Executive Partnership Board

Minutes
14 November 2011

Partnership Board

Those in attendance:	
Nadiya Ashraf	Carers Partnership Board
David Bone	Assistive Technology Board
Trevor Boyd	Head of Commissioning & Service Improvement, Adults and Family Wellbeing
Fred Charman	Talkback - Learning Disability Partnership Board
Andrew Clark	Physical and Sensory Disability Partnership Board
Ian Cormack	Carers Partnership Board
Steve Goldensmith	Supporting People Partnership Board
Elaine Jewell	Wycombe District Council
Alison Lewis	Chair of the Service User and Carer Reference Group / ULO
Ainsley Macdonnell	Learning Disability Partnership Board
Ryan Mellett	Older People's Partnership Board
Pat Milner	Mental Health Partnership Board
Sue Pigott	Talkback
Christopher Reid	OPPB and PSD PB
Jean Rein	Talkback - Learning Disability Partnership Board
Rachael Rothero	Service Manager, Strategic Commissioning,

	Adults and Family Wellbeing
Bob Smith	South Bucks District Council
Jane Taptiklis	NHS Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Cluster
Kelly Taylor	Hightown
Andrew Walker	LINk

No	Item
1	**Welcome and Introductions** Trevor Boyd welcomed everyone to the meeting, and each member introduced themselves. There were no apologies for the meeting. Trevor Boyd chaired the meeting.
2	**Recap of the Review and the future operation of the Board** (Agenda Item 4 was taken together with this item). 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. **Governance Structure** The Review had looked at a structure of five partnership boards and an Executive Partnership Board. There were now two further 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 over-arching 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 over-arching 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 de-motivated, 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. The contacts for the ULO were Nadiya Ashraf or Ann Whiteley (Carers Bucks). **Agreed action:** **Partnership Board leads to feed back what user support is needed on each partnership board.**
6	**Administration and Support** See agenda item 2.
7	**Next steps** Date of next meeting – the EPB would meet quarterly and the next meeting would be in February 2012.
8	**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).
	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.

Chairman

The Local Account Challenge

The Local Account

By May 2012 we will create the Councils first **Local Account**, a document which will enable residents to judge how well the Council is performing in meeting priorities for adult social care in Buckinghamshire and that value for money is being achieved with resources used for social care by the County Council.

The Local Account replaces the performance assessment of social care which used to be carried out by the Care Quality Commission

We have some ideas for what we want to include in our account but would like residents and organisations with an interest in adult social care services to help us put the Local Account together. Some areas we would like to work with you on would be for example

Which social care services you would like us to particularly focus on in our Local Account?

What information in particular would you find interesting to know

What makes excellent social care services i,e what is important for social care services to get right?

How could we best present and publish this information in the Local Account?

The Challenge

The overall challenge in producing the Local Account is to ensure it is meaningful, useful, and interesting and enables people to judge how well the council is performing in meeting priorities for adult social care.

The Timetable

We aim to have an agreed Local Account available by the end of May 2012 but this will require a well developed draft to be produced in February.

Getting Started

We would value and welcome your help in starting the work on the Local Account and propose the following as starting points for your involvement following this meeting.

- Representation-each organisation (partnership board) to put forward 1/2 representatives who would be willing to meet as part of the Local Account Development Group.

- We will also produce a straightforward short document to enable each organisation as a starting point to set out their initial views and put forward proposals they have on the Local Account.

- We will also be involving the wider public through methods such as our website and the citizen jury system.

We look forward to working with you in producing a useful Local Account for Buckinghamshire.

Paul Greenhalgh
Performance Manager, Adults and Family Wellbeing
November 2011