

## **Commentary from Joint Coventry and Warwickshire Quality Account Task Group**

The membership of the Quality Account (QA) Task Group comprises Healthwatch Coventry, Healthwatch Warwickshire, and Coventry City Council Health and Social Care Scrutiny.

The draft version of the Quality Account we received in order to produce this commentary was not complete as it was missing data and narrative from some sections:

- Measures and work programmes related to Quality goals
- CQUIN targets for 2018-19
- Section on the Trust's acute services.

### **Last year's priorities**

The Task Group met with the Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust (CWPT) to discuss progress on last year's priorities and what had been achieved. We found this to be a positive process. The Trust demonstrated achievements in relation to the priorities it has been working on.

### **Next Year's priorities**

Potential quality goals were discussed with the Task Group prior to them being included in the Quality Account.

The inclusion of priorities about putting patients at the centre of care are welcome. As is the focus about connecting and integrating services to deliver better care, and on supporting staff.

The Trust has focused its priorities on its strategic ambitions under the areas of great place to care; great place to and great place to work. The objectives presented under these ambitions are sensible. However, the specifics of delivery are not detailed in the way they have been in previous quality account documents. In particular the implementation of objectives around patient care is not demonstrated.

The version of the Quality Account we received did not contain information about the measures that will be used to show progress on the priorities or how the Strategic Ambitions would be achieved. We requested further information and were sent some information in the format of presentation slides.

Quality improvement is often about change management. The Trust's commitment to making change is clear but the specific change processes to be used is less clear.

## Missing elements

The Trust describes a number of mechanisms for patient/service user engagement and we have seen more engagement sessions this year, but the Trust does not fully demonstrate the impact of its patient public engagement work.

Whilst the Trust is shown to be 'about the same' as other trusts for patient survey results some of the scores are low. More reflection on this within the document would have been useful.

We did not receive the section on Acute Services to comment upon.

The Trust has been changing the designated use of various sites eg putting dementia services in Nuneaton and an explanation of the rationale work and consultations leading to this would be helpful

## Other comments

We have found CWPT to be open and responsive in relation to issues highlighted in its most recent CQC report.

We were sent information to be included in the report regarding mortality and this showed the Trust has identified actions from case and record reviews and investigations, demonstrating learning.

Healthwatch Coventry raised issues identified by people using the Trusts PALS and complaints process this year. We asked for the process to be clarified and more individually responsive and for the response times to complaints to be reduced from 45 days. We felt that senior leaders listened to our feedback and a commitment was made to respond to some complaints within 30 days. It would be helpful if the Trust reported on this.

It is difficult to understand the bigger picture context within which NHS trusts operate from individual Trust Quality Accounts. For 2 years all local trusts, commissioners and local authorities have come together a part of Better Health Better Care, Better Value local planning framework to bring about more integrated care that focuses on the system as a whole and how it works together. This is not reflected in the Quality Account.

[Commentary ends]

[629 words]