



**Carers Service Improvement Forum (SIF)  
21 September 2017  
Town Hall, Conference Room**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Angela Barney (AB) – Vice Chair, ex Carer Chris Sterry, (CS) – Parent Carer Liam Toner (LT) – Practice Development Coordinator, Sheffield City Council John Kirkman (JK) - Carer Lee Teasdale-Smith (LT-S) - Pauline Kimantas (PK) – Sheffield Carers Centre
<b>Apologies:</b>	Liz Naylor (EN) – Carer and Chair Chris Taylor (CT) – Carer
<b>Visitors:</b>	Phil Holmes (PH) - Director of Adult Services (Part) John Mothersole (JM)
<b>Minutes:</b>	Steve Morgan (SM) – Business Support, Sheffield City Council

1	Welcome including agreeing minutes and actions from last meeting	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AB welcomed everyone and introductions were made.</li> <li>• We have no information yet, about who will replace Pam Allen from SHSCT.</li> <li>• AB gave apologies for the next meeting – there will need to be some contingency in place to select a Chair if LN is also unable to attend.</li> <li>• AB thanked Liam for the “You said, we did” at the start of the minutes.</li> <li>• The group agreed that they would like this to be a separate document from the minutes and for it to show the actions and updates from the meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions and Matters Arising</b> <b>You said, we did -</b> <b>No 2 - Longley Meadows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was asked when the SIF would receive the overview Briefing from Commissioning? LT explained that Commissioning had said it would be difficult to summarise how the decisions were made, but would be happy to meet with families to discuss.</li> <li>• CS said there had been an issue with communication from the start – at first it was a tending process, that would have involved discussions with the service user, then it wasn’t.</li> <li>• CS has met with the Care Trust and attended their Board meeting - he told the Care Trust he is not happy with the way they have handled this process and wanted confirmation that they would not allow any similar situation to be handled this way again.</li> <li>• CS has also contacted Anita Winter and is working with the CCG.</li> <li>• It was understood that some information could not be disclosed due to confidentiality but Chris still wanted to know:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Creation of an interface to make it easier for all parties to communicate?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How the process can be made more manageable?</li> <li>○ How to ensure the process does not go wrong again?</li> <li>• LT has asked these questions and will forward the response to the group.</li> <li>• LT asked if CS had any proposals about how this sort of process could be managed in the future?</li> <li>• CS would like a joint “Lessons Learned” meeting with all relevant parties to look at what went wrong – the meeting should also include LD carers.</li> <li>• LT will forward his proposal to Richard Parrott.</li> <li>• LT told the group that there is a named CQC contact to act as interface/link.</li> </ul>	<p>LT</p> <p>LT</p>
<p><b>No 3 – Named Social Worker Pilot</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluation report has been sent.</li> <li>• LT offered to discuss in January meeting as part of the restructure discussion</li> <li>• CS felt this was too late and said he would raise issues with PH.</li> <li>• LT explained Phase 1 provided funding for 3 specific named social workers to focus on transforming care, Phase 2 would look at embedding these workers into the future options team over the next 6 months – they would also provide a link into the locality teams.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>No 4 - Carers Register</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LT spoke to the Communication Officer at the Carers Centre who said the Centre has a database of carers and people they are in contact with – around 8,500 people.</li> <li>• It was noted on the last Census a lot of people were classed as carers and not all these are on the Carers Centre database.</li> <li>• PK informed the group that the Communication Officer has now left the carer’s Centre and that they would be advertising the post.</li> <li>• PK offered to produce an action plan for updating the database.</li> <li>• It was noted that Data Protection laws apply to all organisations that hold personal information although CS believed the Carer’s Register should be accessible to anyone wanting information on numbers.</li> <li>• It was believed that only around one quarter of all carers in Sheffield are identified making it difficult to ensure that all carers receive any information sent out.</li> <li>• It was felt organisations and agencies should sign up to an overarching strategy to identify carers</li> <li>• CS noted people did not identify with the word carer – we need to raise awareness to help carers recognise that they are carers and for professionals to identify that people are carers.</li> <li>• It was suggested having someone on site at hospitals to help identify.</li> <li>• There is an aim to identify 1,500 new carers a year but there was some scepticism from the group that this target could be reached.</li> <li>• It was noted the fragmented nature of the system complicates the process.</li> <li>• It was asked if it would be useful for the SIF to send a letter to lead officers in key organisations?</li> </ul>	<p>PK</p>
<p><b>No 5 - Sharing SIF minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group confirmed they would like the minutes to be posted on the Carer’s Centre website.</li> <li>• It was noted the Sheffield City Council’s webpage needed some improvement and it was asked how this would then signpost people to the Carer’s Centre</li> </ul>	
<p><b>No 6 - Future agenda item log</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LT will send out to the group.</li> </ul>	<p>LT</p>

**No 8 – Changes to sleep in rates**

- JK has contacted Andrew Wheawall, Head of MH/LD Transition and is awaiting a response.

**No 11 - Terms of Reference**

- LT has sent a revised Terms Of Reference for the group to look at.
- LT will also send the agreed Code of Conduct.
- LT asked the group to consider whether there was any training or support requirements for SIF members.

LT  
ALL

**No 12 - SIF recruitment**

- PK will put an item in the Carers Centre newsletter.
- A request was made for a group member to write a brief article about why the SIF is important to them to help generate more interest.

PK  
ALL

**Matters Arising****Page 5****Training - Autism Awareness**

- JK has not heard anything yet.
- LT raised the with Marje Fee who will be in contact with JK.

**Page 6****Panel Meetings**

- SCC is working on trying to simplify the assessment process and is providing training, but there may still be instances where staff and service user have a difference of opinion.
- There are concerns that social workers are not being allowed to do the job they are trained for which impacts on the carer - the panel should be given, and accept, the expertise of the social worker.
- It was suggested we stop calling them assessments – have “conversations” instead.
- An improvement and recovery plan was submitted for approval yesterday.
- There needs to be a full team approach, with Carers seen as part of the team, and the customer should be involved at every stage.
- It was felt things go wrong when only the panel gets to decide.
- CS felt there were too many departmental boxes - for the system to work they should act as one team.
- PH will bring the proposal on how the Local Authority will include the customer in the process, to the next meeting.
- PH will put something in writing and forward to the group about:
  - Restructure (which will be reviewed in February)
  - Named SW pilot
  - Carers champions

PH

PH

**Page 8****Continuing Health Care**

- AB had commented that she felt the decision making tool was dysfunctional, but this didn't get minuted – AB felt that controversial issues were not being minuted.
- AB was assured that was not the case and the minutes are checked for accuracy before they are sent out.
- PH asked if AB had asked for the comment to be minuted and suggested that if any member wanted to make sure a remark was put in the minutes, they let the minute taker know.

LT

- LT will check with Continuing Health Care for feedback from the issues raised.
- It was noted that Jo had stepped in at short notice to attend.

## 2 Phil Holmes – response to issues raised

- PH sent responses to the issues raised to the group – see attached (please note, the link to the report will not work in the PDF, please use the link below:



<http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ielIssueDetails.aspx?IId=23304&Opt=3>

*(If the link does not work you can find the document online by searching Social Care Improvement and Recovery Plans 3)*

### No 7 – “Railroading” people into supported living

- PH added that the Local Authority recognises too many people are going into nursing homes and it is working to reduce those numbers by encouraging more home support.

### PH was also asked that, as part of the restructuring, how was the Council ensuring that skills were not lost?

- A meeting was going to be arranged with SS and Simon Richards to look at, and PH invited CS to attend.
- CS has heard there are still teams that have no LD knowledge.
- PH accepted that there was still work to be done, to support staff.

### No 9 – Diversity in the support provider workforce

- There are issues with recruitment in all areas.
- Restrictions on hourly rates affects the ability of people on Direct Payment to employ PA's.
- CS has asked HMRC for information.
- CS noted that a post, when advertised on the old rate, received 200 applicants, the same post when advertised on the new rate received 1.
- Is this fall off in interest due to payment, reflected across the City?
- CS tried to contact Julie Dore but received no response.
- It was suggested asking Disability Sheffield what they think the issues are.
- From the carers perspective, there is no support.
- PH said Disability Sheffield are developing a specification to go out to tender that they hope will get signed off in January.
- If they are able to attend, PH suggested inviting Disability Sheffield to the March SIF to discuss the Direct Payment process.
- It was asked is Carers could have any input?
- The University of Sheffield has also worked on this and PH said they had looked at ensuring people were from Culturally diverse backgrounds.

### No 10 - CCTV in homes

- PH said that staff do have the option not to work in a house where there is CCTV and acknowledged it is difficult to balance the rights of every individual – it is never about one person's rights being more important than another's, though.
- There is a regulatory body that looks at all surveillance, whether public or covert.
- The group thought it would be helpful if carers had guidance on this, to know what



	<p>were supported and their experience now as adults.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JM said well-meaning policies are fine but young people have not had any life experience outside of the support they received – they had never lived on their own, bought food, paid bills etc.</li> <li>• JM asked the group if any carers want to be involved in something similar – to talk about what it is like to be a carer and what it is like being a carer interacting with the Council?</li> <li>• JM would facilitate and endorse.</li> <li>• LT asked if the offer would be extended to other SIF's and JM confirmed it would.</li> <li>• LT will act as liaison between SIF's.</li> <li>• It was suggested JM attend the other SIF's and receive minutes from the meetings to learn other people's experiences of social services – good and bad.</li> <li>• JM said he had an accessible work style and meets with managers quarterly.</li> <li>• JM also takes part in "Back to the floor" exercises, spending half-days with staff and customers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Champion?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group wondered how it could best make use of JM's involvement.</li> <li>• It was noted that people tick the Carers box on the Census but there is no way of identifying them – of 57,000 carers identified in Sheffield, the Carers Centre only have 8,500 on their system.</li> <li>• The group felt that it needed a Champion to look at how to identify carers in order to increase the carers database.</li> <li>• JM offered to attend the next meeting.</li> <li>• The group thanked JM for attending and were encouraged by what he had said.</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p><b>Peer Challenge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LT reported that the Peer Challenge was being repeated 3 – 6 October and asked if anyone would be interested in attending one of three Focus Groups.</li> <li>• The Peers will be looking at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Preventative services</li> <li>○ Partnership/Joint working with Health</li> <li>○ 0-25</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CS and JK were interested in attending.</li> <li>• CS will use his contact lists to ask if anyone would be interested.</li> <li>• LT send email with details.</li> <li>• It was suggested contacting Rachel Sanchez from the Equalities Hub.</li> <li>• PK will ask at the Carers Centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>Co-production presentation – 20 October 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CS can send link for anyone wanting to attend – although there are no places left at the moment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CS</b> <b>LT</b> <b>LT</b> <b>PK</b></p> <p><b>CS</b></p>
5	<p><b>Date Of Next Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 23 November, Town Hall, Committee Room 3, 10:30 – 13:00</li> </ul>	