

Coventry LINK Steering Group Meeting
10am on 5th May 2010
Held At: Central Methodist Church Hall, Coventry

FINAL Minutes

Attendees: Tom Stone (Chair), David Spurgeon, Alexander Turner (from 11am), Gaile Allen, Sheila Marston, Ruth Light, Moira Pendlebury, Bhanu Dabhi, (from 10.40am) Abdi Ibrahim, Barinder Johal.

From Voluntary Action Coventry: Rob Allison

1) **Apologies:** George Keay

2) **Project Manager's Update – paper 1**

Ruth talked through a paper outlining recent work and meetings she had attended including University Hospital Coventry and Warwickshire's (UHCW) Community Engagement Committee on 15th April. An outcome from this was that it has been agreed that information regarding Coventry LINK will be produced in the Patient's bedside folder.

Jenny Walls (LINK Project Officer) went to a social media training day recently and that Coventry LINK seemed to already be doing a lot of the things that were suggested. The organisers of the training have now expressed an interest to use Coventry LINK as a case study for future training. Ruth asked the group if it would be helpful to receive a Project Manager's Report at meetings. This was agreed.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to produce Project Manager's Update for each future Steering Group meeting

3) **Representative Roles – paper 2**

Tom said the Coventry Primary Care Trust (PCT) had recently contacted him to ask for a representative from Coventry LINK to sit on the Patient Public Involvement (PPI) Working Group in place of Ruth. Ruth informed the group it was a quarterly meeting looking at the PCT's PPI work. Tom asked the group to consider if they were happy for him to represent Coventry LINK at the PPI meetings and all agreed they were.

Ruth talked through the paper, which summarised what the Terms of reference and Code of Conduct say about representative roles and asked if there was anything else to consider and to discuss the following questions:

- a) What is important for effective representation on external bodies?

b) On what basis should LINK decide if it should provide a 'representative'?

Tom suggested representation should be decided on a case by case basis. Moira said the framework was a useful tool to refer back to when deciding on representation and also for looking ahead for strategic purposes. Ruth said there was a lot of time commitments for certain groups and the group must decide on the benefits for Coventry LINK on joining. Dave said decisions to join certain groups should be based on LINK's work plan.

Ruth also highlighted the fact that when a representative attends a meeting, they may get asked specific questions regarding Coventry LINK or for a LINK view and asked how much autonomy representatives should have. Ellen said that the LINK Code of Conduct was the guide and this referred to acting in relation to the LINK's interests.

It was agreed that:

- Request for representation should be made via the LINK office and passed to the Steering Group for decision on which representative roles to take up and who should undertake them
- Representatives may be drawn from working groups if the Steering Group think this is appropriate.
- Representative roles should either be strategic or relevant to the LINK's work programme or aerated to a major issue of concern for local people
- Any decision making or proposed actions for LINK arising from groups LINK is represented on must be discussed and authorised by the Steering Group

4) Findings of GP survey – paper 3

Ruth informed the group the paper was produced as a first draft by Ralph Naylor (consultant) who analysed the data from the surveys for LINK. He also compared the findings of the report with patient satisfaction data from NHS Choices. Ruth asked the group to consider how the report should be used and informed them that the Community Health Services Working Group (CHSWG) would be visiting a few GP surgeries to follow up on responses.

Abdi said the survey should have been aimed at patients as they are the service users. Ruth said the LINK had gathered user feedback last year and were looking at how appointments systems could be improved

Gaile said it would be a good idea to send the findings to the local newspaper. Ruth asked if it might be better to do media coverage after the visits to GP practices had taken place and whether the report should be sent to the PCT and if so at which point. Tom said the PCT are looking for LINK support regarding GP services and they should receive findings of the report and said that the key points should drawn out of the report. Ruth said she had already sent the findings to the LINK media consultants and could ask them to put together a press release for media coverage. All agreed for Ruth to send information to the PCT.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to send information regarding findings of the GP report to the PCT• Ruth to arrange GP surgery visits (target before end of May)

5) LINK Finance Group – paper 4

Tom said it had been proposed that eh LINK had a finance group and introduced the paper. Ruth stated this could be a virtual group. The group was asked for three volunteers: Abdi Ibrahim; Moira Pendlebury and Gayle Allen Expressed and interest. Tom thought George Keay who was unable to attend the meeting would have an interest too. Ruth said one of the first tasks for the group would be to look at this year's budget. Moira asked if the LINK budget was also looked over by Voluntary Action Coventry. Ruth said it was and was also audited.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to confirm group membership

Open Meeting (11.15am)

Additional Attendees: **Esther Peapell** (Head of Patient and Public Involvement, NHS Coventry), **Peter Barnett**, Coventry City Council

Apologies: **Sue Stennett** (Associate Director, User and Care Involvement – Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust), **Bob Marriott** (Service User Involvement Development Officer – Coventry City Council), **Julia Flay** (Patient Involvement Facilitator – UHCW).

6) Minutes of the last meeting and minutes arising – paper 6

Ruth gave the group an update on actions from the last meeting:

- All actions from Malcolm Stamp, Chief Executive, UHCW have been followed up
- Quality Accounts meetings are being arranged

The minutes were agreed.

7) First Draft of LINK Annual Report

Tom highlighted the deadline for completing and producing the annual report and any feedback or comments must be given to Ruth as soon as possible. Ruth said the annual report must be sent to the Secretary of State for Health by the end of June and would be presented at the LINK's annual meeting. Ruth introduced the template for creating the annual report (paper 5) from the Department of Health and stated it had changed since last year.

The proposed content of the annual report was discussed. Dave stated the diagram on Coventry LINK's structure should include arrows to show the connection between the groups etc. All agreed to this amendment. Ruth also mentioned the report is asking for figures on LINK's participants, however Coventry LINK doesn't make a distinction between its members and participants but would include some information around this.

Ruth brought the group's attention to the section regarding benefits and mentioned she would ask working group participants for feedback in this area. Rob said the Government may make comparisons from the figures within LINKs' annual reports.

Esther queried the information about responses to 3 information requests and LINK reports and responses within 20 days. Ruth said that to date the LINK had not received any responses from UHCW or the PCT within the 20 day time frame and that this was causing delay in the LINK's work.

Peter asked how the LINK promoted the fact that it had made reports and recommendations. Ruth said the process followed to date was to send reports/recommendations to the provider/commissioner for response before making reports public. Peter suggested the LINK take a different approach. Tom said it was reasonable to give Trusts the opportunity to respond to recommendations should go to the bodies concerned. Peter suggested LINK informs Trusts that they have a limited time to respond before reports/recommendations are made public and the LINK website hold details of reports send and information request made and the deadline for response and if this becomes overdue.

Esther echoed Peter's comments and stated LINK should clearly state that its recommendations are in a draft form, which would then allow people the opportunity to feedback. P

Rob suggested a 1 page summary informing people that a recommendation has been made and highlighting the main points in the recommendation should be put on the LINK website rather than the entire report; clearly stating that Coventry LINK are awaiting responses.

Abdi comment on the community engagement section of the report and said he felt LINK hadn't done enough work around BME and refugee communities. Ruth said that LINK Project Officers had carried out outreach last year and that would be reflected within the report. Moving into the next phase of work planning would be good time to carry out further community engagement.

Dave queried the audience for the report and said he felt it wouldn't appeal to the wider, general public. He suggested a summary of the final report for the public should be produced. All agreed.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to amend the report in the light of feedback at the meeting• ALL to feedback any additional comments to Ruth as soon as possible

8) LINK Annual Meeting

Ruth suggested that the LINK have two annual meetings so that more people can attend: one on a Saturday and the other during the week. The meeting discussed proposed dates and venues and agreed that meetings should take place on:

Saturday 26th June at the Welcome Centre and Wednesday 30th June – The Willenhall, Education, Employment and Training Centre

Ruth said the meetings would look at presenting the annual reports and also thought round table discussions around the next LINK work plan could take place.

Dave suggested inviting a speaker to the event to ensure a high attendance. Ruth thought that attendance depended on how the meetings were publicised. Tom suggested putting an advert in the local and free newspapers. Dave suggested sending a press release to Warren Manger, Health reporter at the Telegraph. Ruth informed the group that was part of the media consultants work plan and could be linked.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Barinder to book and confirm venues• Barinder to source quotes for adverts in local newspapers• Ruth to work with Stour CIC over media coverage

9) Update on Work Programme from Working Groups – paper 7

Ruth introduced the paper and gave a brief update on each working group and informed the group that the Adult Social Care Working Group has set up 7 focus groups which were beginning very soon.

Esther mentioned she had visited the Community Health Services Working Group recently and asked them what information was useful to patients when choosing a GP and wondered if there were any updates. Ruth said the pieces of work were discussed and the CHSWG the previous Thursday and the group were interested in looking at GP information packs.

10) Feedback and Updates

Scrutiny Board 4:

Dave said they are currently awaiting a new board and there was nothing to feedback.

PCT Equalities and Human Rights working group:

Andrew was absent from the meeting – nothing to feedback

Requests for LINK work, involvement and consultations

Ruth informed the group that she had received another request for LINK to become a member of National Association of LINK Members (NALM). Moira asked what mechanisms were already in place for LINKs to meet and

communicate with each other. Ruth said there was a regional group but it hadn't met in quite some time and another is the LINK's Active Participants meetings. Ruth said she was unsure how NALM are funded and Dave said it would be worth while for LINK to pay the annual membership fee of £20.00 to receive the latest literature. Dave also agreed to look at the membership pack on NALM.

The Care Quality Commission had requested and feedback about City Council social care service by the end of May and had sent a copy of their report on the Council. Moira said the report was quite old now and that it would be easier for LINK to respond in the future after completing work on personalisation – all agreed.

Invites to events

Ruth mentioned a Commissioning workshop on 3rd June in Birmingham from 1pm – 4pm. Tom volunteered to attend with Ruth.

11) Steering Group Meeting Dates after June 2010

The group discussed future meeting dates. It was agreed to keep the same day and meeting pattern. Dave suggested future meetings should be held at 10 am rather than alternating the times. Ruth mentioned she had some annual leave booked. It was agreed that meeting after June will be at 10 am on Wednesday:

- July 7th
- August 18th
- October 6th
- November 3rd
- December 1st

All meetings will be held at Coventry Foyer, Lower Holyhead Road, Coventry (just off Spon Street).

Ruth suggested a specific work planning session be organised in August.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Barinder to book and confirm venues• Barinder/Ruth to check preferences and availability for a work planning session

12) Any Other Business

Ruth told the meeting of a new group called 'Cure the NHS' had been formed by patients from Mid Staffordshire and was seeking to become a national network.

Date and time of next meeting: 2nd June 2010 at 3.30pm – 6pm, Eadon Room – Coventry Central Hall