



Partnership Board

Executive Partnership Board

Minutes

14 November 2011

Those in attendance:	
Nadiya Ashraf (NA)	Carers Partnership Board
David Bone (DB)	Assistive Technology Board
Trevor Boyd (TB)	Head of Commissioning and Service Improvement, Buckinghamshire County Council
Fred Charman (FC)	Talkback - Learning Disability Partnership Board
Andrew Clark	Physical and Sensory Disability Partnership Board
Ian Cormack (IC)	Carers Partnership Board
Steve Goldensmith (SG)	Supporting People
Elaine Jewell (EJ)	Wycombe District Council
Alison Lewis (AL)	Chair of the Service User and Carer Reference Group / ULO
Ainsley Macdonnell (AM)	Learning Disability Partnership Board
Ryan Mellett (RM)	Older People's Partnership Board
Pat Milner (PM)	Mental Health Partnership Board
Sue Pigott (SP)	Talkback
Chris Reid (CR)	OPPB and PSD PB
Jean Rein (JR)	Talkback - Learning Disability Partnership Board
Rachael Rothero (RR)	Assistive Technology Board
Marcia Smith (MS)	Service Manager, Performance,

	Buckinghamshire County Council
Bob Smith (BS)	South Bucks District Council
Jane Taptiklis (JT)	NHS Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Cluster
Kelly Taylor (KT)	Hightown
Helen Wailling (HW)	Democratic Services Officer
Andrew Walker (AW)	Local Involvement Network (LINK)



No	Item
1	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>Trevor Boyd welcomed everyone to the meeting, and each member introduced themselves.</p> <p>There were no apologies for the meeting.</p> <p>Trevor Boyd chaired the meeting.</p>
2	<p>Recap of the Review and the future operation of the Board</p> <p>(Agenda Item 4 was taken together with this item).</p> <p>Rachael Rothero referred members to the terms of reference which had been produced following the partnership board review, and asked if members were still happy with these.</p> <p>Governance Structure</p> <p>The Review had looked at a structure of five partnership boards and an Executive Partnership Board. There were now two further</p>

partnership boards (Supporting People and the Assistive Technology Board), which would be added to the structure if members agreed this.

The governance structure which had previously been agreed was that the Executive Partnership Board (EPB) would be an overarching Board and that the other partnership boards would report to the EPB.

Partnership board members had been concerned that they would lose their identity, but this would not be the case, as there would be a two way line of communication, both downwards from the EPB to the partnership boards, and upwards from the boards to the EPB.

Rachael Rothero also said the following:

- The EPB would report to the Adult Commissioners.
- The EPB was a high-level, strategic Board, and members would have to give a commitment to attend, to ensure that it was effective.
- Partnership boards and the EPB were not decision-making bodies, but made recommendations and could act as steering groups.
- The new Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board would need to be considered in the structure.
- Standard agenda items for EPB meetings would include an update from each partnership board about progress against their work programme.

Membership

A membership of no more than 15 people was suggested for each partnership board, to ensure the boards were effective. The Learning Disability Partnership Board would be different as it had

national guidelines about membership.

The aim was for two representatives of each partnership board to sit on the EPB, one of whom should be a service user or carer.

Members discussed the membership and it was agreed that Community Impact Bucks would be asked to put forward a representative for the EPB, as the priorities agreed by each board would have implications for voluntary and community sector (VCS) providers. It would not be possible to represent the whole of the VCS and this was the reason for having one representative from an umbrella organisation.

It was also agreed that the EPB should have representatives from the following:

- Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
- The Ridgeway Partnership Trust
- Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust

A health forum would be set up in 2012, and that this could be linked to the partnership boards.

Bob Smith suggested that each Board might only need one or two District Council representatives to represent all four District Councils. This would be discussed further once the work outcomes had been set.

Work Programme

It was very important that each partnership board had a work programme which was agreed and signed off at the beginning of each financial year. The work programmes would be reviewed after

6 months and at the end of each year. This would ensure that there was a consistent approach across all the partnership boards.

The Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board had identified some overarching outcomes which could be used as a basis for the partnership board priorities.

Each partnership board would need to produce a list of its priorities. The work programme for each partnership board would be signed off by the EPB.

The Adult Commissioners would also identify priorities for each partnership board.

The work programmes would not just be based on health and social care issues, but also on wider issues, such as transport.

Some priorities would be cross-cutting.

Cross – cutting themes

Some topics (e.g. Day Services or Dignity in Care) cut across all the partnership boards and short-term groups could be set up to address these, rather than them going to each partnership board.

These short-term groups would be set up by the Executive Partnership Board.

Short-term groups would also reduce officer attendance at meetings.

Code of Conduct

The changes incorporated by the County Council's Standards Committee should be considered for inclusion in the terms of reference when they were agreed.

Elections

Elections for service users had recently been held for the Learning Disability Board, but other partnership boards would need to have their service user and carer representatives arranged by the ULO. A common sense approach would need to be taken.

Each partnership board would also need to elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

Training

Induction sessions would be provided for all partnership board members.

Communication

A partnership board website would be developed which would contain all reports, minutes and agendas for each board, as well as the priorities and work programmes once they had been agreed.

There would also be a quarterly newsletter which would cover all the boards, and would be available on the website.

A celebration event would be held annually.

Suggestions for other ways of communicating would be welcomed (e.g. through the User-led Organisation or through the Local Involvement Network).

Ainsley Macdonnell (Senior Joint Commissioner, Learning Disability) had a list of basic communication needs, which she suggested could be adopted by the Boards, to ensure that service

users were properly involved.

Administration

The Democratic Services Team had been commissioned to administer the partnership boards and the EPB, with the exception of the Learning Disability Partnership Board, which would be administered by Talkback.

There was a small budget available to ensure that the partnership board structure operated effectively (administration, communications, training etc.)

Standard templates and formats would be developed for all partnership boards, although the Learning Disability Partnership Board would have additional requirements.

Service user expenses

This would be arranged through the User-led organisation.

EPB members then made the following comments:

- Papers for all meetings needed to be sent out at least one week in advance, and should not be tabled at meetings.
- Partnership board agendas needed to reflect the items on the agendas at more senior boards.
- Communication was not included in the terms of reference for the EPB, and needed to have a stronger focus.
- Business at meetings and paperwork needed to be accessible, and breaks needed to be incorporated in all partnership board agendas.
- Membership was more about quality of communication and regularity of attendance than about the number of members.

Representation on the Board was different to membership.

- Some groups had always struggled to have user attendance (e.g. Mental Health Partnership Board) and engagement with users might have to be flexible (e.g. going out to users in some cases).
- The timescale for setting up the boards should not be unrealistic.

A member asked how service users would be consulted for short-term cross-cutting groups. Trevor Boyd said that each representative would have mechanisms for how they consulted with service users, and how this would then be fed back into a working group.

The Executive Partnership Board agreed the terms of reference for the EPB and for the other partnership boards (attached), and the Governance structure (attached).

Agreed actions:

- **Each partnership board to produce a list of its priorities. A template form to be produced and sent out for completion to partnership board leads before the end of November 2011. The completed forms to be returned by 20 January 2012.**
- **Alison Lewis to meet with Democratic Services to discuss accessibility of paperwork.**
- **Bev Frost, Communications Officer, to be contacted about the production of a newsletter and other communication needs.**
- **Nadiya Ashraf to prepare a paper with interim options for services users' and carers' expenses, and a proposal for a**

	remuneration policy.
3	Break
4	Draft Terms of Reference for Executive Partnership Board See Agenda Item 2.
5	Role of the User Led Organisation (ULO) in supporting the Partnership Boards Rachael Rothero said that a User-Led organisation (ULO) had been commissioned the previous year to ensure an effective service user involvement in the partnership boards. Alison Lewis (Chair of the ULO) and Ian Cormack (Vice Chair of the ULO) would be representing the ULO on the Executive Partnership Board (EPB). Alison Lewis said that many service users and carers felt demotivated, and that they needed to feel that their input into meetings was productive. Timing and location of meetings needed to be considered, to fit around the needs of users and carers. Transport was a large issue. The format of paperwork was important too. The ULO would be recruiting service users and carers, and the first recruitment stage was currently being carried out. A new support worker had been employed, and would carry out a mapping exercise to look at the current numbers of service users and carers on the partnership boards.

	<p>The contacts for the ULO were Nadiya Ashraf or Ann Whiteley (Carers Bucks).</p> <p>Agreed action: Partnership Board leads to feed back what user support is needed on each partnership board.</p>
6	<p>Administration and Support See Agenda Item 2.</p>
7	<p>Next Steps Date of next meeting – the EPB would meet quarterly and the next meeting would be in February 2012.</p>
8	<p>Any Other Business - The Local Account Challenge The Local Account Challenge Marcia Smith (Service Manager, Performance, Adults and Family Wellbeing) handed out a factsheet (attached).</p> <p>The Local Account was a requirement for every social care authority to produce an annual document. The factsheet was for information, and further information would be brought to EPB members in 2012.</p>

Chairman