

Minutes from Board Meeting

14/12/17

For information and agreement

Summary of Actions

1. MG to prepare Brexit risk assessment paper for the Board to review. **O/S**
2. GM to arrange a Trustee Board meeting at CWF sometime within the coming year.
3. GM to brief JBW on Finance discussion had during this meeting as soon as possible. **Completed.**
4. GM to map out future funding scenarios, factoring in Trustees' recommendations. **Discussed during meeting – now closed.**
5. GM to circulate SG Strategic Partnership Board governance documentation to Trustees.
6. GM to complete a Healthwatch funding proposal. **Discussed during meeting – now closed.**
7. KM to send GM an introduction regarding accessing possible funding sources outside the UK. **Completed.**
8. Trustees to commence actively searching for/sourcing additional trustee candidates. **Discussed during meeting – in progress.**
9. MG to convene a Governance Sub Committee meeting prior to end of February, 2018.
10. GM to arrange breakfast meeting to present/discuss monitoring stats with Trustees (and invite 2 new trustee candidates?).
11. JBW to discuss Adult Social Care 'inspector' role with GM.
12. GM to follow up with D Phoenix, VC of LSBU, on ageing population aspect of government's industrial strategy.
13. GM to follow up on potential to agree annual accounts and convene AGM sooner in the year.
14. JBW to forward an alternative risk register & risk plan template to GM for possible adoption.
15. GM to add Brexit risk to risk register.
16. 'Alert Buddy' for lone working to be assessed for possible use (GM>A Hafliger).
17. 'Trans gender' and requisite monitoring language to be incorporated into EO policy (GM>AH).
18. GM (+ D Hayman?) to assess whether completion of NHS Information Governance ToolKit accreditation appropriate for CS' data protection/GDPR compliance.
19. Safeguarding policy to be revised to retain information provided, but reduce length of document (GM>S Smith?)

Attendees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacky Bourke-White (JBW) – Chair • Karin Woodley (KW) – AOB only • Khosi Manaka (KM) • Mark Parker (MP) • Matthew Guest (MG)
Staff in attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon McCullough (GM), Truly Johnston (TJ), Bron Thomas (BT),
Apologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Bukola (MB)

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome & Conflicts of Interest

JBW welcomed the participants to the meeting and asked whether there were any conflicts of interest. As KW was not present at the time, none were noted.

Agenda Item 2 – Minutes & Actions

The minutes were reviewed and then approved.

Agenda Item 3 - CEO Report (verbal update)

GM noted that, as the previous Trustee Board meeting had been held recently, he had not prepared a written CEO report.

Again, GM thanked the Trustees for their inputs and suggestions and stated that his discussions with KW had yielded a positive outcome. GM then explained that he had also met with staff in small groups to discuss the current situation and garner ideas, with a number of contributions being forthcoming as a result, particularly with regard to cost cutting.

Agenda Item 4 - Finances

GM noted that he had circulated the annual accounts and that a £115k deficit had been recorded for the year. The primary reasons for this were that consultancy and Involve had not met their revenue budgets.

MP stated that the annual report was a bit long, but that CS had done a lot. JBW queried the positive feedback received from service recipients on work delivered by CS and asked whether this was benchmarked against anything, e.g. '22% felt that the support on governance had increased their knowledge and confidence a lot'. How was it possible to actually know where this fitted into the bigger picture? MG responded that nothing could be benchmarked against, as no one else measured outcomes in this way. It may be possible to benchmark against Lewisham, for example and MP agreed that this would give a sense of progress and direction. GM agreed and stated that this was effectively setting up for the impact report.

During the 2013-2017 period, a positive trend had been noted especially on governance. Also, feedback on income generation had held steady which was good to see. JBW concurred, noting the 57% success rate achieved on funding applications supported and GM responded that this could be better.

MP commented that one would expect there to be interest from local authorities in the sector, but once funds were granted, local authorities would walk away. A well-funded CS would remain independent; the alternative would have 'begging bowl' connotations.

GM stated that he and TJ met with the council to ask what they wanted CS to change, in response to the 10% cut in funds, e.g. to cut SRCF. The commissioning and monitoring officers responded that they were looking to CS to make a proposal. A discussion on the funding perspectives of the Adult Social Care versus Community Services departments then took place, including the potential to take over 'front door' services, but that there was a need for some infrastructure investment, if this were to happen.

MP asked who CS's supporters were and TJ responded that positive publicity about CS had come from CoolTan Arts and the Walworth Neighbourhood Forum recently. MP responded that it was important to promote such observations and also ask respected people to say that they value CS.

GM concluded by stating that he would arrange a breakfast meeting at which these numbers would be presented to the Trustees in greater detail.

Action Item

GM asked if the Trustees were happy with the annual accounts and the Trustees responded that they were. GP noted the addition of the Cash Flow Statement and that the picture was very similar to the previous year.

GM stated that he had hoped that, by today, there would be more clarity on the HW position and that a process needed to be agreed for deciding which of the three options should be taken by 10th January, 2018, including factoring in maximising what to get out of Social Action and HW synergies. MP cautioned care, in that the two were quite different at partnership level. GM responded that he was referring to engagement level and TJ agreed, so long as there were clear parameters around any collaboration.

JBW stated that she would like to have a conversation with GM about the 'inspector' role and £10k from Adult Social Care to fund a lay inspector team that included volunteers.

Action Item

MP added also, what about revisiting the council's engagement function, which it currently carries out on its own behalf with Tooley Street staff? The council would need to put this out to tender and CS would apply, if appropriate. JBW asked which department this fell under and GM replied that it was the Communities team; they would need to out a 'right to challenge' in during early New Year (January timing).

GM stated that he would mention this to Stephen Douglass again and TJ asked whether the proviso would be to do a better job, or rather be a tick-box exercise (more along the lines of the Planning department), noting also that this could make CS look even more aligned with the council. Evidently, the head of the council could be interested in establishing an 'engagement centre', e.g. the London Fire Brigade also 'engaged'. MP concurred that there were opportunities to open up conversations for a change in future.

MG stated that the government's industrial strategy published on 27th November acknowledged the dramatic effect that the UK's ageing population would have on the economy, and noted that the government needed to pour money into this area - potentially billions, and there would be partnership opportunities as a result. Much academic work was being done on this currently, including at London Southbank University. GM responded that he'd recently met their new vice chancellor, Dave Phoenix and that he would follow up on this with him. **Action Item**

TJ added that CS had a relationship with Goldsmiths' University via the volunteering route; they too could potentially be approached.

It was then noted that a lot of funding opportunities had been popping up recently and were being applied for. As KW had suggested during the previous meeting, these were small pots. TJ was resubmitting the Reaching Communities bid in smaller scope to the Big Lottery Fund (£153k over three years, to focus on two wards, rather than the original three proposed).

With regard to Lambeth, GM stated that no further information had been made available to him. The bidding process was to have concluded in November, with the contract being awarded in January, 2018, but this was now silent. JBW's insights into how CS may be being perceived were then noted.

GM then concluded by stating that a restructuring would be entered into early in the New Year. A discussion on the potential to agree annual accounts earlier and to then schedule an AGM sooner in the year was then discussed and it was agreed that this should be looked into further. **Action Item**

JBW then proposed that the Community Southwark Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31st March, 2017 be approved and this motion was seconded by MP.

Agenda Item 5 - Healthwatch (HW)

GM stated that the combined effect of a reduction in the Council's funding of Community Southwark (CS) and withdrawal of CS subsidising HW effectively doubled the deficit needing to be funded, in order to keep this organisation going in its current form.

GM then updated on the meeting held three weeks ago with all parties involved in HW funding/benefit receipt, including GSTT, CCG/LCNs & Council, where a modest additional contribution was requested from each party. Due to perceived loss of HW

perceived loss of independence and also establishing a precedent, if additional funds were to be provided in this way, none were offered at the time.

The meeting did however highlight HW's value and the recognition of CS's contribution to HW's success and, as there were 16 participants in the room, this was helpful to hear. Discussions also covered the possibility of a more joined up 'community partnership' approach, e.g. on projects, but this was a discussion for the future, rather than one to help solve the current situation.

To recap, there are basically three options on the table:

1. recruit a part time manager in the New Year (following A Gandesha's departure)
2. merge with Lambeth
3. give the contract back to the Council.

As a matter of record, Ross Graves, the new Managing Director of the NHS Southwark CCG, acknowledged the problem presented at the meeting. GM then stated that Stephen Douglass and Ann Ross did reaffirm that the £40k cut to CS's would go ahead.

GM added that when, the potential for some form of operational transformation was broached, this was met with a positive response and the possibility of £20-25k of bridge funding for the following year, whilst HW worked to obtain other revenue sources, was then mooted. If this was not forthcoming, then Option 3. above looked likely. The hard deadline on this was 20th January, 2018.

GM noted that HW had earned £23k this year. Ideas for revenue generation could include running PPGs (noting Lambeth had not been so successful at this in the past) and conducting 'mystery shopper' investigations, e.g. into dental practices in the borough.

MP acknowledged the good work completed on GP practices by HW recently and GM agreed, adding that a piece of work commissioned by GSTT that BT was involved with was also progressing well.

AG's last day with HW (tomorrow, 15th December) was noted and again, the trustees expressed thanks to her for her success in role.

The potential to bring HW and Social Action closer together in 2018 was also considered as a possibility, as there were certainly synergies. GM then stated that he was not sure where this situation would land, but that he was now more confident of the 'knowns'. A decision must be taken early in the New Year.

MP responded that the fit between HW and CS was getting stronger, but that CS should not collaborate more closely, if there were going to be problems. GM then summarised the three options again and confirmed that he had talked these through with HW staff.

Agenda Item 6 - Risk Register

JBW stated that she had a risk register and risk plan that was potentially similar than the draft document being reviewed at the meeting, and proposed to send this to GM.

Action Item

Reviewing the draft, JBW asked if all risks identified were the same. GM replied that they were of a general nature, e.g. finance, and that some of the review dates were overdue. MG added that a Brexit risk needed to be added to the register. **Action Item**

Agenda Item 7 - Policies

The draft policies presented at the meeting were noted by the Trustees, including:

- Lone Working: MG stated he had also deployed at his own organisation. JBW asked whether any CS staff were ever in the office on their own during evenings and TS explained that there was always a duty manager on hand at Cambridge House. This policy was more geared towards covering outreach activities, e.g. volunteering advice surgeries at local libraries. TJ added that staff would shortly receive lone worker training from the Suzy Lamplugh Trust. MP responded that community organisers faced such challenges, particularly when lone visiting houses and the training would be very helpful for them. JBW then explained the 'Alert a Buddy' tracker system that her organisation used; this was call centre driven and very cheap to operate, so could be considered by CS. **Action Item**
- Health and Safety: JBW asked whether this incorporated Peninsula's recommendations and GM responded that it did.
- Equal Opportunities: MP recommended that the current draft be reviewed, with a view to including trans gender language and JBW added that monitoring language should be changed (GM noting change to premises facilities to accommodate this). **Action Item**
- Data Protection: MG explained that, with the exception of signatory, the paper was currently unchanged from the previous version – no provision had yet been made for GDPR. The inclusion of Southwark Giving in CS's portfolio necessitated some procedural changes to accommodate GDPR. Training was also being organised for CS staff who handled personal data. JBW then noted that her organisation had to complete level specific certification within the NHS Information Governance ToolKit and suggested that CS looked at this when reviewing CS's GDPR compliance level. **Action Item**
- Safeguarding: JBW noted that it was no longer correct to refer to a 'vulnerable adult' but rather to use the word 'adult', and that the policy draft should be amended to reflect this. MP then stated that 26 pages of policy was currently too long – it read as a guidance document rather than a policy. KM stated that all information needed to be kept and MP agreed, but that the policy itself

should be shorter. JBW asked whether this policy could be made available to others on the web and GM responded that he would arrange this. MP added that all policies should be posted to the web and in priority order, i.e. essential, good to have, sector applicable (e.g. lone working). There was also a 'Safer Recruitment' policy referred to in the Safeguarding policy and GM responded that this was a council policy. The state of the council's safeguarding guidance on its website was then discussed. **Action Items**

The policies were then approved by the Trustees in their current form, with the acknowledgement that a number of follow-up actions would be completed and amendments made accordingly.

Agenda Item 8 - Any Other Business

KW joined the meeting briefly to confirm that Finance had agreed to the arrangement that she had made with GM.

KM asked GM whether he had yet made contact with the person she recommended to him on possible external fund sources and GM responded that he had emailed, but had not yet heard back.

Concerning new trustee recruitment, two candidates had been identified and it was proposed that they should be invited to join a meeting early in the New Year. **Action Item**