

MINUTES OF JOINT PARTNERSHIP BOARD (JPB) STRATEGIC REVIEW MEETING

Date: 11 September 2023

Location: Tottenham Town Hall and MS Teams

Time: 13.30 - 16.00

Present

Helena Kania	Co-Chair, JPB (Joint Partnership Board)
Sharon Grant	Co-Chair of the JPB, Chair of Public Voice
Isha Turay	Chair of Carers Reference Group
Vida Black	Chairs of Carers Forum, and SCALD (Severe Complex Autism & Learning Disabilities) member
Amanda Jacobs	Chair of City of London Access Group and Haringey Resident
Lourdes Keever	Member of Older People's Reference Group
Paul Allen	Head of Integrated Commissioning (Integrated Care & Frailty)
Patricia Charlesworth	Learning Disability Reference Group
Mary Langan	Chair, SCALD Reference Group (Severe Complex Autism Learning Difficulties)
Phil Stevens	CEO, Disability Action Haringey
Cathy Stastny	SCALD member
Anne Gray	Older People's Reference Group
Qasim Qureshi	Learning Disability Reference Group
Jessica Russell	Facilitator, Participation Manager, Haringey Council
Sara Sutton	Assistant Director for Place based commissioning and Partnerships
Andrea Kelly	Head of Learning Disabilities, Haringey Council
Dan Rogers	Chief Executive, Public Voice
Paul Addae	Healthwatch Haringey Manager, Public Voice
Jano Goodchild	Partnerships Manager, Public Voice
Rachel Sanders (Minutes)	Project Officer, Public Voice

Apologies: Graham Day. Vicky Murphy.

1. Introductions

Helena (Chair) noted that the meeting planned was not the review but how to carry out the review. This was their meeting to find out about your ideas. There was a review process started

in 2017, with an evaluation with various follow up recommendations in 2018, but this was never acted on because of the pandemic.

Sara Sutton, Assistant Director for Place based Commissioning and Partnerships said that she has taken over as the regular attendee from the Council at the Joint Partnership Board (JPB) meetings. Sara has taken over some of Gill Taylor's portfolio and will feed back to the Council. Jessica Russell was there to help facilitate the meeting. Sara noted that there are some points of clarification that she will take back.

Mary Langan said that the Terms of Reference (ToR) should be the start of the discussion and provide the ground rules for what is happening here. Documents should not be sent out 24 hours before the meeting and should be in easy read. One of the problems is how business is conducted so that it facilitates the membership to be involved in what is going on.

2.Commissioning

Dan Rogers updated the group on the Commissioning process. The Commissioner for the Joint Partnership Board and reference groups is Sujesh Sundarraj. Dan and Jano meet with Sujesh on a quarterly basis to update how Public Voice is supporting the service. Monitoring data includes a summary of the meetings, membership, issues raised, actions and ways in which actions are followed up. The Council decides each year if they would like to renew the contract and if the performance requirements are delivered, and this was renewed in July 2023 for 12 months. Larger service contracts are required to re-tender and there is a public procurement process. The JPB contract is beneath this threshold.

The Contract with the Council is £50k per annum. Around 80% of which covers staff salaries, and the rest is on overheads, meetings rooms, equipment, refreshments for meetings etc.

Anne/Cathy asked if the reporting includes feedback from members of the group. How do the council assess how the group is operating. Anne said it would be useful for any survey of user groups to be done independently of Public Voice (PV). They felt that a 'satisfaction' survey should be done by an entity that is independent of the one being evaluated. Anne stated that she appreciates Helena's independent role.

Cathy asked should the JPB members not have been asked about the extension of the contract. Helena suggested that this can be taken offline and discussed as part of the review.

Dan commented that there would be budget implications / dilution if an independent body is used. He said that he is open to involvement from members at meetings with the Commissioner, which is not a standard procedure, but it makes good sense with co-production, but the extent of involvement should be decided by the Commissioner. If the feedback were done independently, Public Voice would not be responsible for the feedback or whether it was enacted.

Phil Stevens raised that for most contracts the reviews are in-house, and it is only if they feel that the information gathered would be corrupted that an independent body is used. Phil said he sees no problem with using Public Voice to complete a review and then sharing the results with the JPB before it goes to the commissioner. External bodies are only used for larger contracts.

Lourdes Keever suggested that both Middlesex and London Metropolitan Universities might be approached for a free evaluation service. They have done this in the past for services in other boroughs. We also have several experienced researchers in the room. Independent surveys are

Haringey Joint Partnership Board

important not just for the JPB but for the Haringey Deal and the entire process of co-production. Isha raised the need for transparency.

Cathy Stastny asked why Sujesh is not in the room. Dan noted that he was invited and is on leave and his manager is also on leave. Sara is representing the Council.

Vida Black noted that Public Voice wanted to change the name of the JPB without consulting, she said Public Voice went behind their back to discuss with Haringey. Rachel Sanders noted this was raised at the strategy workshop with the Council and was suggested that a change of name may increase the profile of the JPB. Dan updated that the change in name was raised as the Council felt this might help Council officers know what the JPB does, but no consensus was reached so this was dropped.

3. Meeting processes and procedures:

3.1 Email communications

Pat Charlesworth asked that any emails that are sent to her not to be sent as a chain but as an individual email.

Could anyone sending an email to Pat Charlesworth to ensure they send this as an individual email and not in a chain.

3.2 Hybrid meetings and technology

Mary stated that there is no opportunity for proper monitoring by the user groups and Public Voice do not have a satisfactory arrangement for hybrid meetings.

Sara offered to provide Council offices for hybrid meetings as the Council premises have several rooms equipped for them. Sara also offered the council to help facilitate meetings.

Amanda noted that we have not finalised the hybrid meeting document which has been shared but this needs to be discussed and adopted. Helena noted the need for a better hybrid system.

3.2 Accessibility and procedures

Amanda noted that accessibility needs to be improved across the board, including that documentation needs to be given in an accessible format and in sufficient time in advance.

Mary asked that all documents, agendas, and presentations be sent at least 72 hours prior to the meeting and be translated into an Easy Read version.

Amanda also asked that we ensure the meeting starts at the time indicated on the invitation and requested a 10-minute access break for every 2-hour meeting.

Amanda said that she was asked by Public Voice not to circulate information to its members and that she felt that Public Voice should be supportive of the JPB members sharing information and that this should be encouraged, not criticised by Public Voice.

Amanda asked that the Co-Chairs reply to her emails when asking for feedback and is awaiting reply from an email from April. She also stated that a point she made about the need for accessibility was excluded from the minutes and she was reprimanded for asking for this to be amended. Anne asked that the meeting minutes be comprehensive and co-produced.

The group stated that they did not feel that it was appropriate for Sharon to be a co-chair of the JPB whilst she is Chair of Public Voice as this is not independent and is a conflict of interest. They would like there to be independent facilitation.

Paul noted the need to hear the voice of seldom heard people and need to understand how residents can be influential in the commissioning space. Paul said that one of the challenges as a commissioner is the best way, we can spend the Haringey pound which is shrinking.

4. Learning Disability (LD) Reference Group

Pat said that when the LD reference group was set up, it was agreed that it would run for a year and then be reviewed. This was in 2018 and the review was not completed. Pat asked who was responsible for the setting up of the LD reference group and raised concerns that this has not happened since before lockdown. Pat would like the My Rights Group and Coffee mornings to be reinstated. Pat and Debbie Floyd previously worked to distribute leaflets to encourage membership of the LD reference group but was not able to identify any new members. Pat said that they need to get more people involved. Pat noted that the coffee morning was for people with LD not their parents.

Pat asked who was responsible for the setting up of the reference groups. Dan replied that Public Voice was responsible for setting up the reference groups and ensuring that actions were followed up on and there are also task and finish groups that we run. We must decide what we prioritise within the existing contract and ask the commissioner regarding whether long term improvements would be possible. Cathy noted she would like to be included in this.

Mary stated that the JPB has not served the LD community well. There has been no review since 2018. Something is fundamentally wrong with the way the JPB functions for the LD community, though Mary said that SCALD works very well. Mary said that Rachel and Jano have worked hard on this but have never been able to crack the problem. The LD Community being represented by the LD reference group requires tackling at a higher level with the involvement of the chairs and the Council. Vida and Mary have written to Beverley Tarka and Cllr das Neves to ask that a different body be commissioned to support the LD partnership. This requires resources, particularly in terms of advocacy.

Mary noted that she has talked to Andrea Kelly about this and there is a meeting planned for 19th October, but she felt that there should have been organic growth the development of a LD reference group over the last 5 years. Mary noted it has now started but only very recently.

Jano agreed we need more advocacy resources and support from the Council as they know the people to contact and be part of the group. There also needs to be more joint working and resourcing.

Phil noted that Andrea is very committed to people with Learning Disability voice being heard and thinks there is a place for an LD reference group in the JPB. Phil commented that in depth support for LD people could not be possible within the current budget; a better vehicle is needed for the LD voice to be heard.

Andrea Kelly advocated a separate review on LD and asked how do we strengthen this and what does co-production mean for this group? There is a lot of available data through National Voices. Andrea is very keen that LD voices be heard, and they need to look at how this can be structured with aims and measurable objectives. Andrea noted that remuneration is important The Council

needs to come to an arrangement about this. £50 000 is not enough to deliver such a large volume of work,

Pat asked that a meeting be set up with Andrea, Mary, Pat, Qasim, Vida, and Cathy to discuss how we can get the LD reference up and running. Pat noted that Michael and Sylvia need to be included. Helena advocated for a separate piece of work to be completed to support the LD community.

5. Reference Groups

Cathy stated that from the papers sent out before the meeting show that PV should be supporting nine reference groups of which only five exist. The four that are missing are: LD, Autism, Mental Health, and Transition reference group. Jano replied that the Autism group has now had 2 meetings with five members, chaired by Andrew Carpenter in conjunction with the Autism Hub. Cathy stated that people with moderate autism are not represented and do not have a voice.

Lourdes agreed that we need to do more work on the missing groups, but it will take a long time to get more funding agreed. Lourdes felt that it would be hard to get more resources in the current climate and suggested partnerships working with other groups for example working with the Transitions department at the Council and the Parent Carers Forum run by the Bridge Renewal Trust to enable us to highlight to the issues particularly in the LD community and ensure people with an EHCP (Education Health Care Plan) have appropriate support. Lourdes raised her concern about the impact of the Haringey Safety Valve.

6. Governance and relationship with Overview and Scrutiny

The ToR state that the JPB should report to the Scrutiny panel and review, the Adults Social care portfolio, and the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group). Concern was raised about whether this happens.

Lourdes reported that she feels that the JPB should have a closer relationship with Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the council. Mary said that the ToR for the JPB to report to the Cabinet and to Scrutiny, within the council have not been fulfilled. All agreed that the Terms of reference (ToR) need to be reviewed and co-produced.

Sara said that operational connectivity has moved on from the ToR. We now have the Borough Partnership, and we could look at how the JPB and reference group structure supports the Haringey Borough Partnership which reports to the Health and Wellbeing board with the Start well, Live well, Age Well. Sara said she could talk to the JPB in another meeting about the Borough Partnership and how it works.

Lourdes also raised concerns about the number of surveys that are carried out by Haringey Council and the outcomes of the surveys and how there needs to be more action research which universities such as the University of Middlesex could help with. Surveys can be inappropriate for certain groups of people.

Lourdes wants to know more about how the Haringey Deal will work and how the JPB fits in with the Council and Health. Words such as co-production and consultation need to be reviewed across the borough.

7. Remuneration

Haringey Joint Partnership Board

Amanda noted that she does a lot of work for free and in true co-production disabled people need to be remunerated. Cathy raised that chairs in other groups in Haringey are paid. Why is there this inconsistency? Pat asked are there organisations which are not allowed to pay their chair.

There are discrepancies between the council and NHS and other groups in whether they pay or not. Paul noted the NHS remunerate as a result of feedback they received. Helena noted that she does a lot of work for the NHS and has yet to be paid.

Amanda noted that The Chair of the City of London Access group is about to be paid. The Chair of London Travel Watch is paid £20k per year and board members are paid £5k per year for 2 days' work per month. Mary noted that Islington, Camden and Lewisham pay their chair and their LD members per hour for LD groups.

Phil noted the need to consider benefits and there can be other ways in which people are paid such as training. People on benefits can receive vouchers, but this should not be rewarded on an hourly basis. Amanda reported that there are problems with the Department of Work and Pensions when payment is per hour. Amanda suggested talking to Inclusion London and the Greater London Authority forum for Deaf and Disabled people which regularly pays people.

Anne noted that there are also discrepancies with payments from the council, noting that attendees at the Co-production toolkit launch were paid with a £40 voucher and this has happened on other occasions.

Jano noted the NHS remunerate more than the Council which still have not worked out their remuneration policy. Jano reported that in the last year 210 people have attended a meeting, for three hours each which would be a total of 700 hours just to attend the meetings, not including prior reading or follow ups. What would the costs for this be if this were paid?

Helena suggested the remuneration be taken separately.

8. Process of the Review

8.1 Who should carry out the review?

Cathy asked if the review should be internal or external? Helena suggested we start within ourselves and see how this works to learn how we work with each other.

Dan stated that if the conversation is how PV is performing then that is a different conversation, to the one we are having today. He would like it to be an internal approach but if the JPB feel otherwise then this can be discussed. Dan asked what do you mean by independent? If we action this, we assume we are playing a role in actioning the recommendations. Vida stated that Sharon is the chair of PV and for her to co-chair the JPB there is a conflict of interest.

Phil said he felt that Public Voice needs to be involved and is part of the vehicle by facilitating the JPB and needs to be part of the review. Phil would like the review to be like how today has been run which has been independent with open frank discussion with Helena and Jessica at the helm. Phil noted that he has never seen a conflict of interest with Sharon as co-Chair of JPB and chair of Public Voice and does not see a challenge with her co-chairing the board whilst the review is taking place. He added there could be a potential for bias, but he has not seen any

evidence of this. If at the end of the review it is agreed that there should be a different approach, then it should be decided then.

Anne asked Jessica Russell in relation to the serving and support of the review process and taking forward improvements. What resources and time are you and your team able to commit to this? Jessica replied that she has stepped in as a facilitator to take part in the participatory process. Jessica said her role is one post in the Policy and Strategy team and she is not a budget holder. Jessica said she will take this back and discuss this with her team and Sara Sutton to see how best she could provide support. Vida noted that Haringey had paid for the Dr Greene report which was responsible for the setting up of the JPB. Helena responded that there was more money in the council at this time.

Dan reiterated that we need to know are Public Voice around the table helping to progress this or are we being asked to step aside?

Helena asked if Public Voice should not be present in the review. Mary replied that this is a very difficult question, about who should conduct the review as there are lots of precedents for asking an external organisation to come in. The question is 'Are Public Voice delivering a JPB service that is satisfactory to its members?' and the evidence is that it is not. Should there be an independent organisation interviewing all parties like a barrister or solicitor? Mary said that she has already asked that the LD partnership be set up as an independent group.

Phil stated that he does not think an independent person will represent the needs of our communities better than the people around this table. He reported that he felt that we can all constructively come together to work out what is best for the JPB and he would like the JPB to do this ourselves with Public Voice and if we are still not happy and are not convinced that Public Voice can deliver what we want then we can come back after the review and say if it is working or not. Phil said that we owe it to each other to work this out and be able to say that we have tried to do this. We all have strong powerful voices. We will challenge ourselves better internally.

Cathy noted that what we want what is most effective way forward and we do not have lots of time. Helena suggested we write up the notes and then when you look at the notes decide whether you want the review to be undertaken internally. Anne said we need to think about this.

Amanda said that the JPB and Public Voice are inter-twined, as Sharon is chair of Public Voice and a co-chair of the JPB and if you want an objective review then there needs to be independent facilitation to ensure there is no conflict of interest. Public Voice's involvement should be on the same basis as the other JPB members, with an independent facilitator. It is difficult for Public Voice to be objective if part of your funding is tied up with the JPB. If the feeling is that there should be a deep-seated review then we need to decide whether this should be carried out separately with an organisation that does not have vested interests in this, she could not see how Public Voice can be neutral.

Amanda thought that an independent chair is critical. Amanda said she does not think Public Voice should be excluded from the review but does not think Public Voice should lead the review. If Public Voice were to lose the contract this would influence people's jobs, and they would not be objective.

Lourdes acknowledged the need for a review, but her key issue is how can we influence the Council? What is the governance structure? What influence do we have and how do we fit in with Scrutiny Panel in the council? Lourdes feels that Scrutiny is ineffective and organisations like us could further the work of Scrutiny and she hopes that the review would cover this. We could make amazing changes internally but still make no difference externally and this is important particularly with the Haringey Deal and co-production and consultation and suggested involving Cllr Pippa Connor.

Anne said she would be happy with Chairs who are independent of Public Voice and minutes that are co-produced and offered to help with note taking. Anne suggested that the chairs of the review could be Helena and Jessica or a colleague and there needs to be an independent record of the meeting. Minuting is an important aspect of co-production as a naturally compulsive minute taker Anne offered to help Rachel.

Mary asked how does this group function in reporting upwards. She quoted in the terms of reference that the JPB will report regularly to Scrutiny and the Adult social care portfolio and the chairs of the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group. This needs to be addressed and explored. They were clear that this needs to happen when setting out the terms of reference. The Scrutiny Panel could have called us in but never have, as could the chair of the CCG and head of the adult social care portfolio. The terms of reference need revisiting.

Amanda supported Anne in saying that she would be happy with an independent chair as she thinks this is critical and minutes should be co-produced. On one occasion an important accessibility point was missed, and she was sent a reprimanding email saying that Public Voice reserved the rights to produce the minutes. We need to ensure the JPB members have an equal voice in what was recorded and taken forward and people should not be told they cannot have their point recorded.

8.2 Timing of the review:

Dan noted that there are a lot of things on the list that the JPB would like to change. And they had talked about constraints and the extra work needed in addition to the ongoing work of the JPB which will involve bringing things back and forward to the groups and impact the timing of the review.

Helena noted that we want to give the JPB enough time to carry out the review. She suggested keeping the remuneration separate and tackling this early.

Amanda felt that a comprehensive review requires a lot of work and could take longer than 6 months and needs investment from the council. If the council is serious about the JPB then it needs proper facilitation and support from the Council.

Mary feels the TOR (Terms of Reference) – should be the starting point and they need to be in easy read.

Paul noted the need to consider interdependencies and Jessica's work on participation for the council and the Integrated Care Board (ICB). He also suggested following the practice of the Dementia Reference Group to understand the outcomes and feedback along the lines of 'you said, we did.'

Mary noted the time constraints on involvement from members of the reference group who are already under huge pressure in their personal lives, and we need to be careful not to overload the process and be careful of the timing, but it was agreed that the JPB need to go back to the reference groups and get their views.

It was also agreed that there is a need for more resources to be able to fully participate in the process as the JPB budget is already stretched to do what they do.

Helena suggested the next general JPB meet in 4-6 weeks. Following the discussion there was consensus that there should be 3 or 4 meetings over 6 months. The review will need investment, facilitation and support from the Council.

8.3 Next steps

Actions agreed at this stage:

- Implement co-produced notes (Rachel and Anne to collaborate and circulate)
- Send around the flipchart ideas and agree issues to be discussed next meeting.
- Agree a timetable for the review and independent chairs.
- Make the ToR available in easy-read form.
- Put the Borough Partnership on a future agenda for Sara to explain
- Public Voice to discuss with the council via Sara how they can best support the review process.