

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

1<sup>st</sup> October 2018, 17:30 – 20:00. St Paul’s Hammersmith, Queen Caroline St, Hammersmith, W6 9PJ

<b>In attendance</b>	
<p><b>Trustees:</b>          Brian Dillon- Finance Committee and Treasurer HW CWL Board (BD)          Chris Doherty- Independent trustee (CD)          Christine Vigars- Chair, Healthwatch CWL Board          Helen Cooke- Healthwatch Westminster (HC)          Joanna Mark Richards- Healthwatch CWL Board (JMR) (Vice-Chair)          Tania Kerno- Healthwatch K&amp;C Local Committee (TK)</p> <p><b>HW CWL staff:</b>          Olivia Clymer- CEO, Healthwatch CWL (OC)          Carena Rogers- Programme Manager, Healthwatch CWL (CR)          Thomas Wood- Governance and Quality Officer, Healthwatch CWL (TW)          Flora Deshmukh- Communications Officer, Healthwatch CWL (FD) (pre-meeting presentation of Communications Strategy only)</p> <p><b>Note Taker:</b> TW</p>	
<b>Apologies for absence</b>	
<p>Keith Mallinson- Healthwatch H&amp;F Local Committee (KM)          Patrick McVeigh- Healthwatch H&amp;F Local Committee (PM)          Abdul Towolawi- Healthwatch K&amp;C Local Committee (AT)</p>	
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	
<p>None disclosed at the meeting.</p>	
<b>Pre-meeting agenda</b>	
<p><b>Communications Strategy:</b>          The meeting started with a presentation of the new HWCWL Communications Strategy to the board by Flora Deshmukh (Healthwatch CWL Communications Officer). The strategy was well received by the board. Key points from the discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The need for a crisis communication plan</li> <li>- The possibility about engaging with local media, particularly around high profile pieces of work such as Grenfell.</li> <li>- The importance of connecting this strategy with commissioner engagement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Annual General Meeting:</b>          Minutes recorded separately</p>	
<b>Minutes and Action Log</b>	

<p><b>Item 1. Minutes of meeting 23rd July 2018 for approval</b></p> <p>These were approved without comment</p> <p><b>Item 2. Matters arising and action log</b></p> <p><b>Action Log:</b></p> <p><i>Item 2 - Discuss dates with Patrick Ryan for the 'Thank You' dinner.</i> It was agreed to abandon this action due to logistical issues around Patrick's availability.</p> <p><i>Item 3 - Provide and update on GDPR for November Board</i> CV commented that the GDPR compliance process is onerous on members as it involves lots of box ticking. Could this be simplified?</p> <p><i>Item 4 - All Board minutes to be put on the website.</i> These need to be updated by TW</p> <p><i>Item 5 - All board members to send bio and photo</i> We have bios for most board members, but we are missing many photos. TW to chase up</p> <p><i>Item 6- Circulate engagement plans to the Board on how to spend the local budgets</i> OC to speak to Chris from Hestia</p> <p><i>Item 12- Brief the Board in October following the meeting with Graham Hawkes from Healthwatch Hillingdon regarding GDPR and DPO</i> Graham Hawkes is leaving HW Hillingdon in November. We need to consider HWCWL's GDPR accountability if the reciprocal DPO post with Hillingdon becomes vacant. The HW Hillingdon Board will need to approve the reciprocal DPO post in addition to HWCWL board approval.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Chase up board bios</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Upload most recently approved board minutes to HWCWL website</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Meeting with Graham Hawkes before the end of November</b></p>	<p>TW</p> <p>TW</p> <p>OC</p>
<p><b>Governance</b></p>	
<p><b>Item 3. Local Committee elections and induction programme</b></p> <p>We are delegating significant responsibilities to the Local Committees. Because we are delegating our own responsibilities, we are responsible for the outputs and outcomes of the Local Committees. However, Local Committees often don't appreciate how important their delegated powers are and do not know how to use them effectively.</p>	

We need to develop a better induction programme for Local Committees in order to help them better understand their roles, responsibilities and powers. This would help with scenario planning if there are any problems with the contract. CR and TW are meeting on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> October to discuss a programme of work around this. CR suggested a two-stage induction programme whereby trustees and committee members (from all three committees) initially go through the same programme in order to meet each other and learn how to work together. The committee members then attend workshops in their own individual boroughs.

HC asked about the upcoming Local Committee Elections. OC stated that whilst we had a good response from members, we did not have enough applicants to trigger an election and so all applicants are able to join the committees by default. The new committee members are therefore likely to need a robust induction programme in order to assist them in their new role, and will sign a code of conduct. With the progress made on Local Committee OC noted that the provision and role of authorised reps would be looked into this.

**ACTION: CR and TW to work on committee induction programme**

**ACTION: OC to look into specification of authorised rep role**

**Item 4. Board development session, feedback from 12<sup>th</sup> September session**

CV fed back her experiences of the board development session. The attendees were split into two groups. CV's group looked at accountability, which was useful in informing her thinking on Local Committees.

**Item 5. Feedback on Annual Meeting**

53 attendees registered on Eventbrite but did not attend on the day. CV asked whether we could send a follow up email to the non-attendees. OC stated that September is typically a busy time of year as many other organisations hold their annual meeting this month and suggested that we hold the meeting earlier in the year in July. JMR suggested holding the meeting in June as people start to go on holiday in July, but OC pointed out that this would not be compatible with Healthwatch England's report timing schedule. HC suggested emailing all registered attendees (those who attended and those who did not) to ask them which month(s) would work best.

JMR spoke to Monsur Khan Commissioner for Healthwatch at RBKC at the conference. He was very impressed with the event. HC asked whether we could invite him to a board meeting, although if we were to do this it would need to have a clearly defined purpose. CV meets him regularly for contract monitoring meetings and suggested that another board member could also attend these meetings.

**ACTION: Email attendees and non-attendees of the annual meeting to ask whether another date (July) would be better for them**

**ACTION: CV to circulate dates of meetings with Monsur**

TW/OC

CV

**Item 6. Board forward plan**

<p>The board agreed to add volunteering to the board forward plan to be discussed in the November meeting in addition to the HR report. CR will do a presentation on volunteering. It was suggested that the meeting commence at 17:30 to allow extra time for this.</p> <p>CV proposed moving the next meeting from the 28<sup>th</sup> January to the 21<sup>st</sup> January.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Confirm trustee availability for the new date and time of the meeting (21<sup>st</sup> January, 17:30)</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Prepare presentation on volunteering</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Circulate board meeting dates for the rest of 2019</b></p>	<p>TW</p> <p>CR</p> <p>TW</p>
<p><b>Finance and Risk</b></p>	
<p><b>Item 7. Finance Committee Report incl. monthly management accounts</b></p> <p>BD: Our income is running in line with our budget. The PPG contract has been paid in advance and our invoicing to the London boroughs is up to date. We have underspends on staff salaries (due to staff vacancies), on our budget for consultancy and legal fees, and on our activities budget. Sage is not yet up and running. We currently have a £53,000 surplus.</p> <p>TK asked whether we could use some of the activities budget for PR/external communications. BD stated that this it would be more appropriate to fund this activity from our reserves rather than reallocate the budget in this way. CV stressed the urgency of using this money to promote engagement.</p> <p>HC asked whether we will continue to underspend on staff. OC stated that this is not the case as the Governance and Quality Officer is now in post and recruitment for the PPG post will soon commence.</p> <p>TK advised the board that during her most recent meeting with Metro Bank she was made aware that our account has been set up in such a way that if we were to make a mistake with an outgoing payment (e.g. inputting an incorrect account number), we would have no legal recourse to recall the payment. In order to have this recourse we would need to apply for a BACS system with Metro Bank (which we do not currently have, and which takes 6-8 weeks to set up). BD stated that BACS is a standard business account feature and if we do not have it already we need to apply. It was agreed that the finance committee will follow this up.</p> <p>CV questioned whether we should remain with Metro Bank given some of the frustrations we have previously had with them. TK stated that we now have a proper account manager, rather than a sales rep, working with us and that as a result the service we are receiving has significantly improved. It was agreed that we would continue with Metro Bank for the time being before making any decision on switching to another provider.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Engagement budget underspend to be utilised</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: BACS application to be discussed in next finance committee meeting</b></p>	<p>OC/CR</p> <p>Finance Committee</p>

## **Item 8. Risk Register**

The red risks were discussed

### *Risk 2: Loss of contract funding.*

It was queried whether or not Hammersmith and Fulham and the Bi-Borough had left enough time to release a tender in time for our current contract expiry at the end of March 2019. We should have received a notification around September/October in time for a December tender, with a result in January in time for a March contract implementation. However, other local authorities have commissioned services with a shorter turnaround time so we should not be complacent. OC advised that the Bi-Borough commissioner was supposed to bring papers to cabinet in September, but it appears that this has not happened. It is possible that the commissioners might allow the contract to roll over for the time being (but we have not been informed of this if this is the case). All things considered, it is very uncertain what will happen with regards to our contract.

HC asked who our competitors are likely to be. OC has met with some of our potential competitors, SOBUS and One Westminster, we believe our tender would be very difficult to beat but it does depend on what the new service specification is.

CV pointed out that it is important to keep our membership figures up in order to evidence our community engagement as part of our tender. She is concerned about how GDPR compliance will impact on our membership statistics.

### *Risk 3: Split in contract tendering process*

CD raised the question of whether Hammersmith and Fulham might commission something different to the Bi-borough. This would be a risk to our organisation. OC advised that this is a possibility, but that Hammersmith and Fulham are likely to be constrained from actually doing this by staff time.

### *Risk 4: Contract value is decreased*

HC proposed that the finance committee spend more time thinking about this.

### *Risk 6: Risk of demotivated staff team, loss of goodwill*

This has been reduced from red to amber and is no longer a current issue

### *Risk 7: Lack of volunteers*

This has been reduced from red to amber following the work of the Volunteer and Engagement Coordinator.

### *Risk 14: Time and energy invested in local committees*

Has moved from red to amber

### *Risk 17: Post novation embedding of independent HWCWL*

Moved from red to amber. JMR and Tsveta are working on a new staff handbook (including staff Ts&Cs). This will be brought to the November board meeting.

<p><i>Risk 26: Embedding an independent HWCWL</i> The advert for a new treasurer has not generated any responses. We could put an advert in The Guardian or advertise through other information channels.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Finance committee to discuss contingencies in the event of a reduced contract value at next finance committee meeting</b> <b>ACTION: Prepare new staff handbook and staff terms and conditions in time for November board meeting</b> <b>ACTION: All trustees to send Treasurer role description/advert to any potentially interested personal contacts</b></p> <p><b>Item 9. Reserves Policy</b> The £100,000 allocated for winding up costs should be more than enough to cover our costs in the event that HWCWL loses its contract (even if TUPE does not apply). The R&amp;D reserve allows us to develop new ideas.</p> <p>The General Designated Reserve of £82,081 allows us to add value to our contracted services and fund our own projects. Our Grenfell project comes out of these reserves.</p> <p>CV raised the issue of potential reductions in contract value, and how we can consider this in relation to our use of reserves. Other organisations have faced a 20% cut. BD suggested we need to consider other income generating activities e.g. CCGs. HC stated that it is important to minimise the contractual underspend as not using the money could be used to justify a decrease in contract value.</p>	<p>Finance committee JMR/OC/ Tsveta All trustees</p>
<p><b>Healthwatch Delivery</b></p>	
<p><b>Item 10. CEO Report</b> No matters arising</p> <p><b>Item 11. Delivery Plan</b> Our engagement plan is still listed as red, but OC stated that more engagement has been happening than has been documented/planned. There is some catching up to do in Westminster and Kensington &amp; Chelsea.</p> <p>We are still in the red on producing a co-production toolbox. This has been tasked to Hammersmith and Fulham. CR is working on this with a view to complete it by the end of January.</p> <p>In relation to Soho Square (page 10), Westminster have a new scrutiny committee with a new chair who is committed to doing things differently.</p>	

CD asked whether our work on Grenfell should be included in the delivery plan. OC stated that the delivery plan represents a “business as usual” approach for the work we are commissioned to do by the local authorities. It does not cover all our work as an organisation, and our Grenfell project plan sits outside our local authority contract.

It was observed that the dates for the project plan around use of urgent care by young people and families (page 9) was incorrect. They should be 2019, not 2018.

**ACTION: Produce a 1-page document for each borough highlighting where we are on engagement, what the gaps are and what we need to do to resolve them, with feedback from local committees.**

OC

**ACTION: CR to work on co-production toolbox for end of January**

CR

**ACTION: Correct the dates on page 9 of project plan**

TW

#### **Item 12. Briefing on User Survey**

CK asked the board to send her any comments they have on the user survey.

#### **Item 13. Grenfell Project Brief – revised**

CR has done some pilot work which has confirmed that the impact of the Grenfell disaster is wider than just the immediate Nottingdale ward. This work has shown the necessity of going out to local people to engage directly with them; postal/online surveys are not fit for purpose. Building trust is essential. Mental health services are continuing to work on a “business as usual” basis, referring people to mainstream rather than specialist mental health services.

We have not been offered any additional funding from Kensington & Chelsea for our work around Grenfell. There has been some pushback from the council about HWCWL’s involvement. RBKC have recruited an international panel to investigate the disaster but the panel are not engaging with the local community.

CV stressed that the work needs to be robust; whatever work we do will be criticised. Markella Bourdiano is working with us to carry out semi-structured interviews.

It is essential to recruit and induct a co-ordinator quickly if we are to influence the council’s response. HC asked whether it was worth investing more money into the project to get someone in quicker/hire a better co-ordinator. CV stated that the issues with timing of recruitment were logistical rather than financial. JMR stated that extra pay for the co-ordinator might undermine HWCWL’s pay structure.

TK stated that Imperial College were investigating Grenfell from a Kensington & Chelsea mental health point of view. TK stressed that our work on Grenfell is about community, and that this includes parts of both Kensington & Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham. OC stated that we are networking with a number of local community groups.

CD asked about potential barriers to the project. CV stated that there is a political risk to us as an organisation, as we normally work collaboratively with RBKC, but as there is no buy in from them for this project we are doing this ourselves. This puts us in a position where we are likely to be critical of RBKC which risks exposing us politically. HC suggested that this could be particularly risky if it coincides with the contract tender. TK suggested that we need a PR plan as part of this project focussing on credibility and visibility. The board agreed that our work around Grenfell is within the remit of what our charity is set up to do, even if it falls outside of the specific remit of our contract with the local authorities.

**AOB**

None recorded