

HEALTHCARE SUPPORT WORKERS – MANDATORY STANDARDS AND CODES

THIRD AND FINAL MEETING OF THE STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

**12 November 2009, 10-12,
Conference Room A&B, St Andrew's House, Edinburgh**

Present:

**Sarah Barbour (SB), Local Pilot Coordinator - NHS Ayrshire and Arran
Catherine Clark (CC) (Chair), Head of Regulatory Unit – Scottish Government Health Directorates
Liz Jamieson (LJ), Programme Director - NES
Maxine Kinnoch (MK), Local Pilot Coordinator – NHS Lanarkshire
Julie McKinney (JM) - Health Finance Directorate, Scottish Government
Leigh Murray (LM) - Royal College of Nursing
Mary Porter (MP), Associate Director of Nursing - NHS Fife
Brian Wilson (BW) – Facilities Manager, NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde**

Apologies:

**Irene Barkby (IB), Nurse Director - NHS National Services Scotland
Anne Campbell (ACa), National KSF Lead - Scottish Government
Marie Cerinus (MC), Director of Nursing, Midwifery & Allied Health Professions (NMAHPS) Practice - NHS Lanarkshire (Maxine Kinnoch deputising)
Audrey Cowie (Chair) (ACo), Professional Adviser - Regulation and Workforce Standards, Scottish Government Health Directorates
Lilian D'Arcy (LD), patient representative
Linda Davidson (LD), Associate Director of Human Resources - NHS Lothian
Ros Derham (RD), RCN Professional Officer - Royal College of Nursing (Leigh Murray deputising)
Frances Dow (FD) – Lay Member
Colette Ferguson (CF), Associate Director NMAHPS - NES (Liz Jamieson deputising)
Martin Henry (MH), Facilities Manager, State Hospital
Brian Main (BM), Head of Support Services/Site Manager - Ninewells Hospital & Medical School
Mary Parkhouse (MP), Head of Continuing Professional and Practice Development - NHS Lothian
Chris Rodden, Practice Development Lead, NHS Ayrshire and Arran (Sarah Barbour deputising)
Jan Warner (JW), Director of Patient Safety & Performance Assessment – NHS Quality Improvement Scotland**

Non attendees:

**Lily Bryson (LB), Assistant Director of Finance, Golden Jubilee National Hospital
Dawn Carmichael (DC), Associate Director of Finance - NHS Lothian
Bridget Hunter (BH), Lead Officer for Nurses and Midwives – UNISON Scotland**

In attendance:

Robert Girvan (minutes)

Item	Topic	Action By:	Due Date:
------	-------	------------	-----------

1.	Welcome, introductions and apologies		
	<p>CC explained that, as Audrey Cowie was unable to attend this meeting, she would be chairing it on her behalf. She welcomed members to the third and final meeting of the Group and round table introductions took place.</p> <p>Apologies and substitutions were recorded as above.</p>		
2	Minutes of 12 October (SIG/2009/13)		
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting were checked for accuracy. At p5, 2nd para, JM noted that the next 3 year spending review cycle would not start until at least 2010. There might be an opportunity for bids to assist implementation.</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>		
3	Action Points: 12 October meeting (SIG/2009/14)		
	<p>CC introduced paper SIG/2009/14 and invited updates on any action points not covered in the agenda.</p> <p>BW tabled a paper prepared by Facilities representatives, concerning which disciplines within Facilities should be included in the definition of HCSW for the purposes of the Direction from Scottish Ministers. He noted that there were two lists, one detailing those staff groups with predominantly direct patient contact (normally 1 to 1) and one with both direct and indirect contact. The paper also listed other disciplines that might be implicated from departments other than Facilities.</p> <p>BW said that during their discussions the Facilities group also discussed the possibility that some staff groups i.e. Catering, could have some staff implicated in the scheme with others not included and came to the conclusion that this could severely hamper flexible working, and such a split would not receive universal support from the service.</p> <p>It was highlighted that if the definition involved a list of job titles this could cause problems as new roles evolved, also given that job titles might vary in different Boards.</p> <p>It was commented that the definition should reflect how directly the HCSW affected the public, whether through the potential to do harm or the potential to safeguard from harm. This was a question of degree of risk.</p> <p>CC highlighted that ACo was to attend a strategic Facilities Directors Group meeting scheduled for Tuesday 24 November 2009, where any remaining issues could be discussed if required.</p>		

4	Frequently Asked Questions paper (SIG/2009/15)		
	<p>CC took the Group through the recent changes to the paper SIG/2009/15 further to the launch of the Standards and Codes and discussions at the Stakeholder event. She asked members whether the FAQs were proving helpful in responding to questions raised by others, and whether there were questions being raised that were not already covered in the FAQs.</p> <p>It was agreed that a question related to the cost implications of implementation would be added.</p>	ACo	
5	Cost analysis		
	<p>JM introduced a further cost analysis paper. She explained that the Practice-based Education Facilitators (PEFs) model might provide assistance in terms of induction procedures for clinical support workers. Non-clinical support workers are expected to require more assistance in terms of both induction procedures and training/assessment.</p> <p>It was noted that NHS Lothian had 133 new starts per month during the pilot period. Up to two thirds of these were non-clinical. NES reported that ISD had told them that there were a total of just under 3,000 new starts per year in non-clinical. This was more than two thirds in proportion. NES had asked ISD to identify the average turnover and length of stay for these staff, although this might not be possible, Board by Board. Further to ongoing discussions with ISD, it was agreed that NES representatives would provide the Group secretariat with indicative figures around new starts and staff turnover to inform the cost analysis. It was noted that the number of staff implicated would hinge on the definition of HCSW.</p> <p>It was agreed that the facilitator post would be key to implementation, providing practical assistance to departments at a local level. BW commented that central co-ordinator roles could create additional work with information demands and so forth. It was noted that mentors could be trained up to assist in implementation.</p> <p>JM said that 1 band 3 Administrator and 1 band 6 facilitator would cost around £70K per Board per annum. An estimated cost could be derived from baseline funding and/or staff numbers in each Board. NES information could also be drawn upon.</p> <p>On PEFs, LJ noted that they provide support for mentors in the development of robust learning environments for all</p>	LJ/CF	

	<p>learners. PEFs were funded on a tripartite basis by NES, the respective NHS Board and Higher Education Institution. The facilitator role may assist the non-clinical workers. She said that it would be of benefit to make the best use of existing infrastructures, avoiding duplication and repetition, and to acknowledge that every Board was different. The pilot Boards all had extensive practice education/development infrastructures. As part of the overall HCSW Workstream NES would be consulting with the NHS Boards regarding the educational resource development to support the standards and codes implementation.</p>		
6	Articulation of the model with KSF processes		
	<p>CC highlighted comments Anne Campbell had received on her KSF paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there was a need to revisit the mapping of the performance criteria to the KSF dimensions on completion of the review being undertaken by NES; making the links more meaningful. <p>She pointed out that Anne had agreed to take forward the following work in conjunction with NES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inclusion of guidance on the articulation with KSF within the supervisor's and HCSW's handbook • linking the induction standards with the induction training programmes being developed for non-clinical support staff (and any similar programmes provided for clinical HCSWs) providing guidance regarding the articulation with the KSF <p>CC noted that the intention was to use the KSF paper as a framework for the guidance that would accompany the Direction.</p>		
7	NES Action Plan and timeframes - update		
	<p>CC invited LJ to update the group on the timeframe for NES to have the necessary elements in place to support the implementation of the standards and codes.</p> <p>On timeframes LJ said that the performance criteria for the Standards would not be available before October 2010, with a final deadline of December 2010.</p> <p>In response to a query from JM, LJ confirmed that this timing would not cause a delay in developing training. It would be crucial for Boards to know the training requirements beforehand. Flexible training would be developed that Boards would be able to tweak either to fit</p>		

	<p>existing processes or develop new ones.</p> <p>LJ commented that NES would be seeking nominations for a HCSW Project Steering Group. To inform nominations it was agreed that the Group secretariat would provide NES with the contact details for SIG members.</p>	Group secretariat	
8	General timeframes with reference to revised SG Implementation Action Plan (SIG/2009/16)		
	<p>CC introduced this item and asked whether there was any element of the revised action plan that members felt was likely to cause challenges for, or delays to, implementation. Recent changes to the paper were highlighted in bold. They were informed using information from the draft NES Action Plan.</p> <p>It was agreed that Julie McKinney would update page 3 of the revised action plan to reflect recent discussions between Group Finance representatives and pilot leads.</p> <p>At page 4, 1.1.7 it was noted that NES would not have a monitoring role, just a support role.</p> <p>At 2.1.3 it was noted that NES would have an Overarching Steering Group, with Working Groups feeding in to it.</p> <p>At 2.1.5 it was emphasised that NES would do this in consultation with Boards.</p> <p>With reference to 3rd part contracts it was suggested that only those with longer term contracts should be included within the definition.</p>	JM	
9	Communications Strategy		
	<p>CC provided a verbal update on the Regulatory Event.</p> <p>She pointed out that there had been the opportunity at the event to share information with stakeholders about the planned implementation of the mandatory standards and codes, and a small interactive workshop which helped inform the amendments to the FAQs.</p> <p>CC reminded the Group that the publications were web-based with an introductory page on the SG website with the three documents sitting on the SHOW website – all as of 28 October. Links would be made from each induction standard statement on SHOW to the NES website where the performance criteria relating to each standard would be housed. NES was, however, still developing the</p>		

	<p>performance criteria.</p> <p>CC highlighted that SG officials would continue to update high level strategic groups such as SWAG as the Direction from Scottish Ministers, implementation details and financial position evolved.</p> <p>Further advice and comments would be canvassed from this Group where necessary, although this was unlikely to be on a face to face basis.</p>		
10	AOCB		
	<p>It was agreed that, with reference to the comments of the Group, another draft of the definition would be prepared in conjunction with SG legal advisors by January 2010, to enable NES to take forward Board level discussions on implementation. Further thought would be given to the handling of agency staff and those on temporary contracts. Once the definition was finalised another costing would be taken forward.</p> <p>CC thanked members for their valuable contributions to the implementation agenda.</p>	Group Secretariat	