

Board Meeting in Public

Date:	Tuesday 21 st January 2020	Location:	The Gallery, Christ Church, Jubilee Square, Woking.	Time:	2pm – 3.30pm
Present: Peter Gordon (PG as Chair), Richard Davy (RD), Don McIntosh (DMc), Andrea Lecky (AL), Maria Millwood (MM), John Bateson (JB), Jason Davies (JD), Deborah Mechaneck (DM), Laurence Oates (LO), Lynne Omar (LOmar)					
Apologies: Tacye Connolly (TC)					
Other HWSY Attendees: Kate Scribbins (KS), Lisa Sian (LS), Tessa Weaver (TW), Natalie Markall (NM)					

Agenda Item	Discussed/Action	Who	By When
1. Welcome and apologies	PG welcomed everyone and noted the apologies.		
2. Declarations of interest	PG advised that although his declarations have not changed there has been an update in the company name for one of the companies on his declarations which needs to be amended. Action: LS to update the declarations of interest accordingly.	LS	21.04.20
3. Questions from the Public (previously tabled)	No previously tabled questions had been received from the public this quarter.		
4. Approval of the previous minutes October 2019)	The minutes of the October 2019 meeting in Public were approved.		
5. Q3 CEO Report & Q3 Activity and Outcomes report	<p><u>CEO report</u></p> <p>KS gave an overview of the highlights of the Q3 CEO report.</p> <p>There has been growth in the number of volunteers and the groups which was reflected in the activity report showing activity for each of the local area groups. The increased activity has particularly been driven by the community influencers who have been attending stakeholder reference groups and committees over the quarter.</p> <p>The KPIs are on track for the majority of areas. The number of experiences shared was down in Q3 due to phasing of the WWH meetings. We expect this to rebalance in Q4 when the meetings are taking place. For the new business KPI we are pleased to report that we have exceeded the £60,000 target for turnover in Q3.</p> <p>In Q4 we hope to boost the Helpdesk and Advocacy traffic through the first dedicated advertising campaign on Eagle radio, which will run from 1st February for 2 weeks.</p> <p><u>Q3 Activity & Outcomes Report</u></p> <p>LS gave an update on the Q3 report.</p> <p>DM asked how volunteer recruitment is going and expressed the need for additional volunteers in East Surrey. LS confirmed that we plan to</p>		

	<p>run a dedicated advertising campaign to recruit volunteers in East Surrey and North West Surrey to try and expand those groups.</p> <p>LO raised concerns about the new target of recruiting 5 volunteers per quarter from April. LS explained that Zoe will be looking for new ways and areas to recruit to adapt to the new target.</p> <p>JB fed back that the Q3 report is great, but he is unclear who the target audience for it is. Not all of the report is interesting to all of the people who will read it. LS explained that it is a more general report, designed to work for a wide audience and so a reader can select through to what interests them. Whilst it's hard to get a document that suits every audience, we've tried to produce it in a way that is appealing to all including the public.</p> <p>Action: LS to work with Laihan to research user feedback on the quarterly report, to see what areas are of most interest to people and look at how that would affect the order of the report. For any changes to be made for Q1 2020/21.</p> <p>KS updated the Board on the fact the consultation is now live for Epsom St Helier reconfiguration. We will be part of the Consultation Oversight Group which will meet regularly to look at how the consultation is going. We will put the IHT survey onto our own website to then take feedback to commissioners.</p> <p>JB asked whether we are happy with the role of being at the top table, when we have little say and it may look like we are endorsing the decisions? KS explained we were put onto the top table at the last minute, which was concerning. However, we have discussed the HW position with David Williams who chairs the SRG and he does not see any concerns. We need to take our time to make sure we're positioned in the right way and ensure people know why we are there.</p> <p>KS asked for any feedback on the SCC budget setting exercise, as the budget is being scrutinised tomorrow at the HOSC which is an opportunity to make comments, and requested that feedback be given to KS before the meeting. MM said the key thing was to question how they are making sure the most vulnerable are not left behind and that the impact assessments are in place.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>21.07.20</p>
<p>6. Thematic Priority Update</p>	<p>TW gave an overview of the projects.</p> <p>Care at home: our report received great feedback from SCC detailing how they plan to respond to our recommendations.</p> <p>Safeguarding project: this received written feedback from the Safeguarding Adults Board and it will be taken into front line teams within the next month. They want to do more work with us in the future.</p> <p>Hospital discharge: there is an in-house project using our</p>		

	<p>existing data. TW will be looking into our database to see what we're already hearing about hospital discharge. TW will be analyzing over 150 experiences to find the key issues that are arising.</p> <p>Mental health: we are still looking for a valuable and worthwhile project, and are committed to bringing something fresh. We aim to ensure we are influential and bringing new information to the system. PG asked how close we are to finalising a project. TW said hopefully the first quarter of next year, on the basis that within the next 4 weeks we will make a decision on what will be valuable if we don't get answers from the system.</p> <p>AL asked about self-harming in children. Do we hear any activity in this area as it is a big problem? TW confirmed there was a workstream started around self-harming/suicide in schools but it disappeared as couldn't get enough people to attend the meetings to make it happen. The issue is generally handled within the school system.</p> <p>Action: LS to circulate the presentation TW handed out in the meeting</p> <p>TW requested that any ideas the Board may have about a Mental Health project be sent to her.</p>	LS	ASAP
<p>7. Review of Board Champion Role</p>	<p>KS opened with the questions regarding the Board Champion role;</p> <p><i>Why isn't it working? Is the concept flawed or have we not implemented it well? Do we need to move away from this? What is the barrier to making it work?</i></p> <p>After some discussion, there was general agreement on the following reasons why the Board Champion role isn't working;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time pressures /juggling with other commitments - Not clear enough briefing / enough structure as to what is expected of the Board Champion - Not clear enough deliverables/targets set to motivate - Is outside the expertise of some Board members - Felt not enough time to be 'experts' in the field - Not close enough links with the intel in the team - Too many areas to cover / too broad a scope - Not all Board Champions had the introductory briefing from MP - How best to marry up the role at a national vs a local level <p>KS thanked the board for its honesty and appreciated it has been challenging. She extended apologies that the support hasn't been there from the staff team. KS' thoughts were about potentially some areas having more focus than others in areas that may not necessarily have a voice/representation. In KS' mind, it should be about keeping an eye on what's in the papers, on the news, in the media and</p>		

	<p>keeping an eye on background information i.e. identifying where are the gaps.</p> <p>PG asked whether we need an expert list/panel who are in these areas whom we can invite to meetings and call upon As we shouldn't be duplicating what is out there already. RD added that there are lots of experts out there but there are some gaps – how do we fill those gaps? KS will take this away to reflect and decide next steps.</p> <p>Action: KS to take away the feedback on the Board Champion role and reflect on next steps</p>	KS	Ongoing
8. Action Log	<p>All green actions were approved to be removed.</p> <p>The amber action relating to building social care experiences into the horizon scanning to be removed from the log. The amber action relating to KS looking at what needs to be de-prioritised to look at SCC and social care packages can also be dropped.</p> <p>PG has had contact with Simon White on another matter and he was happy to attend a meeting with Board. PG to go direct to him to arrange the meeting – post April.</p> <p>Action: LS to update the action relating to Simon White.</p>	LS	21.04.20
9. Public questions not already dealt with	No questions.		
10. Any other business	<p>HW England suggested local Healthwatch contact their local MPs to introduce ourselves and explain who we are, what we do. KS asked whether the Board thought that a good idea/ The Board to agree a letter and open invitation to have a meeting if they wish.</p> <p>LO wanted to pre-empt the AGM and extend gratitude and thank you to Peter for contributions and direction to the Board as Chair. PG said “Thank you, it has been a pleasure” – he is proud of what we have created.</p>		
13. Date of next meeting	The next meeting in PUBLIC will take place 2-4pm, Tuesday 21st April 2020, Anderson Room, Horley Baptist Church, 289 Court Lodge Road, RH6 8RG;		

These minutes will be approved by the Healthwatch Board at the next Board meeting to ensure any Actions are progressed. Any questions or queries raised by members of the public at the next Board meeting in public will be welcomed and considered.

Minutes approved by: (please print)	
Signature:	
Date:	