

Independent Strategic Advisory Body Meeting
 Wednesday 5th October 2016 3.00pm-5.00pm
 Brough Business Centre, Brough, HU15 1EN

Minutes

Advisory Body Members: Sally Burns (SB), Julia Pollock (JP), Linsay Cunningham (LC), and Jenny Jenkinson (JJ).

In attendance: Michelle Harvey (minutes)

No.	Agenda Item/Subject	Action by
1.	<p><i>Welcome and Introductions</i></p> <p>No members of the public were present.</p>	
2.	<p><i>Election of a Chair</i></p> <p>Julia Pollock was elected as Chair for this meeting.</p>	
3.	<p><i>Apologies for absence</i></p> <p>Apologies were received from Carol Dyas.</p>	
4.	<p><i>Minutes of the last meeting</i></p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true record.</p> <p><i>i. Matters Arising/Action Log</i></p> <p>A copy of the response from NLaG was circulated to those members present. LC reported that now Matt Kay is carrying out a dual role between HWERY and HWNL we are being kept ‘in the loop’ and there is increased triangulation of work between the two groups.</p> <p>The Chair queried how happy HWERY was with the response received from NLaG. LC reported that although NLaG were more willing to engage, their response was more of an account of how they could improve as opposed to what improvements had actually been made or actually put in place. However a positive step forward was the fact that NLaG were now more willing to engage. A request was put forward from the Chair to be updated on progress at the next meeting.</p> <p>Action Point: LC to update ISAB on progress with NLAG at next meeting.</p> <p>LC reported that there was another East Riding Safeguarding Adults Board meeting coming up and that similar issues surrounding feedback mechanisms raised by HWERY had been raised by other groups, although no progress had yet been made LC would continue to work on.</p>	LC

5.	<p>Public Questions (submitted in advance)</p> <p>There were no questions submitted from the public.</p>	
6.	<p>Report from Partners</p> <p>i) HWE update</p> <p>SB had attended the last HWE meeting where there had been representatives from Healthwatch East Riding of Yorkshire, Cumbria, Rochdale and Blackburn. SB reported that the future of funding was discussed and information shared around the allocation of funding. In relation to STPs, the Healthwatch England Chair re-iterated the role of Healthwatch to be independent. Groups were cautioned and reminded to have a clear purpose when becoming involved in the STP process as this is not the core role of Healthwatch. Areas of best practice were highlighted, with one area of discussion being the securing of additional funding; however it was noted that if this was an avenue to be explored the project to be funded must have clear and concise outcomes to justify the benefits of such funding.</p> <p>SB also reported that she had discovered Healthwatch Cumbria to be of similar size to that of HWERY in terms of geographical area, sparsity and population etc. and that due to the significant number of similarities, this may be a Healthwatch group that there could be benefits in making links with.</p> <p>SB stated she considered the meeting well worth attending and that this should be noted for attendance at future meetings; however JP noted that HWE did not often give sufficient notice of meetings, which could make it difficult for members to attend.</p> <p>Action: LC to contact HWE requesting for more notice to be given for forthcoming meetings.</p> <p>ii) STP update</p> <p>LC reported that 5 out of the 6 local Healthwatch in the HCV STP area had attended a meeting to coordinate strategy regarding engagement with the STP. LC also brought the NHS England Engaging Local People document to the attention of the board, the document and can be found at:</p> <p>https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/engag-local-people-stps.pdf</p> <p>LC stated that of all the groups, the mental health stream had been the most successful in terms of engaging with local Healthwatch, however in future HWERY should focus on engagement rather than having a focus on attending meetings as this had proved not to be the most productive use of time. HWERY has existing relationships with all three providers and therefore was continuing to lead on the STP for the whole footprint.</p>	LC

7. **Update on Strategic Plan and current delivery:**

i) To receive an update on current delivery

LC had provided a new format performance report which was welcomed by the Advisory Body. Engagement was reported as high over the summer months in-particular, however it was noted that this was much easier over the summer and suggestions were raised as to how to try and maintain this momentum over the winter. LC informed the meeting that HWERY were to have a presence at the eight CCG public drop-ins and investigations had been made into having a presence in some supermarkets/similar venues, however this could only be to promote and publicise the work of Healthwatch as many organisations/businesses had a strict policy on not allowing the collection of data from members of the public.

The Advisory Body discussed the challenges of finding suitable venues within HWERY region as most large shopping centres and venues were actually based outside of our region, with residents choosing to travel outside of the area to these larger centres. A number of suggestions for activities and venues were put forward by The ISAB on how to engage with the public over the winter months and maintain as higher level of engagement as practically possible. LC suggested that the purchase of a designated Healthwatch Gazebo might be a worthwhile investment for the future.

LC reported that the Social Care and Homecare reports are complete and ready for publishing and that follow-up visits were soon to be arranged for those Enter & View visits that had been carried out earlier in the year at residential care settings. The MIU report was also complete and ready for approval. No major recommendations had been made following the MIU report but it was hoped that information gathered would feed into the wider consultation process over closures etc.

JP expressed her disappointment at the lack of response over the Mental Health Report. LC clarified the process followed in publishing a report should no response be received. A suggestion was put forward that if no response is received, then this should be stated on the report.

Action Point: LC to follow up a response from the Mental Health Report.

Another key point highlighted was that the information booth at Brough was finally off the ground and trained volunteers were now regularly in attendance to support the use of the booth by members of the public. A press release had been made but HWERY are not aware if this had been picked up on by the wider press.

LC informed the meeting that a recent work placement student had carried out work surrounding the subject of self-harm in children and young people. No report had been produced, however there had been some useful engagement and case studies carried out by the student.

SB queried how the targets were presented as part of the new format performance report, as the difference between annual and quarterly could be perceived as slightly confusing. This was the only query relating to the report

LC

	<p>as otherwise it was perceived by The Advisory Body as very user friendly.</p> <p>Action: LC to make clear which is target is the annual target on future performance reports.</p> <p><i>ii. To approve revised annual workplan for 2016/17</i> The revised annual workplan for 2016/17 was received by the board. It was noted that there had been some slippage; however it was good for these to be noted. Those noted had been largely unavoidable and the HWERY team were working reactively to address certain areas as they came up.</p> <p>LC stated that the carer’s project had been brought forward to try and avoid duplication of work carried out by the Carers Advisory Group, but this had not worked quite as well as expected. HWERY did not want to carry out further community engagement if CAG had already fulfilled this role, therefore duplicating similar work. JJ suggested a focus on young carers as being a possible option which would avoid duplication, but still add value to the project.</p> <p>The revised annual workplan was approved.</p>	LC
8.	<p>Governance Issues</p> <p><i>i) To sign information sharing agreement with HWE</i> It was agreed that LC would sign the agreement on behalf of ISAB.</p> <p><i>ii) To approve the revised Hard to Reach Strategy</i> The Advisory Body were made aware that the main change to the document was the omission of the list of groups previously included on page 15. The decision not to include the list was made due to the fact that changes occur too frequently for the list to remain accurate. JJ brought the ‘Men in Sheds’ project to the attention of the Board which raised discussion around working age men being a potential group to work with. LC explained there are plans in place for this to be explored in the post-Christmas period and ideas of how to engage with this group are being explored.</p> <p>The revised Strategy was approved.</p> <p><i>iii) To approve revised Research Ethics review process</i> JP highlighted the importance of the Research Ethics Review Process. LC highlighted the fact that it was not the intention for this process to limit the ability to carry out specific projects, but to raise important questions and understand the impact that each project had on its subject. JP suggested that the right to withdraw should be included, which was agreed. SB requested that the document be shared with HWE as an example of best practice. LC would out forward a suggestion for it to go into the HWE Toolkit.</p> <p>Action: LC to add a right to withdraw statement into the Research Ethics review process and share with HWE for inclusion in the HWE toolkit.</p> <p>JP requested that when documents are sent out to members for consideration</p>	LC

	<p>that a deadline for action/reaction is added to assist members in responding in a timely manner. JJ suggested that the date should be added to the subject header to assist in this process. It was also added ISAB members would be happy to receive reminders if documents have not been responded to within the appropriate time-frame.</p> <p>Action Point: A deadline date is included in subject header for time-sensitive correspondence with ISAB members and reminders sent as necessary.</p>	<p>HWERY Team</p>
9.	<p>AOB</p> <p>No other business was identified.</p>	
10	<p><i>Date & time of future meetings</i></p> <p>Wednesday 11th January 2017, 2.00 - 4.00pm. Meeting to be held in Beverley (venue to be confirmed).</p> <p>LC would be interested in sourcing data that demonstrates whether web-casting public meetings has a positive effect upon improving public engagement, as opposed to physically moving the venues of meetings to increase accessibility to the wider public. A list of provisional dates for future meetings is to be compiled and shared with members.</p> <p>Action: LC to provide a list of provisional dates for future meetings to ISAB members prior to next meeting.</p>	<p>LC</p>