

People's Board meeting
Notes of the Meeting held on Thursday 16 June 2016
Douglas Mill

Present

Adam Deacon, PB Member
David Goral, PB Member
Emma Stafford, PB Member
Huma Malik, PB Member
Humera Khan, PB Member
Karol Wyszynski, PB Member
Mark Edwards, PB Member
Mohammed Mahboob, PB Member
Rubina Burhan, PB Member
Stella Hall, PB Member
Wendy Parkin, PB Member

In attendance

Professor Mark Gamsu, Leeds University
Jenny Chatman- Leeds University
Jess Drinkwater, BD CCG Clinical lead for engagement
Sam Keighley, Independent PB Facilitator
Sasha Bhat, Head of engagement & experience, BD & BD CCG
Shaista Bashir, PB Support Officer, BD & BC CCG

Apologies

Abdul Ismail, People's Board (PB) Member
Gary Staniforth, PB Member
Mohammed Akhtar, PB Member
Sally Teasdale, PB Member
Sam Samociuk, PB Member
Shanaz Begum, PB Member

Meeting Notes

	Welcome & Introductions
	<p>Emma Stafford (ES) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself as the in-trim chair for the meeting. ES moved onto welcoming and introducing Professor Mark Gamsu (MG) and Jenny Chatman (JC) who were also in attendance from Leeds Beckett University - Institute of Health and Well-being.</p> <p>Both MG and JC introduced themselves and briefly shared the purpose of their visit and their current role in research. MG is a visiting professor at Leeds Beckett University focusing on the relationship between Citizenship, Inequality and Wellbeing.</p>

	<p>JC is supporting the work of professor MG and has been involved in the work of neighbourhoods and involving citizens on various projects.</p>
<p>2016/04</p>	<p>Evaluation – Leeds Beckett University</p>
	<p>The ‘Health Together’ research project is the practice arm of the Centre for Health Promotion Research (CHPR) within the Institute of Health and Well-Being at Leeds Beckett University. A core function is to support practice to work effectively with people to improve their health and well-being, building on evidence gathered through research and evaluation.</p> <p>Leeds Beckett University has a long standing reputation for formal research some of which includes, working with local health and care services and capturing the voice of citizens and involving citizens in research.</p> <p>Professor MG was pleased to have been asked by the two Clinical Commissioning Groups in Bradford to evaluate the work and capture the experiences of members on the Peoples Board. Some of the questions that the evaluation would seek to address include.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the PB and the problem it is trying to solve • How far the PB has made a difference/ been able to influence decision-making • How they will know if any added value has been achieved • Any challenges or barriers to the PB achieving its ambitions • What needs to happen if the PB is to be successful going forward – including what the CCGs need to do as well as the PB • The process of establishing the PB – e.g. are the ‘right’ people on the PB? Does it work in a way which enables members to have a voice? Does it meet often enough/too often? <p>In order to understand the above GM feels it would be helpful to sit in some meetings to gain a better understanding of the People’s Board and how the CCG engage with the PB.</p> <p>Professor MG also talked about key stakeholders they will be interviewing during the evaluation period and why it was important to do this. Some of the key stakeholders include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peoples Board Members - individually and collectively • Leadership in the CCGs - Chief Officers, Chairs • Local Authority • Engagement Leads • Peoples Board facilitator • Commissioning Leads who will be taking papers to PB. <p>Professor GM made clear that this was not in any way about monitoring the work of the People’s Board but purely to gain a better understanding ways in which the Peoples Board is functioning and the decision making process.</p> <p>He declared all discussions will stay anonymous and the findings will be presented to the People’s Board. They intend to conduct a second set of interviews in 4 to 6 months’ time where they will share their findings and produce a final report.</p>

MG asked the group if they had any questions at this point about their work and how they intend to get involved going forward?

ES raised a concern that the PB had now been in existence for over 6 months, so how will the evaluators work around this?. How will this affect the evaluation.

GM responded to ES, that in his experience it was much better to engage with the group at this point as they have already been meeting for a while now. Members will be better engaged and are likely to be much more involved in the discussions and the work of the People's Board.

SH shared her concerns that the PB does not exist and that they had been imposed on a group of people who are still in the process of forming themselves as a board. In other words the board does not exist formally. SH also mentioned when the board has an identity and has been established, it may then they are in position to work with the evaluators.

RB disagreed with SH that the PB didn't exist. RB instead felt that their role is not entirely clear but they do exist and have been working with the CCG on a number projects. RB agreed the PB still was finding its own way/path on how to work better but they are developing and evolving as time goes on.

WP still unsure about being able to self-govern as a board, this needs to be clarified before being evaluated? WP reiterates she wasn't informed about the evaluators coming.

ES asked the group how people felt about being interviewed. Most members said it was ok and they were happy with it.

ES further asked if anyone had any objections from being observed today. And again the majority were happy for the researchers to stay and observe.

Comments from the group made on the observation:

RB it will be interesting to see from independent researchers how we are working together.

AD we need to be evaluated, but as a group need to be absolutely clear what we are about?

MM wasn't entirely sure if he personally felt comfortable with the evaluation and if he was prepared for being interviewed

KW said to document the People's Board journey is important.

AS is happy for the observation to go ahead and sees it as a positive thing.

WP still feels they have been imposed upon but will give it go with the observation.

2016/07	The Ideas Wall/ Communication
	<p>Members were given a quick update on the Ideas wall and were asked what they thought of it so far?</p> <p>ES said a notification alert would be good to have added to the tool. This would alert people when a response has been received. Anthony Lawton (AL) has been made of this suggestion and is looking into it, for the group.</p> <p>RB said she had not used the ideas Wall and that was mainly because she doesn't feel very confident at using IT and programmes as such.</p> <p>RB asked those people not using the tool or unable to log on to be kept updated and the CCG make arrangements for people to be part of the conversation and discussions on the Idea Wall.</p> <p>Action: Shaista to look into this and feedback how we support members who are unable to access the Ideas Wall.</p> <p>Action: AL to feedback on response alert added to the tool</p>
2016/01	Chair/Terms Of Reference (TOR)/ Quoracy
	<p>Chair</p> <p>ES went into discussion around having a chair for the People's Board and how the group proposes that they select/elect a chair and if people wanted a vice chair.</p> <p>ME said a chair is someone who will be working with the CCG, if this is likely to be the case then they need more authority, to come into the building and be able to speak freely to the CCG and feedback/communicate information both ways.</p> <p>SH said the PB needs to be dynamic to get it going and working better together.</p> <p>RB it's important to understand the role of the chair. The role of the chair in RB view is setting the agenda, being clear on this before meetings, also being clear on what the CCG want the PB to do? This should could from the PB themselves.</p> <p>AD said it would be useful to have a chair as this helps formulate a structure</p> <p>DG said the chair will require support and should not be left alone to do everything.</p> <p>ES suggested to have a vote on electing a chair and vice chair and asked the group if they wanted a chair from City and Districts or if this didn't matter or concern members? The majority agreed that it didn't matter and were happy that there is only one chair from either of the CCGs.</p>

It was agreed by people in the room that the chair would stay in position until the end of March 2017 until the PB is reviewed again.

ME suggested that there should be some flexibility on chairing meetings if the chair is not in attendance at meetings. Anyone from the meeting who is in attendance on the day should be able to chair the meeting from either City or Districts. It shouldn't be as rigid as only the chair can chair a meeting.

ES suggested that members in the room self-nominate and if we have more than one person in line for either a chair or vice chair then there will be a vote for that position.

Self-nominee for the position of chair from amongst members in the room was Emma Stafford.

Self-nominee's for vice chair amongst members in the room was Adam Deacon, Mohammed Mahboob and Wendy Parkin.

As agreed a vote will be set up and sent by email to vote for a vice chair from amongst the self-nominees.

Action: Shaista to send all PB members a survey monkey link to vote for their vice chair. A two weeks closing date will be applied ensuring that people have had plenty of time to get votes in. The results will be shared at the next PB meeting in July 2016.

Terms of Reference (TOR)

Following on from discussions on electing a chair/vice chair, the TOR was discussed with the perception of finalising and agreeing the document at the meeting.

The wording was discussed in Claus 5.3, ES asked if everyone was happy with this? Or do we amend this slightly,

It was agreed that it should be amended to ***'in addition, CCG staff will be in attendance as required'***.

Action: Shaista to make this amendment to the final document.

All members agreed that the document was complete and could be signed off.

ME the PB needs to understand the Clinical Board better and to do this there needs to be some close working going on.

Quoracy

ES- moved the group into discussion of quoracy and what that number needs to be in any given meeting for decision's to be made and actions to be finalised.

It was agreed that the majority need to be in attendance so that is 50% plus 1 member, making it at least 10 members in a room to cast votes. The group further looked at the average number of attendees at past meetings, which was

	<p>on average 9 members. From which it was decided that the number agreed for the board to be quorate, 9 members would need to be present in any case for both decisions and voting to take place.</p>
<p>2016/08</p>	<p>Communication Streams/ Feedback from the Network Event</p>
	<p>ES – began a discussion on ways in which the PB communicates with the wider public on its work. The PB needs to look at ways of feeding back to people and the most appropriate ways of getting information out there. ES asked what this looks and ideas from the group.</p> <p>The feedback from the networking event last month at Carlisle Business Centre included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What exactly has the People’s Board been doing for the last 6 months? • Where is the communication for the Peoples Board? • The PB was hugely seen linked to the CCG and this came across strongly. <p>PB members who attended agreed all of the questions need addressing. Communicating the work of the PB was a priority and had to be organised going forward.</p> <p>KW suggested social media was a good way of getting information out and suggested setting up a twitter account. Action: Shaista to speak to Kamal in communications about this.</p> <p>ES said a personal email address would work well for people to email questions to the board. Action: Shaista to speak to Kamal in the communications team on setting this up.</p> <p>WP suggested the chair of the PB attends the CCG Joint development Board meetings and becomes a permanent member of this. This would be a good way of sharing information and issues the PB may have at board meetings.</p> <p>SHB in responses to WP question, aid it’s a two way dialogue and discussions with both City and Districts Clinical Board will need to be had around the possibility of a Peoples Board member to attend their meetings on a more regular basis. Action: Sasha to feedback to the group on this once clarified.</p> <p>ES further suggested producing a Newsletter or post cards that could be posted/ emailed out to key contacts.</p> <p>AD suggested getting some big organisations on board i.e. hospitals, councils to help promote the work of the PB work.</p> <p>WP the Ideas Wall was another useful way of getting information out to people.</p> <p>KW- preferred using Google docs for discussions outside of meetings. KW said was a very similar tool to the Ideas Walls but a much easier version to use.</p>

	<p>ES suggested we book a room at DM for some PB members to get together and look at how google doc works.</p> <p>Action: KW to email Shaista information on google docs which will be shared with all the members of the PB.</p> <p>ES asked the group if they had any burning issues that the group would like to discuss before closing the meeting.</p> <p>Overall members felt that the meeting was very productive; it was kept nicely to time and well chaired by Emma Stafford.</p>
--	--

2016/02	Update and feedback
----------------	----------------------------

	<p>SHB, JD and SK join the meeting at this point.</p> <p>SHB Liz Allen will be attending the meeting in July to talk about some of the recent CCG topics and programmes. It will be an information only session where Liz will share the latest developments around the Accountable Care System and what this means. SHB suggested the presentation is sent around to the PB for feedback on accessibility and for comments in time for the July meeting.</p> <p>ES mentioned there is a need to look at how the PB works with the CCG going forward and how information is fed back.</p> <p>SHB said the Grassroots data system will be discussed at the July meeting and how the PB uses key information and intelligence to feed into the grassroots database. This will be a key method for the People's Board to talk to the CCG and feed in important information.</p> <p>SK asked the group what people thought about the timings of meetings and if 2.5 hours was long enough to discuss everything or should there be additional meetings outside of the PB meetings.</p> <p>SHB suggested using the Ideas Wall to continue discussions outside of meetings.</p> <p>SHB shares feedback from Dr Carsten and Dr Gilkar on the QIPP session in May and how there was positive feedback received at the Quality Improvement Group. Both Dr Gilkar and Dr Carsten said the meeting with the PB was a positive step for them, they were able to get some real ideas from the session which has in return has given them confidence in decision making.</p> <p>SHB said AL will provide some formal feedback going forward on the Ideas wall.</p>
--	--

	Date and Time of next meeting
	<p>Date: Thursday 21st July 2016</p> <p>Time: 1pm- 3.30pm</p> <p>Venue: Cartwright Hall, Learning Room, North Park Road, BD9 4NR</p>

