

Date	Wednesday 28 September 10:00 – 12:00	TEAMS online meeting
Attendees	<p>Care and member associations: George Appleton (GA) Care England Amrit Sumal (AS) - National Care Association Mary Anson (MA) - Care Association Alliance Jan Burns (JB) - National Dignity Council Katie Hipkiss - Voluntary Organisations Disability Group (VODG) Terry Donohoe (TD) - The Homecare Association Jasmine Peak – The National Care Forum Samantha Crawley – Excel Care Holdings Jan Burns – (JB) Safe and Settled Rosie Mockett (RM) – CWC</p>	<p>CQC: Deanna Westwood (DW) Director of Operations – South Network (chair) Mary Cridge (MC) Director of Adult Social Care Owen Griffiths (OG) Public Information Manager Sam Wallace (CW) Provider Engagement Lead Dave James (DJ) Head of Adult Social Care Policy Lisa Lloyd (LL) Communications and Engagement Manager Becky Appleby-Dean (BA) Provider Engagement Officer (minute taking) Simon Hill (SH) Regional Medicines Manager North Jeannette Blackburn (JB) Regulatory Policy Manager April Cole (AC) Regulatory Policy Officer</p>

MINUTES

Agenda item	Lead
<p>Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Deanna Westwood, CQC Director of Operations – South Network</p>
<p>Operational Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (DW) updated on inspection figures and focus for current approach and update on transformation timelines, see slides. <p>(AS) – Wanted to confirm what we class as inspection, do these include phone calls? (DW) confirmed that this is on site inspections but the phone calls may influence which services we go out to inspect. Risk is still a priority but we will also go to RI and I services although this may take a little longer if it suggests there is limited risk.</p> <p>(AS) – Suggests that it would be positive to see a breakdown of the rating of services that are inspected. Action.</p> <p>(GA) - Do you have any indication as to when the new regulatory approach will be introduced, if being pushed back from January? And was there a particular reason as to why there has been a delay?</p> <p>(DW) We want to refine and improve the new regulatory model before we move forward. All inspections will continue with the current methodology.</p>	<p>Deanna Westwood (DW) Director of Operations – South Network</p>
<p>Local Authority Assurance and provider feedback workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DJ reaffirmed the importance CQC places on TA member insights and feedback and that we prioritise how we strike a balance to make sure that we adequately reflect the provider experience and voice in a way that is proportionate in relation to other evidence sources. 	<p>Dave James, CQC Head of Adult Social Care Policy</p>

- This workshop session aims to gain more insights from members, following our test and learn activities during which we have spoken to lots of groups across 18 months and we have heard some clear messages around what we should be looking at [these are shown on the slides].

(MA) – With not rating Local Authorities and using soft intelligence because the providers who are the most nervous of safeguarding's are limiting their admissions to safe admissions whereas those trying to support the wider system are receiving more safeguarding's and this may affect provider attitudes to this.

(DJ) – This is a good example of what we need to hear in our provider assessment that we then play in that.

(DW) – Need to be flagged to us if there are unsafe discharges so that we can flag these to the relevant people across the system such as hospitals.

(MA) – People with high levels of need may also have an impact on the service and others using the service. This means the rating maybe affected. Services cannot prevent every incident that might happen.

(SC) – Have never been able to hold the LA to account before but this will help them to hold them to account particularly in situations where they misuse care homes from care they cannot provide. Intelligence will allow us to get more information about dangerous discharge.

Questions

(SC) – We need to have an open dialogue with providers about what is going well and what isn't.

(JB) – Need to find out WHY things have worked and why they haven't so they can be fixed. Need to work about having positive connections. Need to have targets about the speed that things can get done and looking at the blockers in this and if this has been reviewed. This information could be obtained from a more detailed PIR. Need to use the market shaping powers that we have as part of this.

<p>(MC) – May look at producing an evidence bank, we could not commit to resource to have inspectors speak to a service every month. When we inspected hospitals we used to invite the public to come in and speak to us and these weren't really attended. We need to tap into things that are already happening so that we can think about affordability.</p> <p>(TD) Need to be mindful that we could provide value for money for our fees.</p> <p>(DW) A lot of care providers are a second family to the people they provide support for. They may not see their work as official advocacy, but they are advocating for people such as getting social care assessments and hospital appointments. The voluntary sector also has a huge role in this and we need to recognise this, they may also be able to see when people need support.</p> <p>(SC) – Need to have questions around if the local authority has engaged with the advocacy that services are carrying out.</p> <p>(MA) – A role for trade associations to gather data and might be able to anonymise data from nervous providers who may not provide this otherwise.</p>	
<p>Publishing findings from inspections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OW presented slides, an update of which will be shared with members following the meeting. • OW shared an overview of mock up designs and user research, feedback and insights to date related to the early-stage designs for website content, which will be further developed related to how inspection activity will be published on the website under the new regulatory model in the future. <p>(AS) – How accurate and up to date will the information be?</p> <p>(OG) – We are still working on the sequence for this. We are looking for balance between when we collect evidence and when we should share this. This is likely to be far more frequent as we aren't waiting for someone to cross the threshold.</p>	<p>Owen Griffiths, CQC Public Information Manager</p>

<p>(MA) – If there is a push on a particular area that causes a group of providers to go up, will this mean services will go down.</p> <p>(SC) – Was in a meeting where CQC went into a service that they may potentially prosecute; how would this be represented on this new page?</p> <p>(OG) – They would have a red banner on the website that would clearly show this.</p> <p>(SC) – Would this be shown before it was published.</p> <p>(OG) – Was unsure and was unable to comment on this case. However, this will still be as before.</p>	
<p>AOB</p> <p>(SC) – Frequency of the information we are supplying is really important for providers and the public.</p> <p>(TD) – Had a call from one of their members, they received advice from the contact centre that led to them receiving a breach. Have advised that we will look into this.</p> <p>(AS) – Would find it helpful to receive the slides prior to the meeting so that answers and thoughts can be prepared properly. Noted the slides for the workshop session were shared with members before the meeting.</p> <p>(JB) – Found the meeting really useful and finds the forums really useful and helps them to look at the practicalities.</p>	<p>All</p>