

RESOURCES AND DELIVERING VALUE SCRUTINY BOARD

2ND MARCH 2020

PUBLIC MINUTES

- Present: Councillors: K Wild, T Diccico, M Gough, M Parker, W Qais, M Allen, B Groom, P Davies and M Brain
- Members: Councillor I Courts: Leader of the Council
Councillor K Grinsell: Deputy Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder Adult Social Care and Health
- Officers: Paul Johnson: Deputy Chief Executive & Director of Resources
Samantha Gilbert: Assistant Director Finance and Property Services
Sarah Barnes: Head of Business Intelligence and Improvement
Richard Johnson: Social Care Programme Manager
Simone Alexander: Social Care Systems Coach
Paul Langham: Assistant Director, Business Systems
Sue Dale: Assistant Director, Adult Social Services
Frank McSheffrey: Assistant Director, Childrens Services and Skills Directorate
Paul Rogers: Democratic Services

The Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board meeting commenced at 6:00 p.m.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations of pecuniary or conflicts of interest were received.

3. QUESTIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

No questions or deputations were received.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

The Public Minutes arising from the Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board meeting held on 29th January 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

5. THE COUNCIL PLAN 2019/20 - PROGRESS IN DELIVERING OUTCOMES AND PLAN REFRESH

The report before the Scrutiny Board outlined the progress the Council had made in delivering the present Council Plan and sought the Board's views regarding the Council Plan for the period 2020-2025.

Councillor Courts introduced the report, informing the Scrutiny Board that the Council Plan was comprised of five priorities:

- Securing Inclusive Economic Growth
- Planning and Delivery for Solihull's Low Carbon Future
- Managing Demand and Expectations for Public Services
- Developing and Delivering Our Approach to Services for Adults and Children with Complex Needs
- Making the Best Use of Our People and Physical Assets

The five priorities were underpinned by eleven key programmes of work:

- Developing the inclusive economy
- UK Central
- Skills
- The Strategic Housing Framework
- The Green Prospectus
- Creating the Conditions for Communities to Thrive
- Digital
- Adult Social Care Transformation
- Children's Services Development and Innovation
- The Employee Journey
- A Corporate Approach to Delivering an Asset Master Plan

Members were informed that key programme objectives and milestones were agreed at the start of each year. The Corporate Leadership Team reviewed performance dashboards on a quarterly basis measuring progress in delivering Plan objectives. Member's attention was drawn to Appendix C '*A Summary of Council Plan Programme Delivery*', which detailed the Plans key issues and linkages. A Red, Amber, Green delivery rating system was used to assess the delivery and financial status of each programme. Nine of the key work programmes were reported as Green delivery status, with two classified as Amber.

It was reported that some considerable progress had been made in delivering key programmes, notably:

- 'Westgate', Homer Road: Planning application submitted and granted. The project is recognised as being key to supporting businesses and developing footfall for the town centre.
- Skills and Employability: Delivery targets are on track to be met.
- Climate Change: The Council's Climate Motion passed on 8th October 2019 provided the authority a road map for delivering zero carbon.
- Digital: Including the potential to exploit 5G across a number of sectors, including health and social care.
- Adult Care and Support Transformation
- Children's Services: Issues to address in relation to level of service demand and complexity of needs.
- U.K Central Programme: Has a long term red financial rating, due to long term risk around securing funding for the programme.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health informed the meeting that:

- **Tanworth Court Development:** A purpose built care home dedicated to the care for dementia patients has been delivered, which provides care through two hubs located in the north and south of the borough. Tanworth Court has increased capacity of in borough care and subsequently reduced cost pressures associated with out of borough placements.
- **Adult Day Opportunities:** Services have been consolidated, not just for clients but also for their carers.
- **Domiciliary Care:** Now provided through two main provider organisations which were rated as 'Good'.
- **Digital Opportunities:** Provided great potential through 5G in terms of roll out of in-home care applications and other healthcare applications.
- **New Social Care System:** Developed in conjunction with social care teams, which would free social care teams to support clients directly in the field e.g. completing care assessments and other documentation.

Having received the presentations from the Leader and Deputy Leader, Members raised a series of further questions, which in summary included the following:

With regard to the Plan programme 'RAG' ratings, a Member questioned how a programme could have a Green financial rating when within the programme there were Amber rated projects. Examples given included:

- *Green Prospectus programme* and the *Creating Conditions for Communities to Thrive programme* and the security of funding.
- The rating of project dependencies was queried, such as for the U.K Central programme (RAG rated Red), which led delivery for the Kingshurst Village centre project (RAG rated Green).

The Leader responded that the judgement made was whether individual components rated Amber or Red within the programmes of work had the potential to adversely impact overall project delivery. The Scrutiny Board agreed that the application of the RAG rating across inter-connected programmes and deliverables required some further clarification to avoid any potential confusion around the projected work programmes delivery status.

A Member noted that Adult Care Transformation Local Authority Contractor Care providers were concerned at the scale of commercial care developments and the impact on workforce availability.

In terms of securing project funding for the Green Prospectus Programme, the Head of Business Intelligence and Improvement clarified that the Council was pursuing a strategy of seeking external funding in relation to electric vehicle charging.

With regard to the classification of overall financial ratings, it was clarified that in making a judgement as to whether a programme should be rated Red, Amber or Green, the overall balance of the work programme was reviewed. Each programme consisted of between eight to ten projects, which in turn were given a RAG rating. If the majority were Green and there were no significant risks identified in the remaining

projects, then overall the programme would be rated Green. If any significant risks to projects were identified, they would be rated Red or Amber, and a judgement made as to whether the project/s Red/Amber status had an detrimental impact on the programme overall and whether any contingency was required.

With specific reference to Kingshurst Village Centre, it was confirmed that there was a dependency on UK Central for delivery of the project, although the Kingshurst project was one of a number of projects within the wider UK Central programme. Overall delivery of the UK Central programme was judged to be on course, hence the Green RAG rating.

Although project criteria was applied to assess the work programme status, it was recognised that there was always an element of subjective judgement involved with applying RAG ratings. The Leader informed the meeting that mitigations were in place for any projects with Red ratings. A detailed explanation and definition for the Delivery and Financial RAG ratings were provided on page 21 of the report.

The Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Resources advised that the Financial RAG rating was measured against an existing Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), which effectively measured whether a saving was being delivered or a budget managed within projected spend. In the case of the UK Central programme, its financial status was rated Red. As the programme was valued at £686M, any material deviation would result in a Red RAG rating.

In response questions pertaining to Tanworth Court, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health stated that Tanworth Court was the Council's response to providing the borough's residents with affordable, quality facilities for dementia care. The Scrutiny Board was reminded that the borough had an ageing demographic for which the Council wanted to ensure that future access to quality care facilities would be available.

Regarding the number and continued development of private care homes located within the borough, the Cabinet Member noted that they were subject to Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspections. It was envisaged that the high standard of facilities and care available through the Council's care homes would act as a driver for the provision of quality facilities in the private care market in the future.

In terms of the care home service labour market, the Council did have in place Market Position Statements detailing what staffing resources were required to work in care homes. The borough did attract care workers from the wider West Midlands region, such as Birmingham and Coventry, as Solihull provided good employment opportunities in the care sector in the borough. A Member of the Scrutiny Board noted that with the increase in private care home provision in the borough, there was an associated risk that appropriately qualified, experienced and skilled care staff could be tempted from local authority care homes to private sector facilities. The Chairman noted that a successful local economy in the borough would attract investors and companies to the borough, which in turn would provide greater income to the Council to continue to provide care homes and related facilities across the borough in future years.

The Scrutiny Board queried the Red RAG status for the Children's Services Development and Innovation and that the funding reserve had been reported to be exhausted. Members were advised that when funding was allocated it was intended to support service provision over a number of years, which had not been possible due to increasing service demand. As the Financial RAG Rating was a measurement for the budget against the current financial year and in light of the reserve having been

exhausted, the Rag rating was Red. However, the meeting of Council on 27 February 2020 had taken the decision to increase the reserve by a further £2M.

A Member questioned the detail for the budget deficit against SEND provision. It was noted that it could not be resolved through top-slicing alone and questioned what mitigating actions had been identified to address the SEND budget pressure. The Deputy Chief Executive and Director for Resources informed the Scrutiny Board that a three-year Draft Recovery Plan had been submitted for consideration by Cabinet, which would be subject to final Cabinet approval in June 2020 and the Department for Education (DfE) thereafter. The Cabinet had made the decision to balance the budget in-year, but would not be seeking to recover the deficit of £5.8M over the forward three years. This position would be put to the DfE i.e. that bridging a deficit of such a size over three years was not a fiscally feasible option. The Leader noted that additional capacity continued to be placed into the service to mitigate the position.

Clarification was sought for how the long term funding amounting to £34M to deliver the Kingshurst Village Centre scheme would be secured. The Leader advised the Scrutiny Board that the funding quoted was in effect a project cost. The £5M project funding secured to date has supported the Council to purchase properties and commence various aspects of the scheme's planning and design stages. The required funding would partly be met from receipts for those properties made available by the Council through the scheme. Funding to be secured stood at less than £10M overall and would be applied for via the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA), via the WMCA Investment Plan. A number of other funding sources were also being applied against the total project cost. The Leader reiterated that the Council held a very clear position for taking the Kingshurst Centre development forward.

The Head of Business Intelligence and Improvement introduced the second section of the report, *Resetting the Council Plan 2020/25* and provided Members with a presentation, which addressed the following headings:

- What the Evidence Tells Us
- Changes in the National, Regional and Local Context
- Our New Plan (1)

A plan for sustainable, inclusive growth built on 5 building blocks:

- Building a vibrant social economy
- Promoting and delivering social value
- Supporting communities to thrive
- Environments that enable healthy living
- Good employment for all

It was the intention everything in the Council Plan should contribute to one or more of these building blocks.

- Our New Plan (2)

The new plan will reflect the developmental path to take forward the Solihull Climate Change Declaration and build consideration of climate impact into everything the Council does.

It will include actions from the Sustainability Roadmap designed to:

- Increase and enhance the Borough's natural capital
- Improve air quality
- Reduce carbon emissions

- Our New Plan (3)

Other key areas for the new Council Plan to consider will include:

- How the Council will work consistently and coherently with partners and local communities to build resilience, influence and shape what happens in their local area.
- Further developing our approach to services for adults and children with complex needs – sustainable, affordable, quality.
- Making the best use of our assets – money, people, physical assets and technology – to deliver all of the above.

- Our New Plan (4)

- The Plan will detail up to 10 key things that the Council needs to do in order to progress towards its vision and the end outcomes that are expected to be seen by doing each of these things.
- Each of the key things will have a set of milestones and measures – 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 4 years – that will enable the Council to track progress.

- Timetable for Finalising the Plan

Council staff and union engagement	Feb/Mar 2020
Partner Engagement – Solihull Together Board	24 Feb 2020
Resources & Delivering Value Scrutiny Board	2 Mar 2020
Engagement with Cabinet Members & Political Groups	Mar 2020
Engagement with partners	Mar 2020
Plan considered by Council for approval	7 Apr 2020

Having received the presentation, Members raised a series of questions, which in summary included the following:

A Member noted reference within the report to the involvement of partners and communities as integral to the delivery of the Council Plan and queried whether a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy was in place to support this. It was confirmed that with regard to direct engagement with residents, they were engaged with in relation to specific projects and issues detailed in the Council Plan and that this had been the case over the past two years. Locality Working arrangements were also highlighted as providing the means for the Council to engage with its partners, such as Parish Councils and Resident and Community Associations concerning shaping the local area. Members were further informed that one of the recommendations arising from the recent LGA Peer Challenge exercise was for the Council to give some consideration towards developing a Place Based Engagement Strategy.

A Member questioned how the new Council Plan would address and help deliver the Climate Change and low carbon agendas. The Head of Business Intelligence and Improvement informed the Scrutiny Board that the Council's reporting template asked all report authors how their proposals were enabling delivery of the Council's priorities, one of which was the delivery of a low carbon future. Going forward the template may be amended further to similarly address the climate emergency agenda.

In reply to Members questions concerning the role of the new Council Plan in addressing deprivation, poverty and associated issues, the Leader stated that further work would be taken forward to determine the approach to be adopted in addressing

deprivation, the people and communities to be reached and how delivery of inclusive growth in the borough could assist those in need of some support from the authority. It was the intention to see clear outcomes arising from the Council Plan and embedded strategies, such as inclusive growth, particularly for those residents and areas experiencing levels of deprivation. The Deputy Leader highlighted that all of the Council Plan programmes addressed inequalities and that this was in fact the 'golden thread' running through all Council Plan programmes.

The Head of Business Intelligence and Improvement confirmed that the new Council Plan would go forward to Council on 7th April 2020. The Plan will be up to 25 – 30 pages in length, to include a 'Plan on a Page'. A table detailing key programmes at a headline level would also be included, with some supporting narrative. The Plan format would be worked up further for public consumption after the Council meeting scheduled for 7th April 2020.

Having considered the report, the Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board:

RESOLVED:

- i. To note the progress in delivering the Council Plan in 2019/20; and,
- ii. To note the resetting of the Council Plan for 2020/2025.

6. NEW SOCIAL CARE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The report submitted to the Scrutiny Board provided a programme update, including an overview of the programme governance structure, the current delivery status of the workstreams, the training solution and the approach to consolidating the remaining scope of work and programme close.

The Social Care Programme Manager presented the report.

Members were advised that the report was drafted some weeks before the Scrutiny Board meeting convened and subsequently referenced target dates, since when both the Adult Social Care and Children's systems had gone live (June 2019 and March 2020 respectively). Progress against the Delivery Plan reported to the Scrutiny Board in April 2019 had remained good using the 4 phase implementation approach. The Delivery Plan for both Children's and Adult Social Care Services had been met. Appendix 4 provided Members with a Risk Register report, which reported that risks continued to be well managed.

Members were advised that the ethos underpinning the core case management system was that it was built, configured and led in partnership with service practitioners, who had also tested the system. External consultancy expertise had been secured as and when required.

The programme remained within budget to date. Payments were made against approved milestones detailed within the supplier contract. The Children's Private Order Financial Assessment component had been jointly developed between the Council and LiquidLogic. However, the timescales originally detailed in the contract (18 months from contract sign) were not met. The missed deadline was contractually compensated for.

The Adult Care and Support Delivery Status was rated Green. It was reported that the external training provider had completed the 6 weeks of staff training. During this time, 10 different modules of training were delivered and 400 system users trained.

The Programme Board acknowledged the step change in delivering services through the new system and subsequently 2.5 additional Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts had

been established to help the service support and further develop the system going forward.

The Children's Services Delivery Status was rated Amber. It was reported to the Scrutiny Board that some project re-phasing had taken place and that the Children's Service project implementation had proved to be more complex compared against the Adult Services project initiation. Some capacity challenges had been addressed around releasing frontline staff to support the project, largely attributable to the size of front line services teams and supporting an Ofsted inspection which had entailed the diverting of some project resource.

Members were informed that some areas of the solution had been de-scoped due to time constraints, which included the areas of:

- Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).
- Professional Portal which facilitated external professional's ability to contribute to the child's case record.

It was confirmed that the training partner had undertaken training needs analysis of all Children's users, with approximately 30 delivery teams across 4 core locations totalling 361 users. A total of 16 courses were created across 38 learning pathways, with training course durations lasting between 0.50 to 5 days.

Similarly to Adult's Services, 2 additional Children's FTE roles had been established and were in the process of being recruited to. An existing 0.5 FTE role would be used to take forward future training development and delivery in the service area.

ICT and Data Migration project status was reported to be Green. Data migration had been delivered largely by Council staff, supported with five consultancy days.

All externally facing system software had been externally tested by experts (penetration testing), with any potential vulnerabilities addressed and then the system component re-tested.

In terms of next steps, the Programme Board had agreed that following the 'go-live' stage for the Children's Services system on 2 March 2020, a programme review would be undertaken to address:

- Contractual arrangements with the supplier
- Budget
- Governance arrangements
- Contracted products review
- Review of Adults and Children's Services post go-live work load.
- Review of supplier milestones.

The review was scheduled to take place during the period until the end of May 2020.

The Assistant Director (Children's Services and Skills) advised the Scrutiny Board that system 'go-live' on day one went smoothly and that staff had been well supported during the go-live phase. It was to be expected for some issues to emerge with the go-live phase, but floor walkers and consultants were in place to provide support to system users.

With regard to the scope for the system to measure quality of service delivery, the Scrutiny Board was informed that the system adhered to work flows. System users were compelled to follow a sequence of work flows. Any missing stages of the work

flow would be highlighted by the system. This feature further supported the quality and completeness of data collection at all workflow stages, as well as negating the potential for any repeating data errors.

The system had the capacity to highlight individual caseloads, the status of staff in-trays on the system and measured system activity. Staff feedback regarding the system had been good to date, particularly with respect to managing workload through the care pathway process.

In response to questioning seeking clarification as to why the option of an off the shelf software solution was chosen, Members were advised that an off the shelf option brought together key suppliers in the marketplace, which provided access to extensive expertise and experience in the local government sector and provided the means for knowledge sharing across local authorities . An in-house procurement option was not considered to be feasible.

Having considered the report, the Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board:

RESOLVED:

- i. To note the new social care information management system progress update report; and,
- ii. To note the indicative milestone dates detailed in the report update for the remainder of the programme and to receive a further new social care information management system progress update report (including a Performance Indicator suite on system performance) at the Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board meeting scheduled for Monday 14th September 2020.

7. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting was not open to the public during discussion of the following items because the report contains exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

8. SOCIAL CARE UPDATE - APPENDIX 5

9. PRIVATE MINUTES

The Resources and Delivering Value Scrutiny Board meeting closed at 8:00 p.m.