

## MINUTES OF THE ICB PEOPLE & CULTURE COMMITTEE

22 FEBRUARY 2024, 09:00–11:00

Via MS Teams

<b>Present:</b>		
Gildea, Margaret	MG	ICB Non-Executive Member and Chair of ICB PCC ( <b>Chair</b> )
Booth, Lorraine	LB	Derbyshire County Council, Head of HR Operations - Deputising for Jen Skila
Dawson, Janet	JD	DCHS, Non-Executive Director and Chair of PCC
Dentith, Jill	JED	ICB, Non-Executive Director
Garnett, Linda	LG	ICB Interim Chief People Officer
Knibbs, Ralph	RK	DHcFT Non-Executive Director and Chair of PCC
Lam, Billie	BL	Non-Executive Director UHDB, Chair of People Committee
Leggatt, Zahra	ZL	DHU Healthcare, Director of People & Organisational Development
Moore, Liz	LM	Derby City Council, Head of HR
Rawlings, Amanda	AR	UHDB, Chief People Officer
Smith, Beverley	BS	ICB Director of Human Resources.
Tidmarsh, Darren	DT	DCHS Chief People Officer / Deputy Chief Executive
Wade, Caroline	CW	CRH Director of HR & OD
<b>In Attendance:</b>		
Frearson, Lucinda	LF	ICB, Executive Assistant ( <b>Admin</b> )
Robinson, Tracey	TR	ICB Project Manager, People Services Team
Watkins, Kevin	KW	360 Assurance, Business Associate
Wright, Jo	JW	ICB Head of Workforce Planning
<b>Apologies:</b>		
Bayley, Susie	SB	General Practice Taskforce Derbyshire – Medical Director
Blackwell, Penelope	PB	Place Board Chair and NHS Derby and Derbyshire CCG Governing Body GP
Clayton, Chris	CC	ICB, Chief Executive
Gulliver, Kerry	KG	EMAS, Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development
Oakley, Rebecca	RO	Acting Deputy Director People & Inclusion - Deputising for Jaki Lowe
Patel, Atul	AP	CRH Non-Executive Director and Chair of People Committee

Item No.	Item	Action
<b>PCC/2324/026</b>	<p><b>Welcome, introductions and apologies:</b></p> <p>Margaret Gildea (MG) as Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introduced Kevin Watkins (KW) from 360 Assurance who was attending today's meeting to observe in connection with his work around committee efficiencies.</p> <p>Apologies received: Susie Bayley, Penelope Blackwell, Chris Clayton, Kerry Gulliver, Rebecca Oakley, Atul Patel</p>	
<b>PCC/2324/027</b>	<p><b>Confirmation of quoracy</b></p> <p>The meeting was confirmed as quorate.</p>	

<p><b>PCC/2324/028</b></p>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>MG reminded committee members of their obligation to declare any interest they may have on any issues arising at committee meetings which might conflict with the business of the Integrated Care Board (ICB).</p> <p>Declarations declared by members of the People and Culture Committee (PCC) are listed in the ICB's Register of Interests and included with the meeting papers. The Register is also available either via the Executive Assistant to the Board or the ICB website at the following link: <a href="http://www.derbyandderbyshire.icb.nhs.uk">www.derbyandderbyshire.icb.nhs.uk</a></p> <p><u>Declarations of interest from today's meeting:</u> Janet Dawson (JD) advised of her appointment as a Non-Executive Director and Chair of the Remuneration Committee for a company called Scott Bader Limited, which had not yet been updated on the Register of Interests but highlighted no conflicts of interest with the NHS.</p>	
<p><b>GOVERNANCE</b></p>		
<p><b>PCC/2324/032</b></p>	<p><b>Committee Terms of Reference (TOR) &amp; Health &amp; Care Workforce Partnership Group</b></p> <p><u>ICB People and Culture Committee:</u> Linda Garnett (LG) present updated TORs for the ICB People and Culture Committee following discussions at the last committee meeting and committee development sessions around the purpose of the committee.</p> <p>TORs had been updated with changes to membership and meeting frequency and focused on 3 elements: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overseeing development and delivery of the ICS Health and Care Workforce Strategy</li> <li>• Providing assurance to the ICB Board and other sovereign organisations on the implementation of the strategy and identification and mitigation of people, culture, and workforce risk.</li> <li>• Having oversight of the 10 ICB people functions as set out in the NHS guidance.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee offered the following comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members asked for copies of the Workforce Strategy and Delivery Programme which were not currently available, but information would be circulated around the scoping and work done so far. <b>Action: LG to circulate scoping information to members.</b></li> <li>• Attendance percentage was queried as the 75% figure was not practical with the frequency of the meetings being bi-monthly. <b>Action: LG advised these were generic TORs and would make the amendment as required.</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;">LG</p> <p style="text-align: right;">LG</p>

- Within Appendix 1 there is a mention of 'one workforce' LG advised that this was an extract from a national document and within Derby and Derbyshire the term 'Health and Care Workforce' was used instead as it seemed a clearer description and also removes the worry that staff may believe they will be working for one large organisation. RK suggested a footnote or interpretation for Derbyshire to highlight this.
- Question was raised around the Academy and where it sits within the structure.
- It was felt important to keep the sovereign organisations updated and the arrows on the diagram need to be going in both directions upwards and downwards.
- It was thought helpful if executive colleagues could look at what has been achieved in this committee since its inception against the TORs, old and new, to demonstrate whether or not things are being achieved. A review should be carried out on an annual basis to look at the current financial position and where we are and what the priorities are for next year.
- One challenge for the committee is finding something we can do jointly over and above individual providers, Anchor organisations would bind us and can be done for the wider ICP space that fits into the Health and Care Workforce Partnerships Group. There is reference to Anchor Institutes in the TORs, but it is making that linkage.

**The People and Culture Committee ACCEPTED the TORs for the Committee.**

Health & Care Workforce Partnership Group:

LG explained that this was a new group being established following the standing down of the Workforce Advisory Group (WAG) which had been replaced by the Academy. It was felt there was a gap in terms of the work alongside the Local Authority and other external partners. A paper was presented at the last Integrated Care Partnership (ICP) meeting, and they were happy to support. The TORs for that group were being presented to the committee for information.

The Committee offered the following comments and questions:

- It was suggested that quoracy should state at least 50% of the membership and one officer should be in attendance at the meeting so that administration was complete with a feedback loop.

**The People and Culture Committee NOTED the TORs for the Workforce Partnership Group.**

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

<p><b>PCC/2324/033</b></p>	<p><b>People &amp; Culture Committee's role in the 24/25 Workforce Plan</b></p>	
	<p>Slides were presented by LG and circulated to members during the meeting, the key points highlighted from the presentation included: -</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned in 23/24 and what to avoid in 24/25 – have to have clarity what the starting position is.</li> <li>• During the year even though plan driven by the financial position the pay bill still does not triangulate and need to understand why that is.</li> <li>• Our system position recurrent deficit is in order of £130m and reflects non recurrent measures taken – so already starting in a difficult position.</li> <li>• Not yet received planning guidance for 24/25 but have seen draft planning assumptions.</li> </ul>	
	<p>LG presented the following questions to members adding that the real challenge this year was thinking about what could be done differently and what was driving that spend:</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What risks and challenges do we envisage in regard to this year's workforce planning?</li> <li>2. What is the role of this committee and its members overcoming issues in supporting process?</li> <li>3. What is the role of this committee in assuring plans at system level and organisational?</li> </ol>	
	<p>The Committee offered the following comments and questions:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a significant amount of spend on patients that should not be in our care that need to be in a different space or in a different place.</li> <li>• Work is underway around fragile services but how do we accelerate that.</li> <li>• There are some fundamental reshaping of building and services and pathways to be done differently whilst continuing to ensure quality, safety and caring for people which are the main issues.</li> <li>• It is about having that baseline to work from and looking at the numbers appropriately also around the approval process and some unit control. These are happening organisationally, but it could be there is a need to look at something more system wide.</li> <li>• There is a risk of being forced into a triangulation with finance which means numbers are out of step with reality and linked to that there is a risk that the plans will assume a level of CIP in each organisation.</li> <li>• There is also a risk around consistency of approach of recording workforce levels and there is probably something at system level</li> </ul>	

	<p>around occupational role support and supply and demand. The system requires to be more consistent as it is not currently. <b>Action: Circulate to members the new workforce productivity diagnostic created by NHSE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is conflict between the drive taking place at provider level to get full head count and having full resources for safety. Going back to the BAF risk what is being heard now is we are being told not to employ enough people. There is either a shortfall of numbers or wrong people in the wrong places and a more detailed diagnosis is required behind that.</li> <li>• The analysis at system level would sit, it was believed, with the provider collaborative due to them having a good programme of work looking at difference aspects of services.</li> <li>• Require looking at the root cause and do we require assistance from a quality improvement team to get the basics right and confidence in numbers at the beginning with a common system that goes across all the organisations.</li> <li>• We are always chasing the numbers and last year after the large amount of work it was incorrect so if we can have confidence the numbers are correct at the beginning this would give some transparency and putting some investment in would reduce some inefficiencies.</li> <li>• LG began summarising by thanking everyone for contributing highlighting the importance, also taking and providing assurance that people are truly sighted on the challenges flagged along with a commitment from organisations to work together and make a difference by focusing on the areas we can change and continue to work on those changes.</li> <li>• There was felt to be a need to feed up to NHSE, this was a two-way thing, and some things cannot be changed such as acuity. Instructions come down and we do what we can to achieve those targets.</li> </ul> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee NOTED the report.</b></p>	<p>LG</p>
<b>CORPORATE ASSURANCE</b>		
<p><b>PCC/2324/034</b></p>	<p><b>Latest Workforce Report</b></p> <p>The People and Culture Committee are recommended to note the M9 workforce position. The purpose of the paper is to provide the committee with a summary of the M9 workforce position in relation to the 2023/24 workforce plan.</p> <p>During 2023/24 significant efforts were made to improve the alignment across workforce and the finance pay-bill. The ambition was to develop a more cohesive and triangulated view approach across all component parts of the operational plan (activity, workforce, and finance) as part of the 2024/25 planning process.</p>	

	<p>This report is summarised in two parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) M9 position against plan and FOT Trend. The FOT position is a particular focus this month as this aims to demonstrate the predicted position at year end based on the H2 reset exercise.</li> <li>2) Actual workforce position/ pay-bill compared to establishment. This aims to provide the most reasonable overview based on the current mechanisms that are in place.</li> </ol> <p>In addition, given the increasing level of scrutiny on agency spend and usage the report includes a breakdown against the four main KPIs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Agency Spend</li> <li>• Agency spend as a % of total staff spend</li> <li>• % of Off Framework shifts</li> <li>• % non-price cap compliant shifts</li> </ul> <p>The breakdown by substantive, bank and agency is detailed in the appendices but overall, the forecast is showing that we will end 380WTE above the revised forecast outturn plan position at M12. This equates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantive, 7.8WTE above using a M8 to M9 growth of 0.1%.</li> <li>• Bank, 62WTE above using a M8 to M9 reduction of 5.5%.</li> <li>• Agency, 279WTE above using a M8 to M9 growth of 1.8%.</li> </ul> <p>All organisations have put measures in place to limit the substantive workforce growth and reduce agency usage for the remainder of this year.</p> <p>The Committee offered the following comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The total workforce projections are required, and some are not there to ensure we know the starting point for fair and robust challenge on plans at M1.</li> <li>• There was limited assurance on this month's position, but some comfort can be taken from the number of actions in place and as we are growing as a system, it takes time to get the processes established.</li> </ul> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee NOTED the report.</b></p> <p><i>Liz Moore joined the meeting.</i></p>	
<p><b>PCC/2324/035</b></p>	<p><b>Assurance Report from the People Services Delivery Board</b></p> <p>The paper was taken as read and was provided for information and to provide assurance around the 3 projects currently being prioritised: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Derbyshire Academy</li> <li>2) People Digital Project</li> <li>3) Scaling Recruitment Processes</li> </ol>	

	<p>There were no comments or questions raised, however, it was suggested to bring an item to the next meeting on the Derbyshire Academy. <b>Action: Derbyshire Academy to be an agenda item for the next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee NOTED the report.</b></p>	<p><b>LG</b></p>
<p><b>PCC/2324/036</b></p>	<p><b>BAF (Board Assurance Framework) Risks</b></p> <p>The purpose of the report is for Committee to discuss the BAF Strategic Risks which are their responsibility. Two strategic risks have been identified: -</p> <p><b>Strategic Risk 05 - <i>There is a risk that the system is not able to recruit and retain sufficient workforce to meet the strategic objectives and deliver the operational plans.</i></b> <b>The overall risk score is recommended to remain at high level 16.</b></p> <p>Despite improvement regarding system alignment, the current risk relates to the affordability of the workforce and further industrial action is planned in February 2024. Therefore, the risk remains the same.</p> <p><b>Strategic Risk 06 - <i>There is a risk that the system does not create and enable One Workforce to facilitate integrated care.</i></b> <b>The overall risk score remains at a high level 12.</b></p> <p>Whilst agreement has been made to sign up to joint objectives, these are focussing on workforce supply and economic development.</p> <p>The Committee offered the following comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question was raised whether there were other items that should be added as issues around finance were coming to the fore.</li> <li>• It was queried whether Risk 05 wording ought to be changed or the threat that underpins that risk. LG to take away and ensure wording reflects the risk as it is happening. <b>Action: LG and Jill Dentith (JED) to review the corporate risk register.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee RECEIVED Risk 05 and 06 assigned to them.</b></p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee AGREED to remain at a risk score of 16 for Risk 05.</b></p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee AGREED to remain at a risk score of 12 for Risk 06.</b></p>	<p><b>LG/JED</b></p>
<p><b>PCC/2324/037</b></p>	<p><b>Freedom To Speak Up (FTSU) Assurance</b></p> <p>The People and Culture Committee are recommended to note the report for assurance. The purpose of the paper is to provide assurance</p>	



	<p>that partner organisations have appropriate arrangements in place to implement the recommendations from the Lucy Letby letter received from the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The Committee offered the following comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was questioned how we are to support organisations in the primary care arrangements, as there was funding for a post at the moment that was non recurrent. LG advised that the ICB would not be in a position to find the funding again and the risk had been included on the Primary Care Delivery Board risk register. It was noted that Primary Care had been given funding through the People Promise Exemplar Programme so there was possibility there.</li> </ul> <p>MG thanked Tracey Robinson (TR) for her work on this item and for providing the report for Committee.</p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee felt ASSURED by the report received.</b></p>							
<b>MINUTES and MATTERS ARISING</b>								
<p><b>PCC/2324/038</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes from the meeting held: 06 December 2023</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 06 December 2023 were accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee ACCEPTED the Minutes.</b></p>							
<p><b>PCC/2324/039</b></p>	<p><b>Action Log from the meeting held: 06 December 2023</b></p> <p>The action log was reviewed and will be updated for the next meeting.</p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee NOTED the action log.</b></p>							
<b>CLOSING ITEMS</b>								
<p><b>PCC/2324/040</b></p>	<p><b>Forward Planner</b></p> <p><b>The People and Culture Committee ACCEPTED both Forward Planners 2023/24 and 2024/25.</b></p>							
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="387 1615 456 1720">1.</td> <td data-bbox="456 1615 1329 1720">Has the Committee been attended by all relevant Executive Directors and Senior Managers for assurance purposes? <b>YES</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="387 1720 456 1890">2.</td> <td data-bbox="456 1720 1329 1890">Were the papers presented to the Committee of an appropriate professional standard, did they incorporate detailed reports with sufficient factual information and clear recommendations? <b>NO cover paper for one item was missing.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="387 1890 456 2027">3.</td> <td data-bbox="456 1890 1329 2027">Has the committee discussed everything identified under the BAF and/or Risk Register, and are there any changes to be made to these documents as a result of these discussions? <b>YES, and further changes will be made.</b></td> </tr> </table>	1.	Has the Committee been attended by all relevant Executive Directors and Senior Managers for assurance purposes? <b>YES</b>	2.	Were the papers presented to the Committee of an appropriate professional standard, did they incorporate detailed reports with sufficient factual information and clear recommendations? <b>NO cover paper for one item was missing.</b>	3.	Has the committee discussed everything identified under the BAF and/or Risk Register, and are there any changes to be made to these documents as a result of these discussions? <b>YES, and further changes will be made.</b>	
1.	Has the Committee been attended by all relevant Executive Directors and Senior Managers for assurance purposes? <b>YES</b>							
2.	Were the papers presented to the Committee of an appropriate professional standard, did they incorporate detailed reports with sufficient factual information and clear recommendations? <b>NO cover paper for one item was missing.</b>							
3.	Has the committee discussed everything identified under the BAF and/or Risk Register, and are there any changes to be made to these documents as a result of these discussions? <b>YES, and further changes will be made.</b>							



	4.	Were papers that have already been reported on at another committee presented to you in a summary form? <b>YES</b>	
	5.	Was the content of the papers suitable and appropriate for the public domain? <b>YES</b>	
	6.	Were the papers sent to Committee members at least 5 working days in advance of the meeting to allow for the review of papers for assurance purposes? <b>YES, except presentation slides due to being current information.</b>	
	7.	Does the Committee wish to deep dive any area on the agenda, in more detail at a future meeting, or through a separate meeting with an Executive Director in advance of the next scheduled meeting? <b>NO</b>	
	8.	<p>What recommendations do the Committee want to make to the ICB Board following the assurance process at today's Committee meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Risk Threats once the work has been done.</b></li> <li>• <b>Endorsing the importance of activity finance and workforce</b></li> </ul>	
PCC/2324/041	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><u>Effectiveness of the meeting:</u> KW advised that he was undertaking a piece of work more specifically around risk management and how that is developing but it talks about the reason for the committees being in existence to some extent and how risk is being managed.</p> <p>KW felt the biggest thing to come out of the meeting was LG's presentation and that significant articulation that you have more people than funded and how that gets reflected as a risk and how you get assured how that is being managed which is a significant thing for this committee to be assured on. Also, what is your relationship with the Provider Collaborative Board do you have that responsibility to get them to talk to the committee about the risk as the committee requires that assurance or is that still with Finance Digital and Estates Committee. <b>Action: MG and LG to meet with KW to discuss further.</b></p>		MG/LG
<b>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</b>			
	<p><b>Date:</b> Thursday 25 April 2024 <b>Time:</b> 13:00 – 15:00 <b>Venue:</b> via Microsoft Teams</p>		