

Minutes of the Meeting (virtual) of the Healthwatch Tameside Board (Part A)

24th March 2022

Venue: Virtual Board Meeting.

Present:	Members: Tracey McErlain-Burns (TMB), Jyoti Rao (JR), Glenis Lee (GL), Royce Goodier (RG), Maria Bailey (MB), Slawomir Pawlik (SP). In attendance: Peter Denton (PD) Healthwatch Manager, Imogen Shortall (IS) Healthwatch Project Support Officer.	Actions
1	Welcome and Introductions: TMB welcomed Board members to the meeting.	
2	Apologies for absence: Apology received from Camilla Guereca.	
3	Registration of interests and declarations of interest to any agenda item: TMB and PD declared an interest in Items 5 and 6, as they were involved in the writing and drafting of the two documents discussed. IS to chase up outstanding declaration of interest forms.	IS
4	Minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2022: Minutes TMB identified a flaw in Item 11 - incorrect acronym of Greater Manchester Healthwatch Network. IS will fix with guidance from PD. Decision Log All new tasks either completed or in progress, apart from Board recruitment interviews (had to be postponed due to PD illness). PD will assess Risk Register in advance of next meeting. PD/IS will send out copy of Decision Log to Board members. <i>Note - presentations from last meeting also attached with today's papers</i>	IS PD PD/IS

<p>5</p>	<p>Decision - Healthwatch in Greater Manchester network All-Age Strategy</p> <p>TMB gave the Board a quick description of HWinGM's recent work and plans, to provide context to the two documents being discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network's next meeting will be held on Thursday next week (March 31st) - each Healthwatch has been asked to talk their respective Boards through these documents before this date, so there should be a position statement and comments from all Boards by then. • Aiming to have the Collaborative Agreement document signed off by end of March - deadline for All-Age Strategy extended due to ICS meeting in April (so that any feedback can be gathered before signoff). • Draft of HWinGM Workplan is still being developed and will be brought to next Board meeting - this will specify how the objectives in the strategy will be delivered over the next year, and give direction to following 2 years. • Funding proposals are also being discussed at next week's meeting - discussions around appointing a Single Point of Access (HW officer to manage relationship/communication between ICS and HWinGM), a part time secretary, and gathering a small amount of funds for each of the ten HWs, to enable them to fulfil the objectives of the HWinGM strategy effectively. <p>Questions and Comments: SP raised concerns about the lack of uncertainty around the structure of the ICB, and how this might affect communication between the network and the ICS. TMB: The network will be represented on the ICB, with one member joining in a non-voting capacity. The Board's first meeting should be held end of May/start of June (once the formal structures have been put in place). All ten HWs will continue to work with their local Boards.</p> <p>Document Discussion PD talked the Board through the All-Age Strategy document via PowerPoint presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context - Ten Greater Manchester CCGs are changing to the new GM Integrated Care Board, which the ten HWs of Greater Manchester will work with collaboratively - this document covers how we will manage working as ten independent organisations with one Board. • Strategic objectives fall into three categories: What we must do (our statutory functions remain the same as before), actions which enable us to do these things, and 'nice to do' things which generate goodwill/stability/income. <p>Questions and Comments: JR: Concerns that the document talks more about procedure than substance/concrete plans.</p>	<p>TMB/PD</p>
----------	---	---------------

TMB: Workplan will help specify general objectives laid out in the strategy - this will be discussed at HWinGM meeting next week. It may well require additional funding to make possible.

GL: List of our strategic objectives strongly reinforces the need for HW and how important they are to the community.

PD: Agrees, and shows how important it is to carry on with our previous work within this new system.

MB: Presentation has answered her questions well - excellent report, happy to endorse.

SP: The wording may change but our work will mostly stay the same - the HWinGM network will continue to be useful for groups such as the Quality System Board and Providers Partnership Board, as our work influences quality and commissioning. Also asked about the role of Chair in the network and how that relates to the ICB.

TMB: Clarified that the network will appoint a Chair from within the membership (on a 12-month term April-April). It is undecided if the Chair will also sit on the ICB (there may be someone else within the network better qualified to do this) - SP suggests this should be TMB (she will continue as interim chair of HWinGM until June, while the role description is being finalised).

PD - agreed that work will look the same as before, we just have to ensure that the network has an effective working relationship with the ICB at GM level as well as our local relationships.

RG and JR stated their support for the strategy.

All Board members agreed to recommend that the HWinGM network move forward with the Strategy, and are happy to give delegated authority to PD and TMB to make minor changes following the April meeting.

<p>6</p>	<p>Decision - Healthwatch in Greater Manchester network Collaborative Agreement (Memorandum of Understanding)</p> <p>Document Discussion PD talked the Board through the Collaborative Agreement document via PowerPoint presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document is an update to the 2016 Memorandum of Understanding - it describes how we will work together and how we manage joint work, collective decisions, disagreements, and accountability. It does not affect local governance arrangements. • Sets out expectations of all HWs, which includes securing some delegated authority from each Board for signoff on GM issues. • A Single Point of Access may be appointed to aid communication (discussions are still ongoing around what this role will look like, and is still dependent on funding). <p>Questions and Comments: SP: 1 - Delegation powers from the Board should be specifically stated, so that decisions which can be made without Board approval are clear. 2 - Are there any people employed directly on HWinGM activity? More funding may be needed to make new system work. TMB - Agrees about need for more funding. Membership of network is made up of the Chair and Chief Officer from each HW (or alternatively a Board member plus Chief Officer), so there are no people employed directly by the HWinGM network. PD - offered to suggest a Scheme of Delegation to the network, so that all ten HWs are using delegated powers in the same way (PD will raise this at the HWinGM meeting next week).</p> <p>JR: Would like to be involved in conflict resolution panel. TMB: May need to discuss this with network, as panel members were going to be picked from existing HWinGM members - TMB will raise the option of other Board members being able to join the panel at the HWinGM meeting next week).</p> <p>Board delegated authority to PD and TMB sign off on Collaborative Agreement.</p> <p>PD noted his thanks to TMB for the hard work and leadership she has provided to the HWinGM network over the past six months.</p>	<p>PD</p> <p>TMB</p>
----------	--	----------------------

<p>7</p>	<p>Discussion & Decision - Chair's appointment</p> <p>PD gave a brief introduction to the Board about the recruitment process of the Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair's role description was approved at our January Meeting (with a change to Deputy Chair wording - now reads 'will be appointed'). • Suggested we appoint a Chair at the May meeting for a 3-year term, with the option for the Chair to do two consecutive terms. • Chair and Deputy Chair will be appointed from existing Board members if there are appropriate candidates - if none can be found, an external recruitment process will be triggered. • Do members agree that the Chair's term should be three years? And how long should the Deputy Chair's term be? <p>Questions and Comments:</p> <p>SP: Believes three years is too long a term, especially when other roles may offer financial compensation for less commitment - suggests 1-year term instead. Also suggested that EOI forms should be sent out for members interested in the role to return before the next meeting (TMB agreed - IS/PD to organize).</p> <p>MB - Sees three years as a common term for this kind of role (allows time to grow into post and offers stability). One year too short - suggests 2-year minimum term. Deputy Chair role should be on a different timescale, to prevent both roles being left empty at the same time.</p> <p>PD - Suggests a 3-year term with option to review annually - allows Chair to leave if their situation changes or stay on if they are happy, and allows Chair to receive feedback from other Board members every year (TMB supports this idea).</p> <p>GL - How long were Kailash's terms? PD - Kailash was appointed for 5 years with an annual extension.</p> <p>TMB highlighted the importance of offering the role of Chair to new Board members as well as existing ones.</p> <p>Board agreed on a 3-year term with annual review for Chair, and a 2-year term for the Deputy Chair.</p>	<p>IS/PD</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Discussion & Decision - Board recruitment</p> <p>TMB happy to invite JR and RG back to the HWT Board.</p> <p>PD gave a brief update on the HWT Board member recruitment process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal interviews session had to be postponed due to PD's illness. • IS/TMB/PD will organise a new date and time, and then ask other Board members if they would be willing and able to sit on the panel. • Board members happy to receive email recommendations from panel members after interviews. 	<p>PD/IS/TMB</p>

10	<p>Report for noting - General feedback report</p> <p>It was noted by the Board that the General Feedback Report circulated by e-mail to the Board on 4 March has been approved (using delegated authority) for publication.</p>	
11	<p>Any other business</p> <p>GL provided the Board with a summary of data gathered from a nationally published survey on access to information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 45% of trusts have accessible information processes in place • ¾ of visually impaired people have not been asked if they needed alternative methods of information access • Will plans to address these issues be included in the workplan? <p>PD: Happy to add this topic to the agenda for Board members to discuss in the next meeting. SP: Asked for link to report so he can discuss with providers (can be found in National Talking News, GL will try and send to SP/PD - SP to email Julie Beech to receive more information)</p> <p>GL passed on thanks to PD, IS and Karen Whitworth for their recent work with Talking News.</p>	<p>PD</p> <p>GL/SP</p>