



Coventry Local Public Service Board

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8th April 2008
Room 77, Council House
10am to 12 noon

Present:

Stella Manzie (Chair)	Coventry City Council
Jos Parry	Coventry City Council
Cllr Ken Taylor	Coventry City Council
Cat Parker	Coventry City Council
Mark Tovey	Government Office West Midlands
Deborah Harrod	West Midlands Police
Jane Beaver	Job Centre Plus
Caron Grainger	PCT
John Forde	PCT
Paul Burton	West Midland Fire Service
Sarah Chand	Probation Service
Matt Gilks	PCT
Barry Hastie	Coventry City Council
Simon Brake	Coventry City Council
Helen Shankster	Coventry City Council
June Morley	Coventry Partnership (Minutes)

Apologies:

None Noted

1. Welcome and Apologies

Stella Manzie, Chair, welcomed everybody to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

- a) The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record.
- b) Jos Parry, Coventry City Council, updated the Board regarding the Local Area Agreement (LAA) - there has been agreement on 33 of the 35 Local Area Agreement indicators with the outstanding 2 being NI35 (violent extremism) and NI 167 (journey times during the morning peak).
- c) The Board were advised that the Department for Communities and Local Government are to review the approach to preventing violent extremism. Commissioner Lord Patel had asked if he could visit Coventry during May 2008 to discuss this issue locally. Stella clarified to the Board that Coventry were keen to work on tackling the issue, but not on including it as an LAA indicator.

3. Managing Service Improvement

Stella Manzie, tabled a paper on Managing Service Improvements, giving examples from the Council. Stella highlighted the need for all partner organisations to allocate a lead person who would be accountable for targets once they were set and agreed. Also noted was the need to recognise where service improvements could be made.

Stella stressed the importance of information sharing between partner agencies. She suggested making a list of improvement reviews to determine any commonality between organisations and to highlight options for joint working. It was noted that operational leads would be useful contacts for details. Stella suggested that parts of service improvement reviews could influence joint working which would generate savings that could be used to redirect resources where needed.

- It was suggested that Coventry Partnership compile the list (although it was recognised that current capacity may be an issue)
- Deb Harrod made the point that there seems to be continual reviews taking place and the list would be an ever-changing one that would need careful managing to be effective, but agreed that it would be useful as a tool to list areas of commonality, providing opportunities for joint working - with the caveat that it would need to be updated regularly.
- Jos Parry suggested that the list could be linked to the work that Mike Coult (Coventry City Council) is undertaking with the Value For Money team.
- Matt Gilks said that the PCT had so much going on that it would be difficult to link all projects to targets and that co-ordination was an issue. He agreed that there would need to be a responsible lead for targets with relevant knowledge. He agreed that the collation of a list was a good idea.
- Stella clarified that the purpose of the list would not create a need to consult with partners prior to undertaking any service reviews. She also clarified that the list would merely highlight 'opportunities for sharing' which could lead to (as an example) sharing of Human Resource services. She recognised the difficulties in managing such a list.
- Matt Gilks, raised concerns that there is often enthusiasm when starting initiatives, but that this was not carried through to reviewing and monitoring to ascertain what was achieved. He stated that there needed to be improvements in evaluation with dedicated leads that would robustly monitor and evaluate to ensure improvements are actually made.
- Paul Burton agreed with Board members regarding difficulties in keeping the list updated – and the necessity to do so. He felt however that it would offer increased opportunities for joined up work.
- Barry Hasty suggested that the funding map he has begun to create which plots activities and associated funding streams would compliment a service review list as it will demonstrate flexibility in resources.
- Cllr Taylor agreed in principle with the creation of a list, but raised concerns around whether partners will change their operations to fit in too much which could lead to diluted capacity. He noted that if it was "just a list" it would not be beneficial unless actively used to encourage joined up working. He also raised concerns about the enormity of the list. He suggested that as a tool for information it would be fine.

- Sarah Chand agreed a list would be a tool for pooling information to ascertain commonalities for partner buy-in and accomplish improvement gains. The route thereafter would be to look at areas that did not necessarily include all partners, but offer options for some to move forward.
- Stella mentioned that the first stage would be to develop a snapshot list and then have a round table discussion. She stressed that the list was not an end in itself, but a tool for debate. Stella suggested that there should be a person nominated to co-ordinate the list.
- Jos Parry noted that there economic issues relating to premises used by partners and raised the possibility of co-locating as an option (citing Children and Young People as an example as they are now entering the implementation phase)
- Matt Gilks queried the roles of lead officers who would be responsible for reporting on work that contributes towards LAA targets, noting that it would be a difficult role and one that was to be done in addition to “day jobs”.
- Stella advised that the LAA targets were not currently finalised, she felt that this could not be accomplished until the indicator definitions were agreed. She suggested that Jos Parry create a draft list of items to be discussed – e.g. clarify individual responsibilities and create a process for reporting to the Local Public Service Board and Local Strategic Partnership Board on areas that were going well and also where there were issues that were outstanding.

Actions:

- **Coventry Partnership Secretariat to be asked to compile a list of current service improvement reviews within all partner agencies.**
- **Nominate lead officer to co-ordinate the service review list**
- **Jos Parry to create a draft list of responsibilities for LAA lead officers**

4. LAA funding and commissioning arrangements

Barry advised the Board that the Area Based Grant now included 3 further funding streams (Preventing Violent Extremism, Young Peoples Substance Misuse and the City Pathfinder Grant).

Barry reminded the Board that at the last meeting it was agreed that he would begin to map out the activities and expenditure from within the Area Based Grant which contribute towards achievement of LAA targets (and eventually all indicators from the National Set). He distributed an example of this from a Council perspective to the Board, and noted that it would be helpful to look at all activities from all partners under each of the national indicators. He explained that the next step would be to talk to operational leads to ensure that as much activity as possible was captured to link targets to activities and expenditure.

- Jos Parry mentioned that although this work evidenced the spend and activity through the Area Based Grant, the Board should recognise that the Area Based Grant was a small amount of overall resource and that mainstream budget spend is much larger.
- Stella Manzie clarified that in some cases there would only be one provider (e.g. waste collection services being a Council operation), but Community Safety

indicators require a host of people to achieve success (e.g. Probation, PCT, Council etc). Stella recognised that Barry did not have the capacity to undertake the exercise outside of Area Based Grant funding and that a group would need to be formed who understand how money flows in each area.

- The Board agreed that there is a need to know what resource is spent on currently and where there were flexibilities to direct resource to new areas. The Working Neighbourhoods fund was noted as an example – guidance indicated that the resources should be spent on worklessness issues, but recognising the significant resource being spent in the City on this issue already (LEGI etc) it was suggested that local decisions could be made to direct this fund towards meeting gaps in LAA target requirements.

Barry tabled a matrix which demonstrated how resources from the Area Based Grant were currently distributed on a thematic basis.

- The Children and Young People theme was noted as currently receiving substantial resource from both Area Based Grant resources and also mainstream resources.
- Matt Gilks noted that it may be difficult to split the PCT mainstream budget to theme headings owing to internal issues around the nature of accounting – assumptions could be made but he aired concerns over accuracy.
- Deb Harrod welcomed the prospect of having the data, but raised concerns over how daunting the process of obtaining the data would be. Deb queried whether partners have capacity to do this and suggested that the work may need to be commissioned.
- Stella Manzie noted various other LSP's who have already undertaken this process (Blackburn and Kent were mentioned) and suggested Coventry make contact to share learning.
- Jos Parry felt that it would be possible to itemise funding relating to each indicator.
- Stella Manzie agreed, but recognised that the process may be more difficult for some partners than for Coventry City Council owing to differing structures and that in some cases educated assumptions would be required.
- Cllr Taylor reminded the Board that this would be difficult for regional partners (e.g. Transport) who may not have a dedicated Coventry Spend.

Action

- **Barry to co-ordinate speaking to operational leads within Coventry City Council to ensure that as much activity as possible which contributes to LAA achievement is mapped**
- **Partners to provide Barry with a named contact (who ideally is familiar with the work of the Partnership or Local Public Service Board)**
- **Barry to co-ordinate a similar exercise with partners to create a holistic picture of city wide activity and spend against targets.**
- **Capacity to be found to assist Barry from (possibly) the Corporate Policy Officer and/or a Finance Officer**
- **Mapped data to be forward to the LPSB for debate**
- **Contact other LSP's to share learning**

Mark Tovey was asked to update the Board on the LAA process

- Mark reiterated what Jos Parry had previously mentioned regarding agreement on 33 of the 35 indicators
- Technical definitions were published on 7.4.08 and on website – still some Home Office ones outstanding
- Home Office and Department for Communities and Local Government were to discuss the Preventing Violent Extremism indicator during w/c 7.4.08
- The indicator around Violent Crime still required further discussion before the definition is agreed. Inclusion in Coventry's 35 was dependent on the definition
- There would be a meeting on 10th April to agree baselines for targets (recognising that availability of definitions is essential before agreement can be reached). If agreement on baseline was not achieved, further discussions with specialist input would be needed. Mark explained that information from 1998 onwards could be used to agree baselines
- For new indicators there would not be a baseline so for the first year there would be no targets set. Targets were to be agreed by 9th May
- Ministers expecting to sign off LAA by 6th June
- Mark noted that Government Office would not need to see delivery plans, but must be confident that they would meet target requirements
- Any reward element of the Area Based Grant will not relate to year 1
- LAA will be refreshed in year 2
- Mark explained that Government Office was aware of the challenges the process posed. He noted that although Coventry was ahead of some authorities, he may be able to provide details to Coventry of authorities that may be of assistance.

Stella Manzie updated Mark on how Coventry will manage service improvements and highlighted the challenge of keeping track of reviews in all partner organisations – and that this will relate to all targets (not just LAA ones).

5. Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) Health and Social Care

Helen Shankster and Simon Brake updated the Board. Simon stated that it was a statutory requirement (as of April 2008) to undertake a JSNA and that there was a local and regional group working on the Assessment, which aimed to co-ordinate current documentation into a central case. Simon noted that the assessment would incorporate both prescribed data and local data and would be published through the Coventry Partnership in a web format to enable the data to be easily updated. It was noted that it is the process of collating the information would be useful, in addition to the outcomes. The Progress, Impact and Evaluation group were also working on this locally. Helen advised the Board that the process and mechanisms for influencing service design should be an integral part of partnership processes.

Caron Grainger noted that the PCT already have a JSNA and the Sustainable Community Strategy, but no processes for updating these regularly. Caron stated that there would be a need to look critically at all information and to keep it updated – she felt that some capacity may need to be commissioned to achieve this. Caron also noted that

the Board should recognise that this assessment would not create an “end product” and that the data set would need to be updated on a regular basis.

Helen noted that Coventry Council is in the process of reorganising their research teams and this may provide room for joint commissioning.

Jane Beaver agreed to share data from Incapacity Benefit illnesses including details which can demonstrate which interventions were most helpful in moving people into work. Jane also noted that there were Lone Parents on Incapacity Benefit with additional issues related to being at home. Jane agreed to provide local data (within confines of Data Protection legislation) to Helen and Simon.

Caron Grainger offered the services of a junior doctor in interpreting the data if needed.

Stella Manzie clarified that Helen was co-ordinating the data, working with a small group and that there was a meeting scheduled for 9th April to take this work forward.

Actions

- **Jane Beaver to provide relevant data from Incapacity Benefits to Helen**

6. LAA Performance Review – update from Health and Wellbeing Partnership

Prior to the presentation, Stella Manzie stated that the purpose of the update was to enable the Board to understand the risk areas around indicators and service issues, detailing the background issues, what was being done to address the issues and how partners could be part of the solutions. Stella noted that Children and Young People and Community Safety had already presented to the Board and that each presentation had taken a differing format. Stella suggested that in future presentations will be in an agreed structured format.

Caron updated the Board on the symptoms of Chlamydia and stated that Coventry had a 10% infection rate in 16-24 year olds, detailing that although treatment is simple (antibiotics), screening was opportunistic and ad-hoc. Caron mentioned that the person who was the sole worker in this area had been seconded and not replaced (but funding was in place for 2 people). Under-spend on funds were used to resource a branding campaign but the 07/08 target was missed.

- Deb Harrod asked if the target would have been met if the worker had been in post – Caron felt that this was not the case but it had impacted.
- Caron informed the Board that currently 20 GP practices proactively offer screening (i.e. one third of GP’s in the City) and 20 Pharmacies do the same (one quarter of pharmacies in the City). Stella Manzie asked if more could be done to improve the rate of GP services and Pharmacies who currently offer screening, but Caron explained that those offering the service did so for free (many authorities pay for the service) and it would be difficult to engage more on this basis.

- Stella suggested that larger partner organisations could do more such as requesting Occupational Health to promote screening services.
- Helen Shankster informed the Board that the research and strategy team have data on the employers across the city. This was felt to be useful in identifying employers to target.
- Sarah Chand suggested that the Drugs Team may be able to help by offering screening when doing regular drug testing.
- Simon Brake suggested that screening could be built into new GP contracts.
- Mark Tovey queried the amount of screenings completed versus the target and made the point that there would need to be a 4-fold increase to meet the 08/09 LAA target.
- Deb Harrod noted that with partners buying into promoting screening, the sexual health services must also buy-in.
- Matt Gilks offered to feed concerns back to the Chief Executive
- Stella offered to send a letter highlighting concerns of the Board, highlighting how partners can be of assistance, but requiring a committed resource from Genital Urinary Medicine. Stella also to ask that GP's be encouraged to take up the screening process.
- Matt Gilks believed that the target could be hit next year with co-ordinated partner activity. Caron Grainger supported this stating that the target could be achieved if all GP's did one screening per day and that she could use the evidence collated from those that currently undertake screenings to demonstrate the benefits to encourage further GP take up.

Caron Grainger updated the Board on the average age of death in the City:

- Caron advised the Board that although trends show that people are living longer there was no narrowing of the gap between the sexes, nor between priority and non-priority neighbourhoods.
- Caron detailed a "blip" in the 2001-2003 baseline data which created a distorted baseline making stretch targets possibly unachievable.
- Regarding males only – Caron reported that age of death is increasing by 2 months per year City wide, but only by 1 month per year in priority neighbourhoods
- Regarding Females – increases reflect that of male's city wide, but priority neighbourhoods are only increasing by 0.5 month per year.
- Caron noted that reducing inequalities is a challenge. Screening in general works well overall, but take up is higher in non-priority neighbourhoods so gaps increase. Targeted approaches impact on smaller numbers and do not affect the city average.
- Caron noted a positive reduction in mortality through heart disease.
- Caron noted that the main challenges were finding the people affected, persuading them of the associated benefits, keeping them engaged through processes and combating cultural issues –as well as persuading those who need to pay for prescriptions to do so.
- Stella recognised the difficulties in making impacts on the statistics.
- Caron also noted that Coventry has had success in combating a disproportionately high level of peri-natal issues, but has further work to do around high levels of respiratory disease.

- Caron noted that GP surgeries tended to be more successful at practices where there was more than one GP.
- The Board asked if there was evidence from other areas as to what can work to reduce the inequalities gap – Caron stated evidence was difficult to obtain, but that part of the issue is that those who are better enabled take advantage of screening processes more readily.
- John Forde noted that it will be essential to raise expectations and aspirations of communities once services are in place.
- Paul Burton asked if links could be made to the “contact and connect” work to include health questions
- Jos Parry queried if the widening of the gap was influenced by new communities coming into priority neighbourhoods. Caron said that the new database is tracking ethnicity but noted that there is no historical data yet.
- Caron reported that there was an issue with young adult males who were not registered with a GP
- Caron advised the Board of a successful event in Birmingham – a drop in cardiac screening event at Aston Villa FC which attracted 600 attendees. Coventry screening is currently via GP only.
- Caron noted that there is a lot of capacity and resource being spent on smoking cessation at present
- Stella thanked Caron and John for the presentation

Action

- **Coventry Partnership Secretariat to develop a format to ensure consistency of presentations to the Board**
- **Stella to write to PCT to influence the Primary Care Strategy to include reference to GP practice size.**
- **Stella to write to the PCT to offer help from partners in meeting Chlamydia targets, and to request that GP’s are encouraged to take part in the screening process.**
- **Cat Parker to contact Occupational Health at the City Council to discuss ways of promoting Chlamydia screening and to contact partners to discuss ways they could be involved (e.g. Drugs Team).**

Any Other Business

- Jane Beaver advised the Board that there are large numbers of new community members who present in Coventry for a National Insurance Number. Jane offered to promote health services / GP registration during this process.

Date of the next meeting:

Monday 12 May from 2.00 pm – 4.00 pm. Venue: Room 2, Council House

June Morley
Partnership Support Officer
Coventry Partnership
02476 834359