Scrutiny

Leicester City Council

Scrutiny Review

‘NHS Workforce’

A review of the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission

November 2018

Leicester City Council

Background to scrutiny reviews

Determining the right topics for scrutiny reviews is the first step in making sure scrutiny provides benefits to the Council and the community.

This scoping template will assist in planning the review by defining the purpose, methodology and resources needed. It should be completed by the Member proposing the review, in liaison with the lead Director and the Scrutiny Manager. Scrutiny Officers can provide support and assistance with this.

In order to be effective, every scrutiny review must be properly project managed to ensure it achieves its aims and delivers measurable outcomes. To achieve this, it is essential that the scope of the review is well defined at the outset. This way the review is less likely to get side-tracked or become overambitious in what it hopes to tackle. The Commission's objectives should, therefore, be as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound) as possible.

The scoping document is also a good tool for communicating what the review is about, who is involved and how it will be undertaken to all partners and interested stakeholders.

The form also includes a section on public and media interest in the review which should be completed in conjunction with the Council's Communications Team. This will allow the Commission to be properly prepared for any media interest and to plan the release of any press statements.

Scrutiny reviews will be supported by a Scrutiny Officer.

Evaluation

Reviewing changes that have been made as a result of a scrutiny review is the most common way of assessing the effectiveness. Any scrutiny review should consider whether an on-going monitoring role for the Commission is appropriate in relation to the topic under review.

For further information please contact the Scrutiny Team on 0116 4546340

To be completed by the Member proposing the review		
1.	**Title of the proposed scrutiny review**	NHS Workforce
2.	**Proposed by**	Councillor Elly Cutkelvin, Chair, Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission
3.	**Rationale** Why do you want to undertake this review?	Over recent years, the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission has repeatedly heard evidence from NHS providers about issues they face with adequate staffing levels and the impact that it has on service provision. The commission has heard that the city's universities have exceptional facilities and courses for medical students and great nursing colleges, yet we have an issue in retaining these students in the city. The commission is keen to understand the issues behind this and whether this 'grow your own' concept could be a solutions to some of the issues faced if we could retain students in the city. Given the importance of having a strong workforce to deliver Better Care Together, sustaining the workforce is vital. The NHS workforce strategy being developed is intended to provide the platform for identifying and meeting future training and workforce needs and the GP forward view aims to address gaps in GP vacancies and meet future need. The commission would like to understand how these aim to meet the needs of the workforce required to cater for the city's residents.
4.	**Purpose and aims of the review** What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?)	The commission aims to establish what the current situation in the city is with regards to NHS workforce and what the plans are to safeguard it for the future. It is hoped the following outcomes will be established: • An understanding of what the current workforce is and what the plans to maintain required staffing levels are. • Gain an understanding of the determinants effecting the workforce. • An understanding of how all organisations are working together to mitigate staffing risks. • Identifying how the universities and health services can work together to address issues. • Consider what future models may look like for workforce planning. • Make recommendations to help achieve a plan that can be adopted locally. • To seek assurance that there is a robust and deliverable plan in place.

5.	**Links with corporate aims / priorities** How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities? http://citymayor.leicester.gov.uk/delivery-plan-2014-15/	The City Mayor's Delivery Plan has a section specifically to promote 'A Healthy and Active City'. The aims within this include reducing health inequality and promoting good public health which will be linked to the outcomes of this review.
6.	**Scope** Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.	The review will look at evidence from universities and health partners on the relationship between these agencies to retain students and ensure sustainability in the workforce. The review will also want to identify what the current situation is and whether local solutions can be found where there are gaps now or risks in future staffing provision. The review will not attempt to look at every area of the workforce, but identify key areas and areas most at risk in terms of staffing levels and loss of necessary expertise.
7.	**Methodology** Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review. How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?	The commission would like to identify the following: • What are our current workforce gaps and how do we address this on a short-term basis? • What are our future workforce pressures, given the changing demographics of an aging / co-morbid population combined with an aging workforce? • What plans are in place to address these including thinking differently about skills-mix? • How are we working with our local education providers (particularly DMU/ UoL medical school) to 'grow our own'? • What is the Impact of Brexit/ restrictions on oversees recruitment? • What can be addressed locally and what needs a national solution (areas such as nurse training/ bursaries/ clinical training numbers and funding)?
	Witnesses Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this	Potential witnesses may include: • Local Workforce Advisory Board • Relevant Health Partners (CCG, LPT etc) • Local universities • Local Nursing Colleges • Adult Skills and Learning, LCC • Public Health Team • Executive Leads for Public Health and Jobs and Skills

8.	**Timescales** How long is the review expected to take to complete?	**November** Scoping document to be agreed at 29th November meeting. **December – February** • Take evidence from partners • Task Group meetings. • Draft findings and conclusions to be established. **March** The final review report to be agreed at 12th March meeting.
	Proposed start date	November 2018
	Proposed completion date	March 2019
9.	**Resources / staffing requirements** Scrutiny reviews are facilitated by Scrutiny Officers and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.	It is expected the Scrutiny Officer will support the whole review process by capturing information at the meetings, facilitating the people to give evidence and writing the initial draft of the review report based on the findings from the review.
	Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details.	There may be site visits to areas that are identified as best practice.
10.	**Review recommendations and findings** To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. Executive / External Partner?	It is likely the review will offer recommendations to the Health Partner's such as the CCG, UHL and LPT as part of plans under the Better Care Together Plan.
11.	**Likely publicity arising from the review -** Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.	It is not expected that this review will generate high media interest but the relevant partners, the Executive lead and the council's communications team will be kept aware of any issues that may arise of public interest.

12.	**Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations** How will these be published / advertised?	There will be a review report which will be published as part of the commission's papers.
13.	**How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement?**	It is hoped the outcomes of the review will support Health partners to determine an adequate plan for retaining medical students in the city and ensuring sustainability of the city's NHS workforce.
To be completed by the Executive Lead		
14.	**Executive Lead's Comments** The Executive Lead is responsible for the portfolio so it is important to seek and understand their views and ensure they are engaged in the process so that Scrutiny's recommendations can be taken on board where appropriate.	
To be completed by the Divisional Lead Director		
15.	**Divisional Comments** Scrutiny's role is to influence others to take action and it is important that Scrutiny Commissions seek and understand the views of the Divisional Director.	
16.	**Are there any potential risks to undertaking this scrutiny review?** E.g. are there any similar reviews being undertaken, on-going work or changes in policy which would supersede the need for this review?	

17.	**Are you able to assist with the proposed review? If not please explain why.** In terms of agreement / supporting documentation / resource availability?	
	Name	
	Role	
	Date	
To be completed by the Scrutiny Support Manager		
18.	**Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Scrutiny Team?**	This has the potential to be a large scale review but it can be supported within the resources of the Scrutiny Team, and will require some intensive working which may restrict the ability to support any further work done by the commission.
	Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details.	The review can be adequately support by the Scrutiny Team.
	Name	Kalvaran Sandhu, Scrutiny Support Manager
	Date	