



Prevention and Wellbeing Partnership Board

Minutes

Wednesday 11 April 2012

Members in attendance:	
Iwona Andrews	Bucks County Council
Linda Barnes	The Alzheimer's Society
Sheila Bees	Wycombe District Council
Josie Bishton	Bromford Support
Roy Brooks	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Peter Bruford	Riverside
Mandy Carey	Bucks Mind
Dominic Games	Paradigm Housing
Steve Goldensmith	BCC
Anna Gordon	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Chris Gregory	Bucks & Milton Keynes Sports Partnership
Martin Holt	Chiltern District Council
Giulia Johnson	Age UK - Bucks
Sally Morris	Thames Valley Probation
Claire Paine	AVDC
Lee Scrafton	BCC
Mark Thompson	ConnectionFS
Mike Veryard	Chiltern District Council
Chris Voller	Vale of Aylesbury Housing

No	Item
1	<p data-bbox="288 181 951 219">Welcome and Apologies for Absence</p> <p data-bbox="288 271 1485 432">Steven Goldensmith welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made around the table. It was noted that the attendees represented a very broad group, which reflected the wide scope of the Prevention agenda.</p> <p data-bbox="288 483 1485 734">Apologies were received from Steven Archibald and Kath Palmer, Luisa Fletcher who was represented by Josie Bishton, Susie Yapp who was represented by Lee Scrafton, Steve Tredwell who was represented by Chris Voller, Rob Michael-Phillips who was represented by Mandy Carey, Stephanie Moffatt who was represented by Claire Paine and Elaine Jewell who was represented by Sheila Bees.</p>
2	<p data-bbox="288 813 724 851">Background Information</p> <p data-bbox="288 902 1485 1016">Steve Goldensmith outlined some background information to explain why a partnership board for Prevention and Wellbeing was being established.</p> <p data-bbox="288 1068 1485 1361">Within Adult Social Care and Health a new governance structure had been implemented, comprising of various partnership boards which report up to a new Executive Partnership Board, as the strategic decision making body. Each partnership board will nominate 2 representatives to sit on the Executive Partnership Board (EPB) and the boards will make recommendations to the EPB and could in turn be tasked by EPB to undertake different pieces of work.</p> <p data-bbox="288 1413 1485 1749">The partnership boards are as follows: Learning Disability, Older People's, Physical and Sensory Disability, Mental Health, Carers, Assistive Technology and this new Prevention and Wellbeing Board. Some of the Boards have been in place for some time but the Prevention and Wellbeing Board is brand new. Representatives from Housing and Housing Support sectors as well as voluntary groups and other organisations focussing more on prevention and wellbeing have been invited to participate.</p> <p data-bbox="288 1800 1485 2085">Traditionally much of the funding around these areas had been ringfenced under Supporting People, but this was no longer the case, so it was proposed that the old governance structure for Supporting People would be disbanded and representatives from the Supporting People Commissioning Body should be included in the Prevention and Wellbeing Partnership Board. This Board would have influence over the Supporting People budget of £4.5m per annum, the Prevention</p>

budget of £400,000 per annum and Prevention Development funding of £4m over the next 3 years.

The key difference between the Prevention and Wellbeing Partnership Board and the other Boards was that the other Boards focussed on the needs of clients who were eligible for support from Adult Social Care, whilst this Board would concentrate on people below this level of need, focussing on promoting independence at home for as long as possible. The Prevention and Wellbeing Board's priorities may well influence and link in with the work of the other Boards.

3 Draft Proposals for the development of the Prevention and Wellbeing Partnership Board

Steve Goldensmith asked the Board members for their views on the development of the new Prevention and Wellbeing Board. There was a lively and open discussion and the following points were noted:

- Steve Goldensmith was asked if the new partnership boards structure was finalised. A member of the Supporting People Commissioning Body (SPCB) expressed concern at the disbanding of that group as he believed that there had not been proper consultation and there was a need for the SPCB to have oversight of the funds. In response Steve Goldensmith advised that the new structure was in place and the SPCB reps would have a key role to play on this new Board. He argued that the SPCB had not had a real commissioning role for quite a while and other members agreed that there had been confusion between the role of the SPCB and the Supporting People Partnership Board, which sat beneath it.
- There was some concern that District Council members were not fully aware of these proposed changes and it was suggested that a paper outlining the new structure should be circulated. Steve Goldensmith was surprised that district councils were not aware of the changes
- The areas of focus suggested in the report by Steve Goldensmith were commended, but it was suggested that these themes may be able to be run through the work programmes of existing groups rather than establishing a brand new Board. Sally Morris of the Probation service welcomed the new Board as she felt that other groups did not focus on groups such as ex-offenders, drug users and care leavers.
- Members were concerned about the breadth of the Prevention agenda and wanted to ensure that the new Board would not simply be a 'talking shop' but that it would have a tight focus and a clear membership. There was concern that there would be a high dropout rate if the group was trying to tackle too much.

- Steve Goldensmith emphasised that it was up to the Board to set their own priorities. These could include refreshing the Supporting People strategy, developing a housing support commissioning strategy and feeding into the Prevention Matters agenda.
- Voluntary organisation representatives were asked for their views on the proposed areas of focus for the Board. Linda Barnes, Alzheimers Society advised that maintaining independence, quality of life and participation safely in the community were the key considerations for their clients. Iwona Andrews, BCC, expressed concerns for care leavers who can struggle with maintaining a tenancy at 18, then turn their life around by the age of 21 but cannot get a second chance due to their earlier failed tenancy. She also mentioned issues with care leavers, often Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers (UASC) who wanted to move out of Bucks but there was no funding to support them in doing this.
- Giulia Johnson of Age UK – Bucks commented that older people did not have major issues with housing and if they did the Older People’s Partnership Board would take up these issues, so there was a degree of overlap. She did however applaud the concept of developing a broad base for Prevention, but cautioned that the Board needed a clear aim going forward.
- Chris Gregory of Bucks and Milton Keynes Sports Partnership commented that he welcomed the opportunities for discussions on Lifetime Health & Wellbeing and felt he could also contribute to the Lifetimes Communities theme, but Housing was not on their agenda and this had seemed to dominate the discussions so far.
- Steve Goldensmith welcomed these comments. He asserted that Housing was key to independence and prevention therefore there was a link. He appreciated the concerns about the number of attendees and the desire not to replicate other existing housing groups but there did need to be a forum for discussions about the wider prevention agenda.
- It was suggested that existing Housing groups could be asked to feed concerns up to the Prevention and Wellbeing Partnership Board, but other members questioned whether existing Housing groups had a fully inclusive membership.
- Another proposal was made that 3 themed meetings should be held to focus on identifying priorities across the 3 areas, then the full Board should meet again to refine the findings of the 3 themed groups before reporting agreed priorities up to the Executive Partnership Board (EPB)
- Steve Goldensmith was asked what the expectations of the EPB might be in terms of timelines. Steve explained that there was no

real timetable – the first key tasks for the Board were to identify its membership, agree priorities and nominate 2 representatives to sit on the EPB.

- Members asked if it would be possible to have a paper about how the new structure fits together and the membership of the EPB to date.

Action: Steve Goldensmith

- It was suggested that the role of the Prevention and Wellbeing Board might be a short term one to refocus the work of other existing groups to ensure that the Prevention agenda would be incorporated into their work. Steve Goldensmith suggested that a priority for the Board should certainly be to test the commitment of existing groups to the Prevention agenda.
- Steve Goldensmith was asked if the Supporting People priorities would need to be reviewed and what timescales would apply? Steve Goldensmith explained that the Supporting People and Prevention budgets were separate pots of money and currently the Supporting People grants had been allocated until March 2014 through 30 contracts. These services could be reviewed between now and then with a view to recommissioning and this Board could influence the commissioning strategy.
- A member of the Supporting People Commissioning Body commented that without a Supporting People support structure in place it would take a long time to recommission 30 contracts. Steve Goldensmith suggested that one of the priorities for the Board could be to offer to create a commissioning strategy in order to take this forward.
- It was agreed that the proposal of holding themed meetings initially had merit. Therefore it was proposed that 3 themed meeting should be scheduled to take place during May and June, with a view to then reconvening the whole Board to consider the priorities which had come out of those discussions in July, in order to present agreed priorities at the EPB meeting in September. It was also agreed that Steve Goldensmith would circulate the Priorities Template for information.

Action: Steve Goldensmith

4 Membership

Steve Goldensmith explained that ultimately it was hoped that service users and carers would become members of the Board. In the initial stages, it was suggested that all agencies should be invited to all 3 themed meetings and then they could decide who would be the most appropriate person to attend to represent them. Steve Goldensmith asked if anyone would like to chair any of the themed groups and Mike Veryard volunteered to chair the Housing themed group.

	<p>Steve Goldensmith thanked everyone for attending and for their contributions to the discussion which had been very useful.</p>
5	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>To be confirmed</p> <p>Dates for the 3 proposed themed meetings would be circulated</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: Kelly Sutherland</p>

Chairman