

Subject:	Nomination of a Member to Represent the SHWB to the Kent, Surrey & Sussex Local Education & Training Board		
Date of Meeting:	05 December 2012		
Report of:	The Director of Public Health		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Giles Rossington	Tel: 29-1038
	Email:	Giles.rossington@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Local Education & Training Boards (LETB) are part of the new NHS structures, working alongside NHS providers to manage and co-ordinate NHS training on a regional basis.
- 1.2 The Kent, Surrey & Sussex LETB has recently written to all Shadow Health & Wellbeing Boards (SHWB) in its patch requesting that the SHWBs each nominate a board member to act as the board's representative in dealings with the LETB. (The LETB letter is included as **Appendix 1** to this report.)
- 1.3 It is proposed that the Brighton & Hove SHWB nominates the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Chief Operating Officer to be the SHWB representative to the LETB. The CCG Chief Operating Officer is content to be nominated in this way.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That SHWB members agree to nominate the CCG Chief Operating Officer to represent the Board to the LETB.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 Under the new NHS arrangements, NHS staff planning and training will be the joint responsibility of NHS providers, Health Education England (HEE) and Local Education & Training Boards (which are the sub-regional spokes of HEE).
- 3.2 In order to carry out its functions the Kent, Surrey & Sussex LETB has written to all local authorities, CCGs and SHWBs in its patch requesting that they nominate an individual with lead responsibility for working with the LETB.
- 3.3 It seems unlikely that the interaction between individual SHWBs and the LETB will be particularly extensive, as the LETB's duties are largely discrete from those of the SHWB. However, CCGs will need to build strong relationships with the LETB, and it therefore seems sensible to nominate a CCG member of the SHWB as the local SHWB representative. This has been the course pursued by our immediate neighbours (i.e. East and West Sussex).

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 None has been undertaken – this is not a matter of obvious interest to the local community.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 There are no financial implications relating to this report.

Finance Officer Consulted: Anne Silley Date: 16/11/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert Date 23/11/12

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 None directly

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 None

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 None

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 There is a need for SHWBs to have a relationship with the LETB, and therefore a risk in not nominating a representative. However, the opportunity is a relatively minor one, as it is unlikely that the LETB will be instrumental in the work of the SHWB. It therefore seems sensible to nominate a CCG SHWB member, as the CCG will in any case need to build a relationship with the LETB.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.7 None directly for the SHWB. Public Health (and BHCC social care services) may seek to build relationships with the LETB, but they will do so separately from the SHWB.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 Having an adequate and properly trained NHS workforce is important for the city, particularly in terms of the key corporate objective to reduce inequalities. However, the key relationships with the LETB are likely to be those forged by the CCG and the relevant council departments rather than the SHWB.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 The SHWB could have declined to nominate a representative, but this might be unwise should the SHWB need to work closely with the LETB at some point.
- 6.2 The SHWB could have nominated a non-CCG member to represent its interests, but this would have required the member to develop a relationship with the LETB whereas the CCG will in any case need to build its own relationship.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The recommendation enables the SHWB to develop a relationship with the LETB whilst making minimal demands on the nominated SHWB member.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Letter from the LETB to BHCC Chief Executive

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

None

