

Coventry LINK Steering Group Meeting
3.30pm – 6pm on 3rd February 2010
Held At: Central Methodist Church Hall, Coventry

FINAL Minutes

Attendees: Dave Spurgeon, Tom Stone, Alexander Turner, Gaile Allen, Terence Doyle, Abdi Ibrahim, Sheila Marston, Bhanu Dabhi, Ruth Light, Barinder Johal, Rob Crutchlow (from The Grapevine), Christine Upton supported by Lucy Jakaza

Apologies: George Keay, Moira Pendlebury

Present: Rob Allison from Voluntary Action Coventry

1) Chairing of the meeting

Tom agreed to chair the meeting.

2) Electing a Steering Group Chair (paper 1)

The meeting discussed and agreed the process for electing a Chair:

- a) Ballot paper to be sent out
- b) 10 day turnaround for voting
- c) Stamped address reply envelope to be provided
- d) Vote by ranking
- e) Results known before next meeting

Sheila suggested rotating the Chair at each meeting. Tom said it may rotate naturally as not everyone can attend each meeting.

All present at the meeting agreed this process.

Ruth informed the group that Tom, Dave and George have put forward their names for the position of Chair and as 3 people had expressed an interest there could be a possibility of LINK having 2 Vice Chairs. The group thought this was a good idea.

2.1 Duration in the roles

All agreed a term of office of 2 years.

2.2 Removal from the role

Ruth highlighted 3 possible reasons for removal as the role of the Chair:

- Ineffective in the role
- Lost the support of the rest of the group through the way they carry out the role
- Conduct – this is covered by the LINK Standards of Conduct policy

Terry said point 3 should be followed as stated in the Standard of Conduct policy. After discussion it was agreed that the process for a vote of no confidence would be by nomination and seconding by other members and by a

majority vote of members present. A Chair or Vice Chair voted with no confidence must resign from the role immediately.

2.3 Finalising the role description

The group discussed the role description. Ruth said she was hesitant for too many roles to go to any one person.

Terry said that any media spokesperson must put forward the view of the LINK. Tom suggested this was up for discussion at the next meeting.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Ruth to add item of the Media Spokesperson to the agenda for the next meeting

3) Report on current Host/LINK work (paper 2)

Ruth talked through the different elements of work highlighted in this paper. Discussions took place around the LINK pieces of work. Ruth said she had shown the work of the Working Groups continuing until the end of June as this is when the commissioning team at Coventry NHS begin to plan their work and so was the beginning of the period of influence. Gaile queried the piece of work on electronic patient records. Ruth explained LINK was taking part in a national project which involved facilitating a game.

4) LINK Budget Report (papers 3 and 4)

The group looked at details of the expenditure and proposals for the under spend. Tom said LINK should spend the budget or commit it.

Ruth said that the Young People's group would like to create beer mats to attract a younger membership to LINK. Ruth has also spoken to the LINK website designers regarding upgrades to the site. Also LINK cotton bags could be re-printed as they were a good promotional tool.

Ruth said the proposal was that LINK should use the majority of the under spend to buy in some consultancy support for the LINK work programme.

Discussions took place around the budget and Ruth asked if the under spend could focus on the publicity and marketing as well as the consultancy. It was agreed to take forward the publicity and marketing ideas and the recruitment of consultants to support the work programme.

Dave questioned where LINK would find suitable consultants from. Ruth said Rob had a number of contacts and adverts would be placed on the LINK website.

Abdi said he would like BME focussed focus groups. Ruth and Terry said it could be done especially around the personalisation work area. Ruth asked for volunteers to be on the panel for the selection of consultants and researchers to contract with. Terry, Dave, Bhanu and Tom volunteered.

5) Name of Steering Group (paper 5)

Tom withdrew his suggestion of changing the name as it was a change to the Terms of Reference requiring consultation with the membership. Tom felt there was more important work to focus on. Dave seconded this. Ruth said she received an email from George Keay (who was not available for this meeting) and he would like the name changed. Discussions took place around finding the balance between Steering Group members' and staff roles etc.

All agreed at this time that a change of name was not necessary. Ruth said it had previously been agreed that the Terms of Reference would be reviewed after 1 year (October 2010).

6) Response for University Hospital Coventry and Warwickshire (UHCW) to LINK information request regarding patient safety (paper 6 – letter from Malcolm Stamp, Chief Executive UHCW)

Dave fed back from recent discussions at the Hospital Services Working Group (HSWG). The main explanation of the rating was that it resulted from issues with coding. The group had picked out comments about end of life provision.

Ruth asked if there was any follow up work and if there was a way to publicise LINK's involvement. The group discussed options for either media coverage or setting up a meeting regarding end of life care.

Ruth suggested asking people in Coventry about their end of life care experiences in the City in order to gain evidence. All agreed for the HSWG to work further on this and report back when necessary.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Further discussion at HSWG regarding follow up from Malcolm Stamp's letter and possible the end of life care experiences piece of work

OPEN MEETING (5pm)

Additional Attendees:

Esther Peapell (Head of Public and Patient Involvement, NHS Coventry), **Bob Marriott** (Service User Involvement Development Officer – Coventry City Council), **Julia Flay** (Patient Involvement Facilitator – UHCW) and **Juliet Hancox** (Acting Director – NHS Coventry)

Introductions were made.

7) Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the last meeting. Ruth provided an update on the actions. Local media work had been delayed by the National LINK campaign. Follow up is required around leaflet distribution.

8) Re-organisation of Community Health Services in Coventry – presentation by Juliet Hancox, Acting Director of Primary Care Trust NHS Coventry.

Juliet was welcomed to the meeting. She explained that she was responsible for independent contractor services (GPs, Dentists, Pharmacies and Opticians).

Juliet outlined some of her work including work on Care Pathways i.e. the nsteps in a patient's journey of care by different health bodies. This is hoped to eradicate repetition of the patient telling their medical problems/symptoms to specialists and GPs, so that information is fed through to various organisations and specialists within the medical field.

The Department of Health has asked Julia's department to develop proposals for the transfer of the management of community health services from the PCT to another body. Early plans are required by the end of March 2010 and Julia highlighted local support is required in order to gather the best findings.

The options were to move the management of these services to UHCW or the Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust or to a social enterprise. Staff however were not keen on the social enterprise idea and community and staff support was needed for the plans.

Dave asked if there was a view on the best alternative for Community Services. Juliet said this was still in discussion. NHS Coventry/Primary Care Trust must meet the criteria given to them by the Department of Health.

Ruth asked if any consideration of linking in with the City Council Social Care Services had been made. Juliet said this wasn't off the table but that staff preferred options of remaining in the NHS.

Terry asked if control over the Community Health Services would be lost if they become part of a Foundation Trust. Juliet replied that Foundation Trusts were still part of the NHS family.

Terry questioned if it would possible to maintain services and save money. Juliet said that by combining services, money could be saved while still delivering good quality care. Terry raised concerns that services might be privatised and Juliet said that wasn't the agenda.

Juliet then went on to talk about strategy for GP services. They will be talking to patients and GPs regarding regeneration of their premises over the next 10 years. They would be looking to get a balance of services within the City centre as well as locally.

Sheila informed Juliet that the equality of services provided by GPs seemed to differ from area to area within the City. Juliet said there was no consistency from one area to the next as most GPs are independent and run their own practices in their own way, however pooling GPs together in one practice may be beneficial.

NB: Christine and Lucy left at this point in the discussion.

Juliet said she would welcome any findings from LINK regarding GPs in Coventry. Dave said the idea of the regeneration GP services was a good idea in practice but questioned the length of time it would actually take. Juliet highlighted the LIFT organisation (partly funded by the NHS) as a good example of pooling together services and said she realised building costs and running costs involved but believes commitments to improving premises in the future can be made.

Gaile questioned some GPs might not want to move from premises without compensation. Juliet said support would be given to GPs in order to sell their practices.

The group thanked Juliet for her time.

NB: Juliet and Robert left the meeting at this point.

9) LINK work programme (papers 7 and 8)

Ruth briefly talked through the paper providing an update on working groups. The Young People's group have asked the Steering Group to approve their plans and they would also like to produce a questionnaire with a prize draw value of up to £150 worth of goods. The plans were agreed.

Gaile reported back on the draft responses to the national car parking consultation paper by the Hospital Services Working Group. Julia said the administration to record the responses given would not be feasible. Dave agreed and said it should have been kept minimal. Gaile said the only options for responding were the tick boxes given and if they were left blank, LINK's response may not be registered. Ruth mentioned there was usually somewhere to write to and would check to see if this would be an alternative.

Esther asked what mechanisms LINK had in place for feeding back to statutory organisations about its work plans. Terry said the LINK would definitely be feeding back as it wanted to have influence. Ruth would include this in the planning of each of the working groups. Julia also mentioned she would like to be kept informed of what the LINK is doing within its work plan.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to inform Jenny Walls (Project Officer) of the outcome for the Young People's groups plans• Ruth to find out if there is somewhere for the LINK to write to regarding it's responses to the car parking consultations

10) Feedback and updates

Invites to events:

- Ruth informed the group about the 'Consult and Inform' event and said there were only 2 places available and at the moment LINK have

requested 3 places. Dave said he was unable to attend the event which resolved the issue

- Darren Jones (Vice Chair of PCT/Coventry NHS) would like to meet with the Chair of the LINK Steering Group. It was agreed this was to be considered after the election of the Chair
- Active LINK Participant's event on Tuesday 2nd March in Birmingham, venue TBC. Open for 2 volunteers. Nobody was available to attend, Ruth said she would ask George if he was available to attend

Scrutiny Board 4:

Dave fed back from the last meeting where the Chief Executives from NHS Coventry and all the trusts had attended to answer questions.

Measuring Success workshop:

Tom attended the event and fed back briefly. Tom stressed the need to demonstrate success and said he had concerns that the public funding climate would lead to the end of LINKs if they are not seen as of value.

ACTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ruth to ask George if he is able to attend the LINKs Active Participants event on 2nd March

11)Any Other Business

Nothing to report

12)Items for the agenda of next meeting:

- More time on the LINK work plan/Working Groups
- Publicity and Marketing

Date and time of next meeting: 3rd March 2010 at 10am – 12.30pm, Eadon Room – Coventry Central Hall

NB: The National LINK publicity campaign was also circulated at the meeting for members to read.