



County Board

Tuesday 3rd March 2009

2.00pm – 4.30pm

Annex Room, Octagon Building,
Staffordshire University

MINUTES

This meeting was held in public and was attended by the following:

Board Members

Robert Darby (South Staffordshire District Committee) - Chair
Michael Creek (Stafford District Committee) – Vice Chair
Hazel Nutt (Newcastle-under-Lyme District Committee)
Anne Glen (Newcastle-under-Lyme District Committee – on behalf of Mike Reynolds)
Richard Wingrove (Lichfield District Committee)
David Kenton (Lichfield District Committee – on behalf of Michael Wall)
John Titlow (East Staffordshire District Committee)
Cyril Burton (East Staffordshire District Committee)
Dennis Firmstone (Cannock District Committee)

Apologies:

Carl Bennett (Cannock District Committee)
Jo Chapman (Stafford District Committee)
Michael Wall (Lichfield District Committee)

Members Present (in the public gallery)

Frank James (Stafford District Committee)
Robin Bastin (Stafford District Committee)
Anthea Bourne (Newcastle-under-Lyme District Committee)

Host Staff Present

Linda Seru (Host Director Staffordshire LINK)
Sue Baknak (Host Co-ordinator Staffordshire LINK)

Guest

Chris Russell (Consultant, Centre for Public Scrutiny)

<p>2. Finance and LINK budget</p>	<p>LS distributed a breakdown of the LINK budget together with a simple spreadsheet of spend to date (where figures are available). LS confirmed that the Finance and Audit Sub-group had received a more detailed breakdown. LS explained that the funding is a Local Area grant from the DoH and is not ringfenced. LA can take up to 15% for contract management – SCC currently taken 11%. LS went through the running costs budget, spend to date and underspend. The University claim the money back from LA and isn't received in a total grant sum. Budget managed in accordance with strict codes of conduct, standing orders and audit regulations of the University. Finance and Audit have asked to the meet the University Auditors. The year-end financial statement of the LINK must be incorporated into its annual report which is submitted to the Secretary of State. AG queried the discrepancy between the advertising budget and the very low training budget. LS explained that the budget was a guesstimate as there was no history to work with when the budget was profiled by the University but the budget can be reprofiled.</p> <p>DK asked if the accounts would be in a proper format rather than a simple statement. LS confirmed they would. DK asked if an independent external auditor could be appointed eg. KPMG. Following discussion it was agreed that the Finance and Audit sub-group would consider this at their next meeting and report back to the Board for a decision at its next meeting. LS advised that the sub-group had suggested the creation of a general purposes and finance group to deal with these issues. No decision made but deferred to AOB.</p>	<p>Host to arrange.</p> <p>Agenda item for next Finance and Audit Sub-group meeting.</p>
<p>3. Feedback from Sub-Groups</p>	<p>LS distributed Feedback reports where available. Votes were taken by the Board to accept the reports – all accepted.</p> <p>3.1 Finance and Audit Sub-Group MC – Minutes and draft Terms of Reference sent out, decision needs to be made to accept. Recruitment of additional staff needs to happen quickly and a group needs to be set-up to take this one. Finance and Audit sub-group don't think it is their remit.</p> <p>3.2 Enter and View Sub-Group MC – Minutes and draft Terms of Reference sent out, decision needs to be made to accept. Minutes accepted – 1 abstention.</p>	

	<p>3.3 Governance and Membership Sub-Group CBurton – A lot of work don't but a lot more needs to be done. Minutes and ToRs distributed. Membership is a matter of urgency and governance will be progressed. DF advised he would like to join the Governance Sub-Group.</p> <p>3.3.1 MC raised points in the Minutes which need a Board decision today.</p> <p>DF is currently on 3 District Committees. DF advised that if he stood down from Lichfield they would not have a quorum as currently have 4 elected Members. DF asked the Board to bear this in mind when voting. CB asked the Board to work down the list of membership issues and vote accordingly. MC advised Members should be on 1 District Committee with 1 vote but Members could attend other DC meetings. RW agreed. DF did not agree as Committees not fully subscribed at this stage JT agreed.</p> <p>3.3.2 DK expressed the need for a membership recruitment drive. Vote taken 3 for, 4 against and 2 abstained. JT proposed this issue be revisited after the elections – DF agreed.</p> <p>3.3.3 Eligibility to stand. Board discussed residency. Cross-border discretion essential; statement of why you want to be a member of that particular District Committee required on nomination form; need to consider implication for expenses if out of area; DK emphasised local representation with local expertise. RD – host to get contact details. LS advised that LINK cannot restrict representation on residency and to be cautious around appropriate wording. Board agreed statement to demonstrate association with the area to be included on the nomination form.</p> <p>3.4 Work Planning Sub-Group JT – stated little discussion about work planning and majority of time spent on Host capacity issues in order to adequately support the LINK – needs urgent addressing.</p> <p>MC – Stafford workplan produced and submitted to work planning sub-group for approval but no decision made. JT advised that it has not been presented in</p>	<p>Host noted.</p> <p>Governance to be agreed after elections.</p> <p>Host to produce form.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>that way and sub-group could not look at 1 DC in isolation. RW commended Stafford for this work and had recommended other DCs follow the same format. FJ commented from the floor that LINK needs quick wins – add on to government initiatives like stroke. JT – LINK needs to be doing things/publicity/get our act together. DF – stroke unit being set up in east locality; DF/CBennett are representing LINK on advisory group – tenders currently being received for consideration.</p> <p>LS advised that priorities for each DC ideally need to be captured as part of the election process which can then be fed into the sub-groups for prioritisation and recommended which would then be put forward to the Board for approval. JT advised that the Board should not vote on whether to approve the Stafford workplan priorities because other DCs had not had the same consideration. Each DC should submit its priorities asap to the Work Planning sub-group as outlined so its recommendations can be put forward at the next Board meeting for approval. RD asked for a vote – majority agreed, vote carried.</p> <p>3.5 Communication Sub-Group RW – need a lot more detail/mechanisms. A lot of consideration about elections. Vote taken to approve the Minutes of the sub-group – Minutes approved.</p>	<p>DCs to submit workplan priorities to work planning sub-group as soon as possible.</p>
<p>4. Feedback from District Committees</p>	<p>4.1 Newcastle-under-Lyme – HN. 3 issues put forward from DC in minutes of their last meeting including A&E services. RD asked if contact had been made with the hospital for someone to come and talk to the DC – HN advised no. Anthea Bourne and Anne Glen had agreed that they would like to stand as Chair and Vice Chair at the AGM/elections. MR standing down as Chair unwell and HN standing down as Vice Chair as too much of a commitment. HN will continue as an elected member of the DC.</p> <p>4.2 Staffordshire Moorlands. HN suggested that they merge with N-u-L. LS advised that BM had resigned. Host had contacted 7/8 people to arrange a meeting to discuss LINK and getting involved. 3 people attended but none could commit the time. LS advised there needs to be lots more effort for recruitment/outreach work. AG advised there needs to be a change of culture. RD urged that we get the younger people involved.</p>	

- 4.3 Stafford** – MC talked to district OSC officer; issued CRB check forms to new members; promoted forthcoming AGM/election; workplan priorities produced. MC thought the Board would be making a decision today about the Stafford priorities as already gone to sub-group. LS advised that a mechanism has to be agreed for taking the priorities forward. MC understood that was to be done by work planning sub-group. LS went through process of where we are/got here with sub-groups. RW advised there needs to be a balance of local/county-wide issues. RW asked MC what issues do Stafford want to get on with. MC – 4 main issues which could be county-wide as have a bearing on LINK members for the whole of Staffordshire for health and social care priorities eg. dementia care is subsidiary to the acute illness in the hospital and this could be looked at across all 8 districts. It is important that Stafford get on with those 4 priorities and need a decision from the Board as to what happens next. CB – goes to the work planning sub-group. FJ commented from the floor that these are priority issues – working with a lot of families – foreclosing care homes. The Board approved that the priorities from Stafford and N-u-L go to the work planning sub-group and other DCs should do the same so that all priorities can be considered and a proposal put forward at the next Board meeting for a decision.
- 4.4 East Staffordshire** – JT advised DC had a positive meeting with responses to questions having been provided by the Host. DC identified wheelchair services as a priority. RD asked if DC had contacted local hospital. CB advised yes and Janet Cort attending their next meeting. MC advised it's not the hospital but the PCT. LS advised that the Host can help with this.
- 4.5 Cannock Chase** – DF responded on behalf of CBennett who could not attend the meeting. DC representing LINK on various groups; Cannock Health Centre, Stroke Unit; PCT prioritisation panels; dementia care at Burton/Derby hospitals. CB will feedback next time. AGM arranged and hoping to get some publicity for it.

	<p>4.6 Lichfield – RW advised DC haven't met. RW attending the district OSC panel. Each PCT required to set up a 'super clinic' SSPCT – health and wellbeing centre based in Lichfield/Burntwood area and currently considering planning permissions, local plans and sites. DK asked if the Board thinks there is a conflict of interest for members when attending other groups eg. Age Concern, CSCI, district care panels. RW advised the legislation states the LINK should not take over other group's work ie. no duplication but good to share information to avoid confusion/conflict. LINK could adopt issues if approved. DK raised the issue of support for the DCs.</p> <p>CB gave apologies as had to leave the meeting.</p> <p>4.7 Tamworth/South Staffs – LS advised host focusing on recruitment for these areas.</p> <p>4.8 FJ commented from the floor that there is an issue of admin support from the host. LS advised that the Board has to make a decision on what it wants from the host/budget in respect of support. LS/SB set out options which had previously been presented to the Board but no decision made. FJ suggested a local person be found for each DC who are then paid an honorarium. AG stated that it is not too late to start the whole thing again with a new structure. LS asked if the Board wanted the host to put a proposal together. AG – "why is the issue of a budget allocated to the DCs not agreed? RD handed the meeting over to MC as Vice Chair and advised he was leaving the meeting and the LINK. MC proposed that the host facilitate a minute taker for each of the DCs on the basis of an honorarium. RW seconded. DF asked LS to find out the going rate.</p>	<p>Host to produce staffing proposal for Board approval.</p>
<p>5. Feedback reports on LINK representation</p>	<p>Feedback reports were received from RW and CBennett and circulated to the Board.</p>	
<p>6. Elections process and DAGMs</p>	<p>6.1 DF gave feedback from CBennett that he refused to complete a profile as if people don't know him by now! LS advised that it is important that people with the right skills are elected so need to complete the details to inform the voting process. LS advised that the</p>	

	<p>draft election rules need to be approved by the Board.</p> <p>6.2 MC asked for decisions on the following: Eligibility to vote – yes all aged 14 or over Eligibility to stand – residency not a condition but need to demonstrate a reasonable connection to the area</p> <p>6.3 Nomination process – agreed nominations could be received on the day. Nominations would be received and voted on in absentia.</p> <p>6.4 Voting process – posted votes will not be requested or accepted. Agreed voting process.</p> <p>6.5 LS asked for clarification on whether all 124 seats were up for election or just the vacant seats and co-opted seats. MC asked for a Board decision – Board agreed those who were elected in September/October 2008 would remain until 2010 as previously agreed. Members who had been co-opted subsequently would have to stand for formal election.</p> <p>6.6 LS distributed copy draft press release and asked for any comments within 2 days. LS repeated host's request for Members to recommend publications for press advertising bearing in mind they are costly. LS distributed copies of election poster and flyer – Board approved them.</p>	
<p>7. Cross-boundary LINKs working</p>	<p>SB gave update of meeting with Derbyshire LINK and opportunities for collaboration. SB advised host had received a request from Stoke LINK for two representatives of Staffordshire LINK (1 each from Staffs Moorlands and N-u-L DCs) to sit on their Management Board in a non-voting capacity. Board agreed in principle but would revisit this issue after the elections. LS advised that clarity is needed on terms of representation. MC advised LINK also needs to engage with Shropshire LINK in the future – DCs need to do this.</p>	<p>Board to decide on representation with Stoke LINK after elections.</p>
<p>8. Away Day/Training Session.</p>	<p>8.1 LS introduced Chris Russell. CR recognised the motivation/frustration of the Board. How can the training session be helpful and asked what would be useful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DK – open forum for issues that have 	

	<p>commonality with allotted time for each delegate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AG – a hierarchical chart of who does what to help educate members. • RW – “provision of provision, commissioning and scrutiny of care services” should be engraved on our soles – this is what we are supposed to be doing. • HN – members not ‘genned up’ enough about health and social care. • MC – 3 items on Away Day agenda. What LINK’s role is, what being a LINK member is – members need to go away feeling they know the answer. • RW – LINK doesn’t have to do it all – providers have a statutory duty; voluntary/community organisations. LINK needs organisation development. • LS – urged the LINK to consider how the culture of the organisation is as important as the structure. Use existing networks and don’t reinvent the wheel. <p>8.2 AG distributed SSCWP membership forms and details of an event on 11 March 2009. AG is attending and happy to represent the LINK and feedback. LS advised that the enter and view sub-group should attend.</p>	
9. Schedule of dates	AGM date – letter to go out to members with minutes of Board meeting enclosing a matrix of dates.	Host to write out to Board members with matrix of suggested dates.
10. AGM and Annual Report	Host to support the Board in production of the report. DAGMs need to produce a report for inclusion in overall report. Report needs to be written by 3 rd week of April. LS suggested a ‘cabinet’ or small group of members to work on the report and to progress decisions quickly. RW agreed as have to act quickly. AG disagreed as it added another layer of democracy and sounded like a ‘closed shop’ MC advised that the Board clearly isn’t working as it should and is not acting strategically. Small group or cabinet would progress issues more quickly and report back to the Board for approval. AG advised she had misunderstood and would agree if the group was a sub-group/committee and answerable to the Board. MC – Board needs to receive information without the need for 4 hours discussion before reaching a decision.	MC and Host to progress sub-group or ‘cabinet’ meeting as a matter of urgency.

	LS asked for a decision on a schedule of meetings. MC advised that the DCs should set up a schedule of meetings for the 12 month period up to and including the DAGM in 2010 and sub-groups should set dates for the same period.	DCs and sub-groups to set 12 month schedule of meeting dates.
11. AOB	LS distributed copies of minutes from meeting with Helen Moss for information. Meeting closed.	