

**Better Start Bradford Partnership Board Minutes**  
**Thursday 17 May 2018**  
**Mayfield Centre**

**Meeting Started:** 9.30

**Meeting Ended:** 11.35

**Present:**

Vipin Joshi	Community Board member (Chair)
Shirley Brierley	Consultant, Public Health
Sarah Hinton	Board Member, Bradford Trident
Rosie McEachan	Programme Director, Born in Bradford
Michaela Howell	Programme Director, Better Start Bradford
Peter Horner	Voluntary Sector Representative, Bradford District Assembly
Talat Sajawal	Ward Councillor, CBMDC
Christy Bischoff	Community Board member
Gwen Balson	Community Board member
Nasim Qureshi	Community Board member
Nasreen Khan	Community Board member

**In Attendance**

Gill Hart	Funding Manager (Investment), Big Lottery Fund
Gill Thornton	Head of Programme, Better Start Bradford
Edwina Lintin	Supervisor, Family Nurse Partnership (in place of Julia Elliot)
Carine Baker	Senior Commissioning Officer, Bradford & Airedale CCGs (in place of Ruth Hayward)
Kristina Juryta	Senior Commissioning Officer, Bradford & Airedale CCGs (in place of Ruth Hayward)
Guy Dove	Programme Administrator, Better Start Bradford
Sophie Eveleigh	Programme Administrator, Better Start Bradford
Gabriella Stringer	Data & Evaluation Administrator, Better Start Bradford

**Apologies for Absence:**

Kev Taylor	Michael Jameson	Sarah Muckle	Shaheen Khan
Rashida Latif	Sara Keogh	Carlton Smith	Phillipa Hubbard
Julia Elliot	Ruth Hayward		

## **1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**

Vipin welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the apologies.

Everyone introduced themselves to each other.

## **2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 19 April 2018**

The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

## **3. Matters Arising actions table**

Michaela noted that social value is on item 8 of the agenda.

Discussions are underway about supporting the local VCS. Sarah has volunteered to help with this and Michaela confirmed Lizzie Hughes is talking to people about it. A paper will come back to the Partnership Board about this matter.

Michaela confirmed we are having conversations about enhancing the revised Public Health service specification for 0-19s and a paper will come back to the Partnership Board about it.

## **4. Declarations of Interest**

Vipin noted for item 6, Talat runs a Dads and Kids group which has received Parents in the Lead funding as have groups based at Womenzone where Gwen is Chair.

Shirley is part of the team working on the service specification for the age 0-19 Public Health contract and the new health visiting contract.

## **5. 'Getting to know you' session – Nasreen Khan**

Nasreen confirmed she will cover this at the June Partnership Board meeting.

## **6. Parents in the Lead**

Gill Thornton outlined the report and said that Parents in the Lead is part of the Innovation Fund and was set up just under a year ago. Parents are on the decision-making panel deciding on applications to fund activities in the Better Start Bradford area which meet our outcomes. Parents in the Lead is a way of trying out new things and ideas and we would like to link the activities with the potential to expand them but we have not reached this stage yet. Parents in the Lead has been undergoing a review and we have had discussions with a sub-group of the Partnership Board, the parents' panel and organisations supporting the activities.

Gill said various changes have been suggested and she would ask the Partnership Board for views. She explained she is currently responsible for Parents in the Lead with Sheila Brett being the co-ordinator and BSB's engagement team contacting the groups with other staff and providing support. However Lizzie is to take over responsibility for Parents in the Lead from Gill.

The first recommendation from the sub-group of Partnership Board members is to do with it not being clear that some applications fit into our funding criteria and the panel want to make that decision and have the trust placed in them to do so. Gill said some criteria are fixed (the

activity is in the BSB area, the activity benefits BSB families and shows some ties to our outcomes and is for the correct age group of children).

Another recommendation is to increase the annual funding limit from £2,000 to £2,500. Gill said there had been a fair amount of discussion about this and groups will be allowed to apply for money more than once a year with an annual total of £2,500 per group. The sub-group had agreed that parents should be on the decision-making panel rather than community Board members only. This would build parents' skills and confidence and potentially involve them in our programme in other ways, including perhaps becoming Board members themselves.

The sub-group also asked for more than the end-of-project report and suggested groups present to the Partnership Board and have an annual get-together to showcase their activities. Trips and parties were originally excluded but the sub-group felt that we should be more flexible if there is a benefit and they can help cohesion and the decision whether to fund trips and parties should be with the panel. This is also the case with residential activities with the panel wanting to make the decision but they would need a clear rationale to fund a residential.

Gill turned to funding applications from different groups based within the same organisation and the panel had felt the only limit should be the £2,500 cap per year. She gave the example of SHINE who have two or three independent groups that operate there, as do Canterbury Children's Centre. They suggested BSB's engagement team clarify the group's relations with the host organisation.

Gill mentioned support for groups from larger organisations who have a role in holding the money and administration. BSB's engagement team have helped with this and Sheila helps to manage the funding and not the activity. Some of the supporting organisations have fed back that there is a cost to them in administration and holding and managing the funding. There is a suggestion that we recompense them for the cost of doing this.

If organisations do not use the money awarded to them in the way they said, the suggestion is that we note the significant failure and bar the organisation from applying to Parents in the Lead in the future. The sub-group had also said they did not know enough about the groups and suggested an additional 'tell us about your group' question on the application form. Our outcomes should also be explained in more simple terms on the forms with examples given.

Gill turned to the discussions with the parents on the panel who said they were generally happy and were following a good process. Their confidence has increased and support is good. However they asked for more consistency in the funding criteria and with the information given and for support offered with the applications to be more consistent. They had also asked for meetings to be held in child-friendly venues and on more suitable days and for more opportunities for social interaction, more training and for visits to the activities they are funding.

The parents suggested that the number of applications are limited to enable due consideration of sometimes long applications and therefore no-one is rushed in decision-making and that some parents may value a brief synopsis of each application, especially when English is not a first language. It was also noted that voice recognition software is another possible solution. They also fed back on the panel meetings and felt that clear ground rules would ensure that everyone respects others' opinions and would enable everyone to contribute and asked that the community board members on the panel recognise the power relationship on the panel, value the voice of the parents and support parent voices to be heard.

Gill confirmed Lizzie has met the organisations supporting Parents in the Lead groups who have been taking on responsibility and direction. They suggest freeing up parent groups so they can be independent and to look at ways of holding cash without an umbrella group but there is a need to manage risk.

Nasreen noted she was on the decision-making panel and asked if BSB's engagement team had been consulted in the recent Parents in the Lead review. Gill said Lizzie has spoken to them and that team have an away day tomorrow and are waiting for our decisions. Nasreen said their feedback is not in the report and would have been vital though Michaela said those conversations are ongoing.

Nasreen said she had heard some fantastic feedback about BSB's engagement team from Parents in the Lead organisations. However there was confusion about the co-ordinator's role with more mixed feedback and if consultancy went on for long enough it should move to employment. Michaela said the point about consultancy becoming employment was well made but we want to keep the additional support. Gill said she was aware of some unhappiness but there are lots of positives about the co-ordinator role. Consultancy has an advantage in that we are only billed for the hours actually worked. The engagement team are reviewing who does what and after we fund activities, what happens next and how we keep information.

Sarah remarked she has seen Parents in the Lead activities at schools and the Parent Involvement Worker has led a lot. Sustainability is important and we must train up the parents. Peter asked if any feedback gathered from the BSB engagement team is not in the report and Michaela said they asked for clarity of roles and empowerment of parents and Gill said they need more clarification about how they support groups.

Talat said the maximum £2,500 per year award would only cover a group's operating costs for four to six months when considering expenses such as venue hire. Gill Thornton said the Innovation Fund is not for organisation's running costs and Talat said with such a tight budget it was not possible to empower groups and we are looking to develop them for the long term.

Gwen said the report comes across positively and Parents in the Lead has been quite a success despite the concerns raised and empowerment is going on. She suggested doing confidential parents' surveys as they may be less likely to speak openly in a group meeting.

Christy said she was glad the engagement team are discussing Parents in the Lead at tomorrow's away day. It is a community engagement activity and we do want to empower parents and we should have that at the forefront rather than having too much monitoring. Michaela said this will also be included in our discussions about how to support the VCS sector.

Vipin asked us to decide if to support the report's recommendations and Talat asked what the money is for, if not to meet groups' running costs. Gill Thornton said its purpose was agreed by the Partnership Board some time ago and it is to support local activities run by parents to achieve our outcomes and it is an engagement tool. The Big Lottery Fund however say we are not a community development programme. Nasim said it is about terminology and Parents in the Lead is paying for the activity and not the running costs.

Gill Hart confirmed the BLF fund activities and not running costs though mentioned a 'full cost recovery method,' when, for example, a group were running five activities and the BLF were funding one, their approach is to consider paying a fifth of the running costs.

Shirley asked what the annual Parents in the Lead budget is and Gill Thornton confirmed there is £35,000 budgeted for 2018/19. Peter asked if there should be a limit on the number of applications if the panel is too busy and Gill Thornton said the solution would be to have more than one panel but we have not reached that stage yet. We had originally intended to have a panel for each of our three wards.

**Decision: To accept the recommendations in the report, including the increase in the maximum award to £2,500 a year.**

**Action: To report back to the Partnership Board this time with a presentation from a Parents in the Lead group.**

## **7. Annual Review of Partnership and Governance**

Michaela noted we have a commitment to review our governance annually and different aspects are considered each time. We have updated the partnership agreement and will circulate it once some new community Board members have been recruited. Some delivery/investment partners' legal teams may need to see it.

Michaela observed that the buddying scheme has been a limited success; the scheme has not worked for the majority of members. Kev Taylor however has given excellent feedback and was paired with Christy and met with refugees at her place of work and would encourage others to participate in the buddying scheme.

Gwen said she found hers really helpful and has suggested some informal coffee and chat sessions and the first one is tomorrow for new applicants to the Partnership Board. It was noted however that arranging it on a Friday during Ramadan was bad timing. Gwen also suggested buddying for new Board members which would make their roles easier.

Michaela noted we have covered some items in greater depth in Partnership Board meetings though it is hard to get discussion time in such a big Board. She invited the board to get into three groups to discuss the buddying system and how to improve meetings.

After the group discussions Michaela then asked for feedback. Shirley said her group suggested that buddying be made optional and flexible but participants should report back. There was also a wish to visit our projects with BSB staff. Gwen said her group wanted buddying to continue and to be made informal (perhaps going for a coffee rather than a visit to someone's workplace) and there should be a list circulated of all the organisations the community Board representatives are involved in.

Christy said her group were quite positive about the buddying system but people are busy and would need to prioritise buddying to do it. Nasreen said she worked in Leeds so buddying was difficult for her. Christy suggested people be allowed to put in requests for who they want to buddy with.

**Action: Michaela to do a summary of our discussions about buddying for all Partnership Board members and will help with the pairing.**

On meetings, Shirley said she liked how Partnership Board meetings are working but asked what the plans for the high level dashboard are. Peter said that more time should be made for social and informal space and this should include BSB staff. Gwen suggested we should spend more time discussing reports and less time delivering them in meetings as Partnership Board members should already have read them.

Edwina turned to Partnership Board recruitment and we should take time to make sure new members feel included and ensure they understand things and are followed up. Christy suggested using small groups to do this and Nasreen said there should be help given with terminology. Michaela confirmed we are talking about doing a glossary. Edwina also suggested doing buddying at meetings and Christy said the 'get to know you' slots helped the tone of meetings although we have not had one for a few months. Gwen suggested our service users could observe a Partnership Board meeting.

## **8. Social Value**

Michaela mentioned previous discussions about 'small' and 'local' organisations in terms of our procurement and said we are trying to get to a shared understanding. She circulated a statement that is brief and simple although as mentioned before 'small' is very difficult to define in this context. Instead the statement says why 'small' is important and tries to capture previous discussions. Michaela thanked those who had contributed already and this first attempt will go to the Commissioning Advisory Group and be incorporated into our revised commissioning strategy. She also tried to capture Talat's point about those local organisations who know the area and have been successfully delivering an activity for years.

Michaela invited comments and Gwen said sustainability should be in the statement. The statement should also cover the different approach in procurement to organisations of different sizes in terms of, for example, income, skills and knowledge. We should consider there are lots of local micro-organisations who will have less capability and infrastructure and there are different starting positions and this needs to come through.

Peter said for micro-organisations we may not normally commission more than their current income. Innovation Partnerships are a possibility here. It can be simple to define 'small' in terms of income but we might need to also consider an umbrella organisation's income and national charities may have a devolved local structure. Local governance may be missing and a national organisation should have a local steering group.

Nasim said the statement was a good start but does not go far enough. To pick up the local supply chain, a level of procurement is needed. We are a learning programme and should use different methods of procurement and some local authorities are doing that and using Innovation Partnerships already. We need to nurture capacity building and Nasim mentioned linking with Locality who are working in Bradford.

Gwen said we need to remember why we are doing this and the Innovation Fund should have a different commissioning process to what BSB have used before which ended up with lots of local organisations not being commissioned.

Shirley noted Bradford Council recognises social value in its procurement and 10 per cent of the new contract for age 0-19 Public Health will be social value. This is new for them with procurement done at a different level but she can see the value of it.

Talat also mentioned the Innovation Fund and said small local groups are already doing good work with a proven track record and these should be built up and embedded locally.

**Action: Michaela to provide this feedback to the Commissioning Advisory Group and add it to the Innovation Fund criteria.**

## **9. Award of Contract for Breastfeeding Support**

**Decision: To ratify the Commissioning Advisory Group decision awarding the Breastfeeding Support contract to Health for All (Leeds) Ltd.**

## **10. Programme Monthly Report**

Michaela mentioned Jane Barlow's presentation to us last month and links to it and further information are in the programme monthly report.

Michaela confirmed that the ending of children's centre contracts is included in the risk log. Sarah queried the 'Red' rated risk and Gill Thornton said only 30 per cent of health visitors had been recording maternal mental health issues and the results vary from the BiBBS study. Rosie confirmed PHQ is a measure of depression and GAD measures anxiety. She thinks the screening is happening but is not being consistently recorded electronically. Rosie has been talking to health visitors about recording and about what will go into the revised service specification.

Shirley confirmed she is working with BSB in designing the revised specification. Sarah said as a former health visitor they need to feel more connected and then we would see results and outcomes. Shirley said she would make sure this comes through more formally.

Nasreen raised political engagement and the meetings with MPs Tracey Brabin and Judith Cummins but noted Imran Hussain MP is our ambassador.

Michaela was asked about Partnership Board recruitment and she confirmed she asked for volunteers for the interview panel. There are 16 candidates with interviews on Monday afternoon and all day Tuesday. So far the panel will be Michaela, Vipin and possibly Lizzie. Nasreen remarked she would have loved to be on the interview panel but she is one of the candidates herself. Michaela said previously the panel contained a service representative, a community representative and herself.

## **11. Any other business**

Rosie said BiBBS have entered a partnership with University College London to bid for some systems change work and have got through the first round. She hopes BSB can be a key linchpin and will keep us informed. There is a steering group and Rosie would like two community Board members to be on it.

Rosie also mentioned the INRICH conference on reducing child health inequalities with a public event in Bradford on 7 June and a book launch on 8 June and booking can be done via Eventbrite.

Shirley announced she is retiring in July and will be on leave in June so today is her last Partnership Board meeting. She wished to thank everyone and said working with Better Start Bradford has been the highlight of her career and she will still live in Bradford in retirement. Michaela said the shaping, vision and energy of the programme was down to Shirley and Vipin, on behalf of the Partnership Board, said Shirley's efforts were very much appreciated.

Finally Vipin asked if everyone had felt they had an opportunity to contribute to this meeting and all agreed that they had. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

**12. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting is on Thursday 21 June 2018 at Bowling Park Primary School, Usher Street, BD4 7DS starting at 9.30 am.

The meeting closed at 11.35 am.