

Minutes of VCSE Strategic Partnership Meeting

Held on Monday 5th June 2023

At Sanger House

In Attendance:

Tom Beasley (TB) – Active Gloucestershire
Chris Brown (CB) – Forest Voluntary Action Forum
Sally Byng (SB) – Barnwood Trust
Kobe Francis (KF) – The Music Works
Pippa Jones (PJ) – Create Gloucestershire
Matt Lennard (ML) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance
Vicci Livingstone-Thompson (VL-T) – Inclusion Gloucestershire
Indigo Redfern (IR) – GL11

Apologies:

William North (WN) – The Long Table

Guests:

Jill Parker (JP/Chair) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance
Gemma Artz (GA) - ICB
Will Chapman (WC) - ICB
Siobhan Farmer (SF) - GCC
Hannah Gorf (HG) - ICB
Mary Hutton (MH) – ICB

Minutes by:

Karen Matthews (KM) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance
--

The meeting commenced at 13:33.

70.	Welcome, introductions and apologies	ACTION
	Apologies had been received from WN who was on leave. Apologies were accepted.	
71.	Declarations of interest	
	There were no new interests declared.	
72.	VCSE sector resilience and infrastructure funding	
	<p>Guests were welcomed to the meeting.</p> <p>MH informed the group that her aim in attending the meeting was to facilitate the VCSE and public sector working together to ensure a flourishing VCSE in Gloucestershire, and to consider what conditions needed to be in place to enable that to happen. The purpose of the discussion was agreed by all.</p> <p>The group considered what was currently in place that worked well: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There were thriving thematic infrastructure organisations, such as Create Glos, Active Gloucestershire and general infrastructure, such as the Gloucestershire VCS Alliance. - In Stroud, a number of place-based “hublets” were working together with GL11 supporting their development. - FVAF was doing amazing work in the Forest of Dean, but this was not replicated in other districts, with gaps in Tewkesbury and Gloucester City. <p>13:46 CB joined the meeting.</p>	

	<p>The group reflected that what worked well in one area might not be appropriate for another, and that rather than trying to “fix” problems, it was more effective to create the conditions to enable the community to solve its own issues.</p> <p>The group suggested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Once working models and processes were in place, it was easier to replicate in other areas. - Community Development roles were often a catalyst, and considering how to support those roles was important. - The stimulus for change could often be a person rather than a service. - Physical spaces were needed for groups and individuals to come together. Many new housing estates had no infrastructure for communities. - People in the community often needed support to feel that they had “permission” to do things. - Governance, regulation, and bureaucracy were demotivators. Infrastructure organisations that could provide fiscal hosting, employment guidance and insurance helped to share the risk to smaller organisations and start-ups. - Good infrastructure organisations were aware of what was being offered and could link-up organisations to make better use of available funding. - The State of the Sector had shown that the majority of funding was being allocated to larger organisations. - Too often, infrastructure organisations were only able to survive financially by becoming involved in delivery. This eventually made them a competitor of the groups that they were set up to support. - Short-term contracts and funding presented challenges for staff retention, and business planning. Many organisations were happy to go through a tendering exercise if it secured longer-term contracts. - Funding that encouraged partnership working was important, although in some areas where there was less activity, finding partner organisations was challenging. - Place-based intelligence with thematic expertise was needed. - Good infrastructure allowed other organisations to grow, rather than growing itself. FVAF would only step into delivery where there was an identified gap in provision, and with a plan in place for the community to eventually take it on. - Franchising important individuals within communities was key in reaching “difficult to reach” groups. - Commissioning had the power to change relationships. A sliding scale of disinvestment (with larger organisations in a partnership receiving a tapering share of the funding) was something to look into. - A Mental Health consortium was needed, along with other thematic streams. - It was often difficult for countywide organisations to engage strategically with the ICS, with this group being the only way to work across the county. - Rather than mapping what was already in place/not in place, consideration should be given to why things were as they were, and what conditions had created that situation. Good areas to case study for that exercise would be Matson, FVAF and Gloucester City. <p>Active Gloucestershire had recently been through the cyber security requirements for a recent bid and had prepared some guidance.</p> <p>ACTION: TB to share cyber essentials guidance with SF.</p> <p>MH thanked the group, and suggested meeting again in September.</p> <p>14:50 MH, SF, GA, WC, and HG left the meeting.</p>	<p>TB</p>
--	--	------------------

73.	ICS Updates	
	a. EACI	
	The recent EACI meeting had been postponed.	
	b. Health & Wellbeing Partnership	
	<p>The Partnership had been focussing on relationship building and ways of working. The three key priorities were blood pressure, smoking cessation, and employment.</p> <p>The possibility of putting forward a proposal on behalf of the VCSE was discussed.</p> <p>ACTION: TB to raise with the ICP the possibility of VCSE organisations providing blood pressure checks for a fee.</p> <p>ACTION: JP to arrange an online meeting for IR, PJ, ML and CB to discuss developing a proposal on infrastructure.</p>	<p>TB</p> <p>JP</p>
74.	Minutes of Previous Meeting (2nd May 2023)	
	a. Approval of previous minutes	
	<p>It was noted that VL-T had attended the meeting in-person, with SB attending via Teams.</p> <p>Subject to the above amendment, the minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting.</p>	
	b. Matters Arising	
	<p><u>57c. KF to discuss feeding into the group from the Creative Health Consortium with Deborah Potts.</u></p> <p>KF had spoken to Ria, who had taken over Ami Mortimer's role as chair of the Creative Health Consortium. He was due to meet with her in the coming days to establish an effective channel of communication between the two groups. PJ would also discuss the matter with her.</p> <p>ACTION: PJ & KF to discuss feedback channels with Ria from the Creative Health Consortium.</p> <p><u>57c. JP to contact the Gloucester Race Equality Action Group about taking a place in the Strategic Partnership.</u></p> <p>ML informed the group that conversation was taking place between the Black Southwest Network and GREAG about their future, with the possibility of GREAG being incubated within the VCS Alliance in the coming months.</p> <p>ML suggested that a meeting between the group and Anira, the director at GREAG would be useful.</p> <p>ACTION: ML to arrange a meeting between GREAG and the group.</p> <p>15:24 KF left the meeting.</p> <p>All remaining actions had been completed.</p> <p>JP noted that the draft research proposal from the CIC sub-group would be presented at the next meeting.</p>	<p>KF & PJ</p> <p>ML</p>
75.	Any Other Business	
	a. August meeting	
	It was agreed that the August meeting should be cancelled.	

	<p>The meeting concluded at 15:29.</p> <p>The date and venue of the next meeting is:</p> <p>1:30 – 3:30pm – 3rd July 2023, venue Overton House, Barnwood Trust.</p>	
--	---	--

Acronym Key	
EACI	Enabling Active Communities & Individuals
ICB	Integrated Care Board
ICP	Integrated Care Partnership (also known as the “One Glos Health and Wellbeing Partnership”)
ILP	Integrated Locality Partnerships
VCSE	Voluntary, Community & Social Enterprise sector