



MINUTES

Meeting held on Wednesday 11th June, 10am to 12.30pm
The Leatherhead Theatre, Green Room

Present :

Diane Woods (Surrey PCT) (Chair)
Fiona Edwards (SABP NHS Foundation Trust)
Dr Keith Ingram (SABP NHS Foundation Trust – Learning Disability)
Metka Shawe-Taylor (SABP NHS Foundation Trust)
Megan Aspel (Let's Link Charity)
Stuart Craig (Carer Representative & Informal Chair of NW Stakeholders)
Dr Malcolm Hawthorne (Medical Director, SABP NHS Foundation Trust)
Anthony Byrne (NE Hants & Surrey Heath Stakeholder Group)
Diane Luck (Rethink & East and Mid Stakeholders Group)
Ann Heath (Woking BIC's Service)
Michael Sellors (User Involvement Lead-Together)
Donal Hegarty (Surrey County Council)
Clive Stone (Chair of Guildford and Waverley Stakeholder Group)
Dr Jill Rasmussen (Surrey PEC)
Janine Sanderson (Surrey PCT)
Beryl Lawrence (Minute Taker)

Apologies : David Rye

1. Welcome/Introductions

Members were welcomed to the meeting and introductions made.

2. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference, established as a draft at the last meeting, were examined and the following recommendations made:

Purpose of the LIT - Agreed that there was a need for a broader view than just the NSF and that the purpose should also include the

Darzi NHS next stage review and make specific reference to national standards and new initiatives.

Discussion took place following a question on whether the LIT would cover early onset dementia and linkages with the older adult agenda. It was agreed that this group would need to take an interest and not exclude but recognised that other forums existed for Older Adult service planning and delivery.

Aims and Objectives - Two further bullet points would be included: the NHS next stage review and the equality and diversity agenda that would then pick up the issues re 'Adults' and 'Elderly'.

Deliverables - Noted that this list would evolve as priorities and a work plan developed. It was agreed to include an additional bullet point incorporating NICE compliance status and pathways. Agreed further that the bullet point 'Map of current services' should be given a higher priority in the list.

Membership of the LIT - It was noted that this membership should be considered a starting point and it would be reviewed as the process progressed, noting, at this point, that the Consultant Psychiatrist was to be the Medical Director, the other clinical representative should be the Specialist Therapy Director.

Agreed to include the Prison Commissioners in the membership of LIT.

Quorate for Decision Making - Agreed.

Meeting Arrangements and Frequency – Agreed to increase the 5 working days for the circulation of papers to 10 working days, noting, however, that some allowance would have to be made where postal deliveries had to be made.

Resources Available to LIT - Noted that the budget would have to be developed as requirements were identified.

Reporting and Accountability - Agreed to add Local Strategic Partnerships to the flow diagram.

LIT Key Dependencies – Agreed to add Health and Wellbeing Group

Review Arrangements - Agreed that, as the terms of reference set out were due to be reviewed only in May next year, there would be an earlier review in 6 months.

Framework for Service Planning and Monitoring - The last bullet point under the Terms of Reference of the Joint Commissioning

Group should be amended to read “To ensure all stakeholders are informed and are involved in the decision making processes.”

Add to this Diagram, the local stakeholder groups with an update of their terms of reference. In addition, consideration to be given to adding other planning forums such as LSPs.

General Comments – Agreed that any written protocols and other long documents, including minutes, would be made available in plain English, noting that resources would have to be set aside for this purpose.

Agreed that the Terms of Reference would be updated following discussion at today’s meeting and presented to the next meeting for sign off.

3. **NSF Self Assessment Scorecard**

Difficulties were outlined in trying to compare ratings from last year to this year noting that standards frequently changed. In addition, Items 4 – 8 and 22 and 23 had not been rated last year. It was also noted that the Scorecard was retrospective and that some of the Red areas might already have changed.

Action Plan Templates have been drafted. It was agreed that they will be completed for every target, irrespective of whether green, amber or red. This will enable the LIT to have an evidence portfolio of our performance. Leads with responsibility for ensuring the plans are completed have been identified at a senior level. Plans to come back to next LIT for sign off and then monitoring.

The following Red areas and other areas of concern were discussed by the LIT:

Primary-secondary interface – Large area of work with Diane Woods taking the lead. It was also suggested that other areas not covered in the criteria, such as IAPT through to secondary care pathways and ADHD shared care should be included. Reference was also made to the incompatibility of IT programmes used across primary and secondary care which impeded the interface and that the system currently in use in Kent could usefully be investigated as an example of good practice

Early Intervention in Psychosis – This service provision has now been commissioned across Surrey and as these teams build up their case load it is hoped that will progress towards identified targets. The GAP analysis was to be examined.

Assertive Outreach - An Assertive Outreach Team that covered Surrey Heath was now being implemented, which should result in a

Green rating next year. Reservations were expressed by Surrey Heath Stakeholders, however, that, although this provision had been requested by the Stakeholders they had not been consulted in its development. It was clarified that to a certain extent the shape of these services were determined by the policy implementation guidance (PIG).

FE agreed to ask senior representation leads for this development work to link in with the stakeholder groups to ensure they were informed of the development process around the assertive outreach provision. Agreed that contact name would be passed to A Bryne by SABP.

MH of People with Learning Disabilities – Amber last year. Keith Ingram confirmed that although Surrey had made significant progress in this area work was still need to agreed joint protocols between Learning Disability and Mental Health to ensure agreement on who commissioned after care and address the problem of delayed discharges. Protocols were also required for the health gap for learning disability and mental health patients in acute hospitals who required treatment involving, for instance, dentistry or an anaesthetic. Diane Woods agreed to link in with Keith Ingram to develop an action plan for this.

Fiona Edwards agreed to ensure Donal Hegarty (Surrey County Council) was sent activity data on delayed transfer of care (already sent to the PCT).

A gap was also highlighted in the linkage between transfers of dementia patients falling under learning disability coming into this area and going into a nursing home placement falling under the Elderly Adult service.

BME community Development Workers – Following a tender exercise 2 voluntary organisations have now been commissioned to recruit and support 6 community development workers (CDW's) to work with the BME communities in Surrey (including the prison population and Gypsy/Travelling communities) In addition to this There was currently a steering committee overseeing this area, which it was hoped, would move into Green next year.

Governance – A lack of uniformity in the level of sharing across LITs was noted.

Advocacy – This was an area of priority which required the action plan to be taken forward as a matter of urgency. Funding for this area to be addressed by Donal Hegarty.

Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Team – Currently Green but negative reports about the quality and access to services coming through on a weekly basis. An audit of the services across the county was called for, noting the inconsistency in delivery, including

the dropping of the name “crisis” from the description of services. This audit could be compared with the policy implementation guidelines to highlight the gaps and should also include customer experience.

Improving Access to Psychological therapies – An area requiring further development, including the broadening of scope of work to secondary care not just primary care

Personality Disorder Services – currently Amber.

Noted that the score cards would be circulated together with the suggested leads for each action plan for report back to the next LIT.

4. NSF Themed Review

This document was circulated at the meeting. It focussed on how mental health commissioners, with local stakeholders were developing local commissioning priorities across health and social care. It was also noted that although the key questions were challenging, they should be seen as a starting point to establish where the process currently was. Attention was drawn by Fiona Edwards to the section ‘Summary of Review Findings and Recommendations’ where it was indicated that Surrey represented only 60% of the mental health needs of the whole of England – a figure which was challenged. It was confirmed this figure did not include learning disability.

Question 5 under Key Questions – learning disability should be included alongside mental health.

5. LIT work Plan

Agreed that this Plan would be amended and distributed, noting the need to include NICE guidelines review dates QOF updates, needs assessment, service user monitoring reports, new strategies as they come out i.e dementia, emergency care in hospitals, prison/forensic with mental health needs and national commissioning guidance. Agreed further that the November meeting would be devoted to a stock take on the progress of LIT and preparation for Commissioning Intention development and prioritisation. It was proposed by Diane Woods that her and Janine meet with the Local Stakeholder Chairs and bring together draft work plans in order to ensure synergies across the groups and the two way information flows can be achieved, and that, once some sort of order had been achieved, a meeting could be held with the Local Stakeholder Groups and the LIT to assess progress on the plans.

A standard item would be placed on the LIT agenda entitled 'Review on New Initiatives'.

6. Strategic Review and Commissioning Strategy

Noted that the Keith Wilson report, which included an executive summary has been circulated but, together with a similar document from Surrey County Council paper copies had been brought to the meeting for those that wished to take and circulate. Workshops are taking place across the Local Stakeholder Groups through July to give opportunity for the documents to be discussed. Agreed that Diane Woods will liaise with Jo Young from SABP to ensure that isides are agreeable. Responses would be discussed at next LIT

7. Local Stakeholder Group Reports/Updates

Anthony Byrne (Surrey Heath) reported that there was no clear focus yet in this group, noting the difference between the requirements in terms of meeting format between the professionals and the service users and carers. Some of the carers and service users did not want to attend formal meetings while the professionals tended to require more formal reporting. It was hoped to establish a planning group to decide on the way forward. The importance of involving Stakeholders in reaching solutions to the problems identified was again stressed.

NW Stakeholders – No meetings had been held. However meetings had been planned, one to discuss the big meeting due to be held on 31 July, to which service users and carers had been invited and one on the 15 July for consideration of the Wilson report. It was reported that of the 3 Mental Health Forums, Runnymede, which was largely driven by the service users, had operated the most successfully, although it had also not met for a while. Woking Forum had deteriorated into being mainly attended by professionals, which was not thought to be ideal. Spelthorne was also not meeting.

East - There were currently discussions taking place over the membership.

Guildford – This group was still in its embryonic stage with only one meeting having been held although the next was planned.

Noted that once it had been possible to meet up with all the Stakeholder Chairpersons, agreement could be reached on what items to place on the LIT agenda and the manner of reporting.

8. Any Other Business

8.1. Newsletter

It was reported that an accessible style newsbriefing was being planned, which would have information from the local stakeholders and from LIT, including items of interest from the minutes of LIT meetings. A web site is also being constructed for the dissemination of information. Feedback from LIT members on the style and language of these initiatives would be welcomed.

8.2. Users and Carers

It was known that the Trust had 4,500 users and carers members and Fiona Edwards offered the use of this to extend the circulation of the LIT and Local Stakeholder Newsbrief to maximise their involvement in the working of the LIT. This offer was welcomed by Diane Woods and accepted by the LIT.

8.3 Next Meeting

Wednesday 10 September 2008 at 10.00am – 12.30pm at Park House, Leatherhead.