# HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE Tuesday, 9 May 2023

Note of inquorate meeting of the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 9 May 2023 at 11.00 am

### Present

#### Members:

Deputy Christopher Boden Michael Hudson Andrew Mayer

### Officers:

Simon Cribbens

Hannah Dobbin

Ellie Ward

Theresa Shortland

**Ben Dunleavy** 

### Also in attendance

Sophie Green Mercedes O'Garro

- Community and Children's Services Department
- Town Clerk's Department
- City and Hackney Neighbourhoods
- Neaman Practice

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deborah Oliver and David Sales.

As there were only two Members present five minutes after the start of the meeting, the meeting was inquorate and continued as an informal meeting.

# 2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

# 3. ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

Members noted the Order of the Court of Common Council dated 27 April 2023, appointing the Committee and setting out its terms of reference.

### 4. MINUTES

Members noted the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2023.

# 5. WORKPLAN

Members received the Committee's workplan.

Members suggested that future inclusions for the workplan, including mortality rates and City worker access to health services.

# 6. UPDATE ON NEAMAN PRACTICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Members received a presentation providing an update on the Neaman Practices improvement plan.

The following points were discussed following the presentation:

- Members asked staff from the Neaman Practice to work on increasing the number patients participating in patient group meetings. In reply, the Neaman Practice said that they had reached out to local community centres. The City Healthwatch Representative requested that the Neaman Practice keep City Healthwatch and the Committee informed of the levels of extra attendees.
- About 2% of staff at the Neaman Practice were new. There were three full-time doctor posts and six doctors working at the practice overall.
- Members noted that reviews for the Practice on Google were improving, and asked for further information on the historic low ratings. The Neaman Practice said that these generally concerned access and telephone waiting times. They had rearranged the staffing og phonelines at peak hours to address this issue.
- The Chairman asked for further information on the smear test data. The Neaman Practice undertook to circulate this to Members following the meeting.

### 7. ADULT SOCIAL CARE INSPECTION FRAMEWORK - CARE QUALITY COMMISSION (CQC)

Members received a report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services, concerning the Adult Social Care Inspection Framework.

The Chair asked officers if it was accurate to say that while the City of London Corporation was the smallest responsible authority in the country providing adult social care, it possibly spent more than any other with a resulting higher level of service per person. In reply, officers confirmed that the City Corporation was the smallest authority providing this service. It operated in a very different context to other population areas, being surrounded by densely populated London boroughs and several hospitals. It placed relatively few people in permanent social care, and just a couple of cases with more complex needs could inflate costs. The City's population had a longer than average life expectancy, and the City Corporation's strategic aim was to care for people in their homes where possible. It also benefitted from a smaller number of caseloads per social worker.

The Chair remarked on the granularity of data for the City of London and the social discrepancy that it highlighted. Officers replied that it was important to have as much information as possible. They were looking at ways to improve

their engagement and service. The small client base allowed social workers to get to know clients well.

A Member asked for further information on late hospital discharges. Officers replied that the delivery of hospital discharges had changed because of the pandemic.

A Member asked how CQC would exercise the new powers it was being give. In reply, officers said that the CQC was beginning activity and undertaking pilots, though the City of London was not involved at this stage.

A Member asked the extent to which the higher expenditure on social care resulted from the small number of patients leading to higher admin costs. Officers replied that costs predominantly related to delivery staff.

In reply to a question from a Member on funding arrangements, officers confirmed that funds were in place but that there may be a need to consider alternative projects. The inspection would not have an impact on the core budget.

#### 8. SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS AND DISABILITY INSPECTION

Members received a report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services concerning special education needs and disability inspections.

The Chair asked for further information regarding the children with special education needs and disability under the City Corporation's remit, and how many assessments were conducted in a year. In reply, officers said that there were currently 22 individuals, an increase from the numbers following the previous inspection. The nature of needs had changed; there had previously been large numbers of boys on the autistic spectrum but referrals since the Covid-19 pandemic and become more complex, with more girls being referred and a greater connection to mental health. The Chair expressed his concern about the increase in numbers, with officers replying that these followed trends seen elsewhere.

A Member asked officers to clarify the coverage of the inspection. In reply, officers said children or young people with an education health and care plan were the responsibility of the local authority where they resided. All 22 of those on the City's plan list resided in the City of London. Officers were working to monitor the quality of education that children on SEN support received who were educated outside the City and help provide information about what additional support they could access. Officers worked closely with the City's independent schools, and had a responsibility to monitor school attendance.

The Chair asked if the City Corporation faced similar problems to other local authorities when it come to block allocation. In reply, officers said that due to the small numbers of affected persons, the City Corporation was technically not part of the same funding formula as other local authorities.

## 9. ANTICIPATORY / PROACTIVE CARE

Members received an oral update from officers from City and Hackney Neighbourhoods concerning anticipatory and proactive care.

A Member asked when patients started to get involved with the scheme. Officers replied that the pathway had started a couple of months prior to the meeting, with residents being contacted at the time of meeting. Residents would be consulted on their care preferences.

The Chairman asked how trips and falls were monitored, with particular reference to the Otago system, and if medication was prescribed. In reply, officers said that Otago was an evidence-based falls programme which provided structured falls education and training with an aim to reducing falls. A pilot held in Springfield Park had shown that many patients had lost confidence during the pandemic, resulting in an aim to introduce a programme to build confidence through home-based interventions. Officers could go access prescription for patients but wanted to use non-medical interventions in the first instance.

Officers confirmed that outcome measurements would be formalised over the coming months.

10. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT** Officers provided Members with an update on items to be included for the meeting in October, which would include virtual wards and Adult CEF.

The meeting ended at 12.53.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman

Contact Officer:

Ben

Dunleavy

ben.dunleavy@cityoflondon.gov.uk