Chairman
AGENDA ITEM 8
8. Staffordshire Moorlands HOSC | Renal Services
Staffordshire Moorlands Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Renal Dialysis Services Report
AGENDA ITEM 8

Staffordshire Moorlands Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Update on Renal Dialysis Services
Wednesday 30th September 2015

Introduction

Renal dialysis services for patients with chronic renal failure are commissioned on behalf of Clinical Commissioning Groups by NHS England through the Specialised Commissioning Teams. There are 10 Specialised Commissioning hubs across England with the west midlands team commissioning services from specialised services providers within Shropshire, Staffordshire, Birmingham and the Black Country, Coventry and Warwickshire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire.

There was a national proposal that the commissioning of renal dialysis services would move from Specialised to CCG commissioning from 2015/16 onwards. This timescale was withdrawn and although future plans are not yet clear the message has been disseminated that the service will not transfer for or during the 2016/17 financial year.

There are seven providers of renal dialysis services within the West Midlands with the University Hospitals of the North Midlands (UHNM) covering much of the Stoke and Staffordshire area as well as caring for patients to the north of the patch including close working relations with Leighton. This report relates to patients dialysing at services provided by UHNM. There may be Staffordshire Moorland patients dialysing at units provided by Derby and Manchester Hospitals. This information would not be available to either UHNM or West Midlands Commissioners.

Patients have a range of options regarding their renal dialysis:

Transplantation is often considered a gold standard for many patients. This can be done prior to patients starting dialysis or after a patient has been on dialysis for weeks, months or even many years. Kidneys can be donated either by live donors, often a close relative or partner of the patient, or through after death donations by people who carried donor cards. Transplantation is not an option for all patients, particularly those in poorer health or with a range of medical conditions.

Haemodialysis (HD) is the most common type of dialysis. This involves extracting blood from the patient and passing it through an external machine which filters it before it is returned to the arm. This is usually carried out three days a week, with each session lasting around four hours. This can be done in hospital, dedicated bases known as satellite centres or with equipment in patient’s own homes (home dialysis or HHD).

Peritoneal dialysis (PD) uses the inside lining of the abdomen (the peritoneum) as the filter, rather than a machine via a permanent catheter. Fluid is pumped into the peritoneal cavity through the catheter. As blood passes through the blood vessels lining the peritoneal cavity, waste products and excess fluid are drawn out of the blood and into the dialysis fluid. The used fluid is drained onto a bag and replaced with fresh fluid. Changing the fluid takes about 30-40 minutes and normally needs to
be repeated around four times a day or can be done by a machine overnight. This is done in the patient’s home. In some cases a nurse or health care assistant may attend to support the patient and change fluids. This is referred to as assisted peritoneal dialysis or aPD.

Not all patients may choose to start dialysis and they can be supported along an end of life pathway as the kidney function declines.

Renal dialysis is funded by a national tariff with a range of prices depending on the mode and location of dialysis and whether or not the patients have blood borne viruses. This funding is provided to the dialysis centres to make best use of it to provide service for patients in line with national Service Specifications. The standards around patient transport indicate that a patient should not have to travel for more than 30 minutes to access dialysis treatment unless they have specifically chosen to dialyse at a particular centre or unit. The tariff is reviewed nationally on an annual basis and any reductions create significant challenges for Trusts and make the delivery of developments such as new satellite units very hard to realise.

**Services within Staffordshire Moorlands**

In preparation for this meeting the West Midlands commissioners were asked to liaise with renal clinicians at University Hospitals of the North Midlands to understand the provision for patients from the Staffordshire Moorlands area. Although this service provides services for patients from the area to the north of the west midlands including Leighton it is possible that some patients have chosen to access services via Nottingham or Macclesfield. The Macclesfield service is provided by the renal service at Central Manchester University Hospitals. Information about these patients would not be available to the West Midlands commissioners.

The clinical team at UHNM regularly reviews the provision of renal dialysis services to try to ensure the optimal provision for the local population. This has included mapping patient postcodes to look at travel times and access to services. The two maps below show the location of all patients registered with UHNM who travel to access HD services. The first map shorts the Crewe and Stafford patients and the second Stoke patients.
There is currently work underway to redevelop the satellite unit at the Country Hospital in Stafford with a move from six to twelve dialysis units offering provision for up to sixty patients, doubling existing provision at County Hospital. This should allow patients from Stafford and the surrounding area currently dialysing on Stoke to
access treatment closer to home. Satellite units need to be able to attract reasonable numbers of patients in order to make it viable to staff and run them.

UHN is currently considering whether the development of a centre around Kidsgrove/Biddulph area would offer an improved service to a cohort of patients at some distance from Stoke which may have sufficient number to make a satellite unit an option. This option may slightly decrease travel times from Leek but is unlikely to make a substantial difference to patient journey times. It is possible that some patients from Congleton currently dialysing in Macclesfield may end up wanting to transfer as a new satellite unit in Kidsgrove/Biddulph should be a shorter distance from them too. This proposal is at a very early stage of development and any proposals will be dependent on demonstrating a sustainable patient pool and assurance around the future funding for this service.

The Trust had considered an unstaffed dialysis facility of one or two stations in Leek but this requires patients to be dialysing independently this is not easily achieved and may reflect a more transient population is it is likely to benefit patients who are likely to be strong candidates for available transplants. Unfortunately the patient distribution would not support the development of a substantive satellite unit in either Leek or Cheadle.

Sarah Freeman
15th September 2015
21 September 2015

**Briefing Paper from Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Partnership NHS Trust**

**District Nursing Service**

This report provides an update on key issues in the District Nursing service in Staffordshire Moorlands.

**Context**

District nurses provide nursing services using a holistic model of care for housebound adults, for example for wound care and end of life care. In addition district nurses provide clinic services for ambulatory adults for specific conditions, such as, complex wound care. Within Staffordshire Moorlands, our district nursing teams have bases in Leek, Biddulph, Werrington and Moorlands rural, including Cheadle.

Locally, our district nurses have been working within integrated health and social care teams and also with GPs to ensure close working and ‘joined up’ high quality care.

**Recruitment**

As a result of a number of successful local and national recruitment campaigns, staffing levels have improved month-on-month and are currently as follows:

- **Staff in post - Moorlands:** 54.72 whole time equivalent (WTE) staff (including registered and unregistered staff and 1.23 temporary ‘bank’ staff). Vacancies: 5.5 whole time equivalents (including backfill for 1 WTE nurse who has, this month, been successfully seconded to specialist practitioner district nursing training)
- **In addition,** we are pleased to have recruited four additional ‘specialist practitioner’ district nurses who commenced on 14 September. All four of these recruits were seconded to the specialist practice qualification course and have chosen to return to Staffordshire Moorlands to work.

A rolling programme of recruitment for district nursing has been established and measures to retain staff are in place, for example, where possible and appropriate allowing staff to ‘retire and return’ if this is their preference. Such measures are aimed to ensure the Trust is in a strong position in relation to securing a stable workforce.

Other actions have included taking part in the national recruitment campaign to encourage those who have left the profession back to nursing, approaching nursing staff who have recently retired to request their consideration to work for the District Nursing bank.
Cheadle Hospital

Services

Cheadle Hospital has two inpatient wards with a total of 47 beds. Both wards provide services including rehabilitation for patients who have had an acute episode of illness and are now recovering, but need further nursing and therapy support to enable them to return home as independently as possible.

Palliative care- assessment of future care, slow steam rehabilitation for patients who require a less intense but longer period of rehabilitation.

Other services provided at Cheadle Hospital include:

- Occupational therapy
- Physiotherapy
- Outpatient clinics (including children’s physiotherapy, audiology, diabetes, EMI, substance misuse, warfarin clinic, Parkinson’s, rheumatology, district nurse, continence nurse, falls service, neurology, speech and language, supportive therapies, oxygen therapy, pulmonary rehabilitation)

Future of Cheadle Hospital

- Cheadle Hospital is integral part of the provision community health and care services for the town and surrounding communities.

- The Partnership Trust’s overall strategy, or model for care, is to care for people closer to home or in their own homes where possible and support them to maintain or regain their independence.

- Cheadle Hospital remains in our plans for the provision of a range of joined up health and social care services that link effectively with other community services.

- The Partnership Trust is working with University Hospital of North Midlands and North Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Clinical Commissioning Groups regarding their new model of care to ensure that patients, community hospital staff and members of the public are involved and informed of details regarding the long term future of all community hospital beds once the CCG’s final proposals are known.

Mandy Donald

Chief Operating Officer for North Division and Community Hospitals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Items for Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 July 2015</td>
<td>Bite-size Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Code of Working Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sept 2015</td>
<td>Dialysis – Sarah Freeman (Possibility of Services at Leek &amp; Biddulph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Nursing Update – Mandy Donald, Chief Operating Officer for North Division SSOTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheadle Hospital Update – Mandy Donald, Chief Operating Officer for North Division SSOTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov 2015</td>
<td>Healthwatch Staffordshire – Jan Sensier, Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Jan 2016</td>
<td>Social Care Staff Training - Sandra Daniels, Chief Operating Officer for Social Care, Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent NHS Partnership Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 March 2016</td>
<td>North Staffordshire Clinical Commissioning Group – Annual Update – Marcus Warnes, Interim Accountable Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 May 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Organisations to Invite/ Schedule Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Health &amp; Wellbeing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Stoke University Hospital – Mark Hackett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Staffordshire CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire &amp; Stoke on Trent Partnership NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Staffordshire Combined Health Care NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthwatch Staffordshire – Jan Sensier, Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Cancer and End of Life Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Small Pharmacy Scheme – Possible closure of Cheddleton Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Stoke Hospital Out-Patients Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>