Council of Governors

Minutes of the Council of Governors Meeting on Thursday, 5 October 2017 at 18:00 in The Town Hall, Bridge Street, Banbury, Oxfordshire OX16 5QE.

Present: Dame Fiona Caldicott FC Chairman
Dr Arthur Boylston ABo Public Governor, South Oxfordshire
Mr Steve Candler SCa Public Governor, Rest of England & Wales
Ms Lucy Carr LC Staff Governor, Clinical
Mrs Sue Chapman SCh Public Governor, West Oxfordshire
Mrs Sally-Jane Davidge SJD Public Governor, Bucks, Berks, Glos & Wilts
Dr Elizabeth Gemmill EG Nominated Governor, Oxford University
Dr Cecilia Gould CGI Public Governor, Oxford City
Mr Martin Havelock MHa Public Governor, Vale of White Horse (from Item 6)
Mrs Jill Haynes JHy Public Governor, Vale of White Horse (from Item 6)
Mrs Rosemary Herring RH Public Governor, Northamptonshire & Warwickshire
Mrs Anita Higham OBE AH Public Governor, Cherwell
Mr Martin Howell MHo Nominated Governor, Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust (from Item 6)
Dr Astrid Schloerscheidt AS Nominated Governor, Oxford Brookes University
Mr Thomas Snipe TS Staff Governor, Non-Clinical
Ms Julie Stockbridge JS Staff Governor, Clinical
Mr Keith Strangwood KS Public Governor, Cherwell
Dr Chris Winearls CW Staff Governor, Clinical

In Attendance: Dr Tony Berendt ABe Medical Director
Ms Susan Brown SB Senior Communications Manager
Mr Christopher Goard CGr Non-Executive Director
Mr Scott Lambert SL Young People’s Executive Co-ordinator
Ms Susan Polywka SP Head of Corporate Governance and Trust Secretary
Dr Neil Scotchmer NS Programme Manager

Apologies Mr Tony Bagot-Webb ABW Public Governor, Northamptonshire & Warwickshire
Dr Susy Brigden SBri Public Governor, West Oxfordshire
Mr Simon Brewster SBre Staff Governor, Clinical
Dr John Harrison JHr Public Governor, Oxford City
Dr Paul Park PP Nominated Governor, Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
Mr Mariusz Zabrynski MZ Staff Governor, Non-Clinical
Emily Young People’s Executive [YPE]
Lewis Young People’s Executive [YPE]

CoG17/04/01 Welcome and introduction
The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the new governors who were present, Arthur Boylston, Thomas Snipe and Keith Strangwood. Re-elected governors were also welcomed back to the Council and the Chairman noted that terms of office for all of the
recently elected governors would last until the beginning of October 2020. She further noted that letters of thanks had been written to those governors not returning and that the local induction of new governors was to take place on 15 November with details to be circulated to governors shortly.

The Chairman also welcomed Astrid Schloerscheidt, the newly nominated governor for Oxford Brookes University to the meeting. The Council was informed that Emily and Lewis would be the new nominated governors for the Young People’s Executive [YPE] although neither was able to be present on this occasion.

Finally the Chairman welcomed the Medical Director, Dr Tony Berendt who was in attendance to update the Council following its joint meeting with the Board of Directors.

CoG17/04/02 Apologies and declarations of interest
Apologies were received from Tony Bagot-Webb, Susy Brigden, Simon Brewster, John Harrison, Paul Park and Mariusz Zabryznski as well as the two YPE governors.

Anita Higham declared an interest as the Chair of the CCG’s North Oxfordshire Locality Forum. Keith Strangwood declared an interest as the current Chair of the ‘Keep the Horton’ campaign group and for the previous four years.

The Chairman informed the Council that Val Ingram, a member of the public, had made a request to ask a question at the meeting. The Chairman explained that, whilst there was no allowance for this under the Constitution, it had been agreed that on this occasion Ms Ingram might ask a question at the end of the meeting if it was notified to the Chairman in advance.

CoG17/04/03 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2017
Rosie Herring noted that she had sent her apologies for the previous meeting but that these had not been recorded.

The minutes were otherwise accepted as an accurate record.

CoG17/04/04 Matters arising from the minutes
There were no matters arising not on the agenda.

CoG17/04/05 Chairman’s Business
The Medical Director was in attendance to respond to any questions regarding the recent joint seminar of the Council of Governors and the Board of Directors following the circulation of the notes of the meeting.

RH commented that the notes read as accurate but could have been written before the session as they did not incorporate any of the comments made by governors. She suggested that it was important to demonstrate that this was a joint meeting.

The Head of Corporate Governance clarified that it had not been practice to make the seminars minuted proceedings but that on this occasion some notes had been produced to highlight the key points of discussion for those governors unable to attend. They were not intended to be a record of the discussion at the meeting. The Chairman recognised, however, that this point should be considered for future joint seminars.

Sue Chapman commented that she felt the event had been very helpful. The level of attendance was commended with a high proportion of the Board present. RH noted that it was very positive that the Council and Board had mixed around the table and that there had been good interaction between the two groups.
Chris Winearls noted that the Medical Director had spoken about the possibility of joint ventures at the seminar and that this had been followed by a more specific announcement regarding a joint venture with the Mayo Clinic. He explained that some colleagues had been concerned that this could include the establishment of an independent private clinic in Oxford and asked if such a development was planned.

AB noted that the Trust currently undertook a very small proportion of private activity and that there was a desire to take better advantage of the reputation of the Trust and the University of Oxford. He explained that non-NHS commissioned revenue could be sought to help both organisations in their missions, in the case of OUH to improve patient care, particularly in the light of financial pressures on the Trust from an NHS perspective. To this end a joint venture had been established between OUH and the University of Oxford and a venture for an advanced diagnostics centre in London with the Mayo had been agreed. The Medical Director confirmed that there was no intention for this venture to establish a clinic in Oxford.

Elizabeth Gemmill asked whether it was possible for governors to have sight of any memorandum of understanding relating to the venture, particularly to clarify the Mayo’s intentions in relation to teaching and training. AB indicated that some elements of this remained commercially confidential at that stage and the Chairman agreed that clarification would be sought regarding those elements that could go into the public domain.

Action: SP

The Medical Director informed the Council that small revenues had previously been made from spin outs and inventions by members of the Trust. However, the Trust had recently signed an agreement with Drayson technologies regarding SEND [System for Electronic Notification and Documentation], a system developed with the Trust's Biomedical Research Centre. This system was part of a decision-support technology to highlight patients at risk of deterioration. Wards where this work had been implemented had seen significant reductions in cardiac arrests due to earlier warning of deterioration. This development could now bring in revenue to Trust and be rolled out across the country. The Chairman explained that this was now being used as an exemplar of how work done within the NHS could be extended for the benefit of both the Trust and the wider NHS.

Anita Higham noted that two clinicians had approached her for information regarding the joint venture between the Trust, the University of Oxford and the Mayo and asked if Trust staff had now received a briefing on the development. The Medical Director noted that the Trust’s intention was always to inform governors in advance of a general release of information, with clinicians notified shortly afterwards. He commented that there were restrictions regarding the timing where information was commercial and in confidence. Chris Winearls confirmed that information regarding the joint venture had now been communicated to Trust staff.

Cecilia Gould commented that ventures of this nature sometimes involved NHS patients in research and that it was hoped that developments could then be accessed by the NHS on favourable terms. The Medical Director explained that this would depend on the particular terms and that the benefit in some cases would be full payment for use of NHS resources and knowledge during the initial research. AB also noted that OUH was operating in a competitive environment and that others might take up opportunities that the Trust turned down, recognising that there were potential pitfalls and that the organisation needed to maintain its awareness of these. The Chairman confirmed that the Trust would continue to keep the Council informed regarding this development.
The Chairman explained to the Council that the Independent Review Panel had advised the Secretary of State that further action in relation to the temporary suspension of obstetric services at the Horton General Hospital was not in the public interest. A judicial review of the decision by Oxfordshire CCG to employ a two stage consultation process for its proposed changes to health services across the county remained to be heard. In addition the Oxfordshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee had referred the decision to create a single specialist obstetric unit for Oxfordshire (and its neighbouring areas) at the John Radcliffe Hospital and to establish a permanent Midwifery-Led Unit at Horton General Hospital to the Secretary of State.

Keith Strangwood asked whether maintenance on the Maternity Building and Ward at the Horton General Hospital had been continued since the temporary suspension of obstetric services. The Medical Director explained that he was not in a position to answer this point directly but it was agreed that a written answer would be provided to the whole Council following the meeting.

**CoG17/04/06 Lead Governor role and election**

The Head of Corporate Governance presented this paper outlining a proposed approach to the election of the Lead Governor.

It was noted that Dr Gould’s current term of office expired on 1 December and the Council agreed that she would be asked to continue in the role should no new governor yet have been elected to the role on this date.

The Council discussed whether all governors should be eligible to stand as Lead Governor or whether there should be some exclusions. It was suggested that staff governors might be perceived as having a conflict of interest. In addition CGI suggested that the CCG’s nominated governor could also be regarded as having a conflict of interest due to the negotiation of annual contracts between the two organisations. MHo similarly suggested that he would not consider standing as the nominated representative of Oxford Health. It was agreed that there was no specific conflict of interest that would prevent either university governor from standing. Scott Lambert suggested that the YPE governors should also be excluded. The Chairman indicated that it would probably not be appropriate to consider OCC or NHSE in their absence.

AH also asked whether an individual married to someone who was employed in the Trust could be in a difficult position as Lead Governor. The Chairman noted that there was no exclusion on such a basis within the Constitution and noted that it would raise difficult questions about the types of personal or family relationships that would be regarded as problematic.

AH further highlighted that some trusts have a deputy to the Lead Governor and that this might be something to consider. Jules Stockbridge also questioned why the term of the Lead Governor was only for a single year, noting that this made elections fairly frequent. SP commented that a longer term increased the chance that a new Lead Governor could be required as a result of not being re-elected in a set of governor elections. AH noted that the presence of a deputy would provide a solution to this problem. It was confirmed that there was no reason under the Constitution that the term of office could not be longer than one year. CW commented that he saw no issue with a one year term, explaining that this provided governors with an opportunity for change if they wanted it but suggesting that a strong candidate was likely to be unopposed for re-election.
It was agreed that the manual ‘double envelope’ approach to voting had worked effectively at the last elections and agreed that this should be used again, recognising that an electronic solution might be possible in future. TS asked about the voting system and it was confirmed that this was currently ‘First Past the Post’. CW noted that with a large number of candidates this was not the optimal system and TS supported this view.

CGI observed that her experience had been that she was often approached by individuals who wanted issues raised and had on that basis contacted the Head of Corporate Governance regarding adding these to the agenda. She proposed that the Lead Governor should therefore have a formal role in agenda setting. Dr Gould explained that she had also acted as a conduit to the Board on some occasions although always being clear that she had no specific mandate to do so. She noted that including such a mandate within the role would avoid putting the person undertaking it in a difficult position when this occurs by ensuring that it is done with the Council’s support.

MHo commented, based on the experience of Oxford Health, that involvement in agenda setting could be a helpful extension to the Lead Governor role though observed that it could sometimes involve a significant amount of work. RH also supported such an extension as being in line with her own experience at another foundation trust. She also agreed that it could be useful for the trust to have a recognised conduit for communications. AH similarly supported the Lead Governor being an authorised route for communication to enhance transparency. CW supported the proposed extensions to the role, suggesting that its current nature was confusing given its name. He suggested that this would allow processes to run more smoothly.

The proposed extensions to the role were agreed by the Council but it was agreed that the length of term would remain unchanged for the present and that no deputy role would be created at this stage.

The Chairman noted that the next meeting at which the Board could approve the changes was in November. The Council would be informed of the Board’s decision following their meeting.

It was agreed that a note would then be circulated to the Council of Governors to confirm the timing and arrangements for nominations and elections.

Action: SP

CoG17/04/07 Non-Executive Director appointments

Martin Havelock presented the report from the Nominations and Remuneration Committee [NRC].

The Committee had confirmed that it supported the reappointment of Anne Tutt as a non-executive director for a period of three years and this recommendation was accepted by the Council.

Proposals for the process for appointment to the upcoming NED vacancy arising upon expiry of Mr Peter Ward’s term of office on 30 November 2017 were tabled at the meeting. It was agreed that any comments on the suggested approach should be communicated to the Head of Corporate Governance as soon as possible following the meeting.
Proposed terms of reference for merger of the NRC and Appointment Panel

Terms of reference for the new Remuneration, Nominations and Appointment Committee were presented to the Council, based on those used by the previous Nominations and Remuneration Committee [NRC]. These also encompassed the constitutional requirements for convening an appointment panel for a NED appointment.

Martin Havelock explained that there had been unanimous support for the proposal to merge the Nominations and Remuneration Committee with the Appointment Panel for non-executive director [NED] vacancies from the existing NRC. AH noted her support for the proposal that the Lead Governor be a member of the merged entity.

Rosie Herring noted that she had recently been involved in the review of the constitution of another trust and highlighted two points based on this experience. Firstly, she suggested that when considering the re-appointment of a NED on first renewal (to consider whether this might be made without a process of open competition), RNAC should reserve the right to meet with the NED. She noted that this would not always be exercised and was primarily so that the Committee could satisfy itself that the time commitment was possible for the individual and that there were no conflicts of interest. Secondly, she suggested including a clause that all members of the appointment panel should be appropriately trained. These suggested amendments will be taken into consideration when reviewing the terms of reference of RNAC, along with the terms of reference of other committees of Council.

The Head of Corporate Governance clarified that the new Committee would bring together all members of the Nominations and Remuneration Committee as well as the members of the previous Appointment Panel, along with the Lead Governor. Future appointment panels would be formed from a subset of the total membership so as to meet the requirements of the Constitution.

Chris Winearls highlighted that the Nominations and Remuneration Committee had also considered matters not relating to appointments and this new committee would now be responsible for looking at these.

CW also noted that this meant that a governor who was not a member of the newly enlarged committee would not as a matter of course be a member of an appointments panel and SP agreed that this would be the case, unless specific provision was made to co-opt another governor.

Martin Howell suggested that the Council might want to consider whether an additional NED should be involved in the panel to review prospective candidates.

The Chairman commented that an outline of lessons learned from the recent appointment process would be brought to a future meeting of the Council of Governors. She noted as an example that this had not included the opportunity in the process for candidates to meet the rest of Board.

Martin Havelock noted that governors on the Appointments Panel had previously been selected by election by governors but that the proposed terms of reference indicate that they will be chosen by the members of the Committee. The Head of Corporate Governance recognised this point and confirmed that the Council was being asked to cede to the Committee the decision regarding the appointment of individuals from its membership to the Appointment Panel. There was provision for committee members to hold a secret ballot should this be required.
The merger of the two bodies and the revised terms of reference were approved by the Council.

The Head of Corporate Governance confirmed that at this time the membership of the new Remuneration, Nominations and Appointment Committee would comprise all members of the former NRC and the previous Appointment Panel, with the addition of the Lead Governor. Membership of the Appointment Panel for the upcoming NED recruitment would be unchanged from the panel for the recent NED recruitment.

The Council heard that the terms of reference of all committees were due to be reviewed and proposals would be submitted to the next meeting of Council on 30 January 2018. The Chairman suggested, in particular, that a proposal should come to the next meeting of the Council of Governors regarding whether there should be fixed terms of office for the membership of all committees, and whether consideration should also be given to phasing the terms of office to prevent the entire membership of the committee changing at one time.

Action: SP/NS

CoG17/04/09 Governor elections 2017: Lessons learned

This paper was presented by Sue Chapman as Chair of the Patient Experience, Membership and Quality [PEMQ] Committee. She began by welcoming back those governors who had been re-elected and welcoming new governors to the Council.

SCh explained that there had been a number of issues with the electoral process on this occasion. The most significant had been the omission of a candidate from the ballot, an error to which UK Engage, the electoral provider, had responded very positively. Some difficulties had also been experienced by staff voting and proposals had been made to rectify these in the future.

Committee members had been pleased by the number of nominations received but slightly disappointed by the turnout and it was felt that there should be work to improve the latter in the future. SCh outlined a proposal recommended by the Committee to pause the voting timetable to avoid voting taking place over the summer which was believed to have an impact on turnout. This would result in a later announcement of the result and so all candidates should be informed of the dates for future Council meetings so that they could have these in their diaries. These proposed changes were agreed.

In addition to this change the Committee had recommended a review of some constituency boundaries. SJD explained that some residents of Milton Keynes had assumed that they were in the constituency covering Buckinghamshire but had discovered that, because Milton Keynes was a unitary authority, it formed part of the Rest of England and Wales constituency. The view of the Committee had been that constituency boundaries should be amended to reflect historical county boundaries. It was suggested that a general approach should be agreed that could form a sound precedent should other unitary authorities be formed. SCa noted that he had been surprised to find that Milton Keynes formed part of his constituency and suggested that the important thing was to consider whether its residents considered themselves to belong in Buckinghamshire. It was agreed that the Trust would review this and bring proposals back to the Council of Governors.

Action: NS/SP

CW noted the low turnout in staff constituencies and suggested that global emails were not the best way to reach staff. JS supported this view and commented that many global emails would just be deleted by staff. It was suggested that information could be
attached to pay packets and it was agreed that this seemed a good approach and would be investigated.

LC noted the complexity of the process. A simpler way to review information on all candidates was requested. TS highlighted that it was awkward to have to separately open multiple profiles. NS explained that discussions had already taken place with UK Engage regarding ways to improve this for future elections.

TS also noted that it would be helpful to have clearer guidance in future elections regarding what approaches were permissible in campaigning for election.

MHa asked how the turnout compared with Trust’s elsewhere. NS explained that this question had been raised with UK Engage based on their experience elsewhere. They had commented that the level of turnout had been broadly in line with an overall decline that they had observed nationally and turnout in the Trust’s public constituencies was consistent with levels in other trusts. NS noted, however, that levels had been lower for staff constituencies.

**CoG17/04/10 Proposals for management of governor vacancy in South Oxfordshire**

NS presented this paper which outlined options in relation to the current vacancy in the South Oxfordshire constituency caused by the resignation of Simon Clarke.

Governors supported the option of leaving the seat vacant given the relatively short period of time until the next elections in this constituency. ABo, as the other governor for South Oxfordshire, confirmed that he has happy with this.

KS asked whether it would be possible to co-opt someone into the role and it was confirmed that the Constitution did not currently allow for this option.

SCa noted that governors from neighbouring constituencies could provide support if required. The Head of Corporate Governance confirmed that this was appropriate, reminding the Council that all governors were responsible for representing the interests of the public as a whole.

**CoG17/04/11 Annual Auditors’ Letter and Annual Accounts 2016/17**

The Head of Corporate Governance explained that these documents would be formally presented at the Trust’s AGM on 11 October 2017 which all governors were encouraged to attend. Governors were asked, however, whether they had any questions at this stage. It was also noted that the Auditor’s Letter was being shared as draft on the basis that there was no expectation of any changes in the substance prior to the AGM.

It was suggested that in future attachments of this size be presented separately to reduce the size of the pack of papers for the meeting.

No questions on the documents were raised at the meeting and it was agreed that any queries should be sent to the Head of Corporate Governance in advance of the AGM.

**CoG17/04/12 Update on appointment of external auditor**

The Head of Corporate Governance presented a paper outlining progress regarding the appointment of the external auditor. The Council of Governors was asked to agree the terms of reference of the External Audit Working Group and note the progress made. It was also asked to note that a policy regarding the Engagement of External Auditors for Providing Non-Audit Services was in place.
The Chairman clarified that members of the Group were volunteers. CGI commented that there had been limited interest in participating in this work and that a replacement for Richard Soper on the Group would probably be required. The intention that the Group continue as a subset of the membership of the Performance, Workforce and Finance Committee was clarified with MHa noting that it was helpful for those involved also to be members of the main committee.

CGI commented that being the auditor for a trust was not necessarily an attractive role for large auditors and the Chairman noted that the NHS requires trust auditors to belong to one of a limited number of recognised firms.

ABo raised a query regarding the locally-selected indicator of VTE assessment, noting that the number for the assay seemed low and asking how this had been arrived at and whether there was any measure of whether the correct actions were taken for patients at risk. The Chairman directed ABo to the Quality Account for fuller detail regarding the indicator. CW clarified that every patient admitted was assessed but that the purpose of the audit was to confirm that this was done. JS commented that, whilst 25 was a relatively small sample, a robust process for the assessments existed in the Emergency Department.

CGI commented that the Electronic Patient Record [EPR] was integral to these processes and that it might be of benefit for governors to have a seminar on this. CGI noted her interest in this as her husband worked for the Trust as a clinician in a role that included responsibility for the development of the EPR.

CoG17/04/13 Reports from sub-committees of the Council

i. Patient Experience, Membership and Quality

Sue Chapman presented the report from the Patient Experience, Membership and Quality Committee. She recommended attendance at the Board by governors, noting that it was useful as a member of a subcommittee to have observed the relevant Board discussions.

SCh explained that the last meeting of the Committee had included a helpful discussion of the Quality Report and the opportunity to understand the patient experience work that was being undertaken, with a presentation from Rachel Taylor, Public Engagement Manager. It had been agreed that a visit to the HART [Home Assessment Reablement Team] service would be arranged separately from the Committee’s regular meetings. The Committee’s desire for governors to be involved in the peer review programme was highlighted and this was to be followed up with Eileen Walsh, Director of Assurance.

SCh emphasised that new members of the Committee would be welcomed and the Head of Corporate Governance indicated that she would send a note to governors following the meeting to invite expressions of interest by 13 October.

Scott Lambert noted that YPE governors had expressed an interest in this committee but that meetings were currently generally during school hours. He asked if it might be possible for the young people’s governors to be a different type of member and SP suggested that members of the Committee might be willing to be flexible regarding this.

ii. Performance, Workforce and Finance

Cecilia Gould explained that this Committee had stood down its most recent meeting as the key topics had been covered at the joint seminar with the Board.
She also welcomed new members to join this Committee, commenting that staff governors were particularly encouraged because their perspective was very helpful. The Chairman suggested that if the pressures of work did not make this viable then they might be able to attend one or two meetings rather than becoming full members. MHa suggested that it might be helpful to consider the forward plan for meetings so that those areas where support would be most helpful could be flagged up.

CoG17/04/14 Update from Young People’s Executive

Scott Lambert provided an update on behalf of the young people’s governors.

SL firstly outlined Hannah and Millie’s exam results and plans for the future. Hannah had been offered a place to study paediatric and mental health nursing at Bristol University while Millie had been offered a place to study Psychology, also at Bristol University.

Lewis and Emily would be the two new YPE governors. Lewis was in year 13 and would stand for just one year but Emily was in year 12 and would stand for two years. It was hoped that in future a new governor in year 12 would be selected each year to stagger the roles and ensure that there was always a governor with experience to provide support.

At the last meeting of YPE the results of the National Children’s Survey had been reviewed. Lewis and Emily were keen to share the results with the Patient Experience, Membership and Quality Committee.

Members of YPE would also be attending the ‘Big Meet Up’ at Great Ormond Street Hospital and would be presenting in November at the Oxford Brookes University service user involvement session.

Finally SJD passed on congratulations to SL on being appointed to a permanent role as YPE Co-ordinator.

CoG17/04/15 Meeting dates in 2018

NS presented a paper outlining a proposed schedule of meetings and seminars for the Council during 2018. Governors were asked whether they wished to continue to vary the times, days and venues for meetings as had previously been the case.

LC noted that 5pm was a difficult time and that it was better for meetings to be either later or earlier than this.

RH commented that she continued to support having meetings in different parts of the county as she felt that, although attendance had sometimes been low, it was important to give members of the public in different areas the opportunity to attend.

EG asked how meetings were publicised to members. Governors were informed that all members were notified and that efforts were made in particular to highlight them to people who lived locally. On this occasion social media had also been used.

SL suggested that, for meetings taking place from 6pm, it would be helpful to have the YPE item earlier on the agenda.

No further changes to current arrangements were proposed and it was agreed that dates for 2018 would be circulated to all governors shortly on this basis.

Action: NS/SP
CoG17/04/16 Any Other Business

AH sought clarification that future elections for governors would be for a period of three years and NS confirmed that this was the case.

KS asked if items from governors should be added to the agenda through the Lead Governor. The Head of Corporate Governance clarified that currently the opportunity was provided to all governors to suggest items for the agenda directly. KS also commented that work plans for committees should be defined by the Council of Governors and it was agreed that the future work plan would be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

Action: SP/NS

The Chairman invited Ms Ingram to put her question to the Council as had been agreed. Ms Ingram asked whether the Trust and Oxfordshire CCG complied with their obligations under the 1989 Children Act. The Chairman commented that it would not be possible to provide an answer on behalf of the CCG but that a written answer would be provided on behalf of the Trust following the meeting.

CoG2017/04/17 Date of the next meeting

The Council of Governors will meet in public on Tuesday, 30 January 2018 with the venue to be confirmed.