

**Coventry City Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board (5) held at 11.00**  
**am on Wednesday, 29 June 2016**

Present:

Members: Councillor D Gannon (Chair)  
Councillor R Auluck  
Councillor J Clifford  
Councillor L Kelly  
Councillor D Kershaw  
Councillor K Taylor  
Councillor G Williams

Co-Opted Members: David Spurgeon

Other Members: Councillors F Abbott

Employees (by Directorate)

V Castree, Resources Directorate  
P Fahy, People Directorate  
L Knight, Resources Directorate  
J Moore, People Directorate

Apologies: Councillors R Ali, A Andrews and S Walsh

## **Public Business**

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016 were signed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

### **3. Adult Social Care Peer Challenge**

The Scrutiny Board considered a briefing note of the Director of Adult Services which informed of the recommendations arising from the Adult Social Care Peer Challenge which took place from 23<sup>rd</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 and detailed the actions to be progressed to address the issues raised. A copy of the feedback letter from Keith Skerman, who led the Peer team; their feedback presentation; and the Adult Social Care Action Plan in response were set out at appendices to the briefing note. Councillor Abbott, Cabinet Member for Adult Services attended the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The briefing note indicated that the Peer Challenge was part of the sector led improvement approach across Adult Social Care and provided an opportunity to

have an objective assessment of how well a service was performing in a specified area, highlighting any areas for improvement.

Prior to the review, a case file audit of 20 social work cases was undertaken by two principal social workers. The overarching question which formed the basis of the challenge was: 'How equipped is Coventry City Council to enable people who come into contact with Adult Social Care to make active choices about how outcomes are met.' In examining this question the Peer Challenge focused on four key lines of enquiry: the approach to both new and existing customers; the approach to workforce development; and commissioning and financial management processes.

The Peer Challenge summary highlighted that performance was being maintained despite significant financial reductions. Examples of innovative service delivery were identified and these along with a 'can-do' attitude within the directorate leadership and workforce and positive relationships with health partners and other stakeholders was seen as a good foundation for further improvement.

As anticipated the team identified that progress had not been made in an evidential way when delivering personalised support for Coventry residents. There was an acknowledgement that the Coventry and Rugby CCG had continued to use the Better Care Fund to protect Adult Social Care which had increased in 2016/17 but that the lack of a single plan for the health and social care system could be a barrier to progress.

The findings focused significant effort on the workforce, the processes used to support Adult Social Care, and the way the market was engaged to support the delivery of the changes required to make the delivery of personalisation more of a reality for Coventry residents.

The briefing note highlighted the seven recommendations from the Peer Review Team along with responses from the Directorate. In relation to Safeguarding and to ensure that a personalised approach was being taken in this area, a separate action plan was in place. It was intended that this work would include an independent evaluation of progress in this area later in 2016. All actions set out in the briefing note were included in the action plan which would be used by Adult Social Care as a basis for delivering and measuring progress. The action plan covered the following five areas in which progress would be made: vision and strategy; embedding personalisation in practice; improving the experience of the customer; embedding personalisation in process; and robust financial planning and programme management.

The Board questioned the officer on a number of issues and responses were provided. Matters raised included:

- Details of the Peer Review Team and any financial implications for the City Council
- Following the challenge, what would be the benefits for Coventry residents
- Whether officers had been provided with any further details other than what was set out in the feedback presentation

- A concern that in the feedback weaknesses were highlighted as strengths which undermined the report, potentially meaning the review was not as robust as it could have been
- A concern that no feedback had been given to the key focus groups including Health watch
- A concern about the quality of the evaluative comments including a lack of detail/ evidence
- A request for the Board to have the opportunity to consider the independent evaluation of the progress being made in safeguarding
- Whether the observations and findings would be relevant to all local authorities across the country
- Further details about proposals for the use of new technology and an acknowledgement of the need for employees to be receptive to new ways of working
- A comparison of the safeguarding figures with neighbouring local authorities
- The involvement of Adult Social Care with the Sustainability and Transformation Plan and the current position of the Better Care Fund
- In relation to safeguarding, a concern about the welfare of carers
- Clarification that the concerns of the Board regarding the findings of the Peer Review Challenge would be reported back to the Peer Review Team and to the West Midlands Association of Directors of Adult Social Care.

The Board also considered that appointment of a member to sit on the Personalisation Reference Group.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) The outcome of the Adult Social Care Peer Challenge undertaken between 23<sup>rd</sup> and 25th February, 2016 and the actions being progressed as a result be noted.**

**(2) Councillor Clifford be appointed to serve on the Personalisation Reference Group which will include voluntary sector and user representatives.**

**(3) The Chair, Councillor Gannon to liaise with Councillor Abbott, Cabinet Member for Adult Services and Pete Fahy, Director of Adult Services to provide feedback from the Scrutiny Board on the Peer Review report for the Peer Review Team and the West Midlands Association of Director of Adult Social Services (ADASS).**

**(4) A further report on progress with implementing the action plan be submitted to a future meeting of the Board following Keith Skerman's visit in October.**

**(5) A report on the independent evaluation of the progress being made in respect of safeguarding ensuring that a personalised approach is being taken in this area be submitted to a future meeting of the Board.**

**4. Any other items of Public Business - Healthwatch Coventry**

For the benefit of new Members, the Board received an update from David Spurgeon, Co-opted Member about the purpose and work of Coventry Healthwatch, which was the independent champion for health and social care in the city.

Healthwatch undertook the following:

- (i) Asked people what they thought about services to see what worked well and what should be improved
- (ii) Influenced the planning and delivery of NHS and social care services based on what local people told them
- (iii) Provided information to the public about local health and social care services
- (iv) Provided information and support for people making an NHS complaint.

Healthwatch had legal powers to enable them to gather information, visit services and to get a response to their recommendations.

The Board were informed that Ruth Light, Chief Officer and John Mason, Chair, were both members of Coventry's Health and Wellbeing Board. Members were invited to attend Healthwatch's Annual General Meeting which was taking place on Tuesday, 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.

**5. Any other items of Public Business - Health Select Committee Visit to Coventry**

Jane Moore, Director of Public Health reported that a party of MPs on the Health Select Committee visited Coventry on 23<sup>rd</sup> May to take a closer look at the city's efforts to reduce health inequalities and how the policy objectives of the Marmot report on health inequalities had been implemented. The Committee met a range of partners and public health practitioners and were particularly impressed with the strong partnership work and all the enthusiasm for making improvements to peoples' health and wellbeing, quoting Coventry as 'inspirational'.

(Meeting closed at 12.20 pm)