

# Minutes of VCSE Strategic Partnership Meeting

Held on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2023

via Teams (Virtual)

<b>In Attendance:</b>
Chris Brown (CB) – Forest Voluntary Action Forum
Sally Byng (SB) – Barnwood Trust
Kobe Francis (KF) – The Music Works (via Teams)
Pippa Jones (PJ) – Create Gloucestershire
Matt Lennard (ML) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance
Vicci Livingstone-Thompson (VL-T) – Inclusion Gloucestershire (via Teams)
Ami Mortimer (AM) - Artlift & Gloucestershire Art Consortium
William North (WN) – The Long Table
Indigo Redfern (IR) – GL11

<b>Apologies:</b>
Tom Beasley (TB) – Active Gloucestershire

<b>Guests:</b>
Jill Parker (JP/Chair) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance
Emily Barker (EB) – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance

<b>Minutes by:</b>
Karen Matthews – Gloucestershire VCS Alliance

The meeting commenced at 13:27.

<b>34. Welcome, introductions and apologies</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<p>TB had a previous commitment and had sent his apologies.</p> <p>Apologies were accepted.</p>	
<b>35. Declarations of interest</b>	
<p>There were no new interests to declare.</p>	
<b>36. Minutes of Previous Meeting (5<sup>th</sup> December 2022)</b>	
<p>The minutes were accepted as a true account of the meeting.</p> <p>Matters arising:</p> <p><b><u>28. JP to feedback the group’s decision to the Clinical Programme Board</u></b>            ML and JP had met with Gemma Artz, the Clinical Programme Lead. Consequently, the group had been offered a seat offered on the Clinical Programme Board. The meetings were held quarterly, and their remit was to have a strategic oversight of the content spread over all of the Clinical Programme Groups (CPG).</p> <p>VL-T had experience of attending several CPGs and offered to represent the group at the Clinical Programme Board.</p> <p>It was agreed that VL-T would take the seat, with IR deputising.</p> <p><b>ACTION: JP to contact Gemma Artz to let her know of the group’s decision, and to forward the first meeting details to VL-T &amp; IR.</b></p> <p>During the meeting with Gemma Artz, ML had suggested hosting a “Clinical Programme Day” rather than having VCS representation at all of the many CPG</p>	<p>JP</p>

	<p>meetings. This would take the form of a full day with each CPG having a segment. This had been well received and would be trialled in March/April 2023.</p> <p><b><u>28. JP to invite Roger Mortlock to join the group</u></b></p> <p>JP had made contact, and Roger had suggested a colleague, Nicola Simpson to take up the place. JP was due to meet her to discuss in the coming days.</p> <p><b>ACTION: It was agreed that Nicola Simpson should complete a nomination form which could be considered outside of the meeting (in advance of the February meeting) by the group.</b></p> <p><b><u>29a. JP to invite Emily Barker to the January meeting to facilitate a longer session on what the data is telling us</u></b></p> <p>Completed.</p> <p><b><u>31. JP to contact nominee to inform them that their nomination was unsuccessful as it was necessary for their organisation to be a VCSE sector member to become a VCSE ILP Representative</u></b></p> <p>JP had contacted the nominee and explained that he was ineligible for the post due to not coming from a VCSE organisation.</p> <p>The nominee had challenged this comprehensively, and JP shared the points made with the group.</p> <p>It was agreed that the nominee would be accepted for the role of Cotswold ILP Representative.</p> <p><b>ACTION: JP to contact nominee to inform them of the group’s decision.</b></p> <p><b><u>31. JP to include “Governance of ILP Representatives” to the agenda for the next meeting</u></b> Completed.</p>	<p>JP/ALL</p> <p>JP</p>
<p><b>37.</b></p>	<p><b>State of the Sector</b></p>	
	<p>EB shared a data summary with the group. The main points raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recent jumps in income were limited to organisations classified by NCVO as “major” and “large”. In general, 4% of all charitable organisations held 71% of total charitable income.</li> <li>- “Micro” and “small” organisations had seen a 28% and 12% decrease in income respectively.</li> <li>- Across categories, those working in social services, health, and housing had all seen increases in income. Organisations working in health had seen a 43% increase, but the category was predominantly made up of hospices and care homes.</li> <li>- Grant making foundations had seen a 22% drop in income.</li> <li>- Cross-referencing the ONS Indices of Deprivation against the income for the health and social services categories threw up some contrasts, indicating that need was not matched with funding.</li> <li>- There was a disparity in income between physical health services and those supporting mental health, with the former receiving higher income. There was also little evidence of increased income for older people organisations, despite the ageing population. This could indicate that treatment was outranking prevention in terms of funding.</li> <li>- The pandemic had seen income increase for many organisations, but this had now fallen back to pre-pandemic levels. The need for services had remained high.</li> </ul>	

	<p>There was a discussion around the concerning trend for funding following illness rather than wellness, and the importance of prioritising wellness within community-based health. The group highlighted inequalities across districts, with it being noted that while some organisations might be considered to operate countywide, their services were often inaccessible to those in the Forest of Dean, for example.</p> <p>It was felt that it was incumbent on the group to help funders and commissioners to make good decisions, and there was a discussion on what could be done to support this using the data.</p> <p><b>ACTION: ML and PJ to meet to discuss sharing the data at the “Data Day” organised by Create Gloucestershire and Active Gloucestershire alongside Connected By Data on the 26<sup>th</sup> April.</b></p> <p>The group reflected that micro organisations could offer a lot to larger organisations with their close links to communities, and could benefit from the experience of larger organisations, and increased “incubation” would be beneficial.</p> <p>In terms of reduced income within grant making organisations, the group was concerned that this would impact on smaller organisations who were less likely to derive income through the commissioning process. The group noted that it was becoming increasingly common for funders to approve a bid, but to offer only half of the requested funds. This reduced the bid to the absolute essentials, exacerbating the focus on illness rather than prevention.</p> <p>The group thanked EB.</p> <p><b>14:34 EB left the meeting.</b></p>	ML & PJ
<b>38.</b>	<b>Updates</b>	
	<p>a) <u>Gloucestershire Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership</u></p> <p>ML reported that there had been a very short meeting to sign-off on the strategy. ML had raised a couple of comments, and the document had now been signed-off.</p> <p>The group reflected that they felt that further discussion was needed to follow up why the suggestions made by the group were not included in the final document.</p> <p><b>ACTION: ML to share the finalised strategic document with the group and to take comments back to Carol and the Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Production of a shared VCSE Strategy to be added to a future agenda.</b></p> <p>b) <u>Enabling Active Communities and Individuals</u></p> <p>AM reported that, in the most recent meeting, Vikki Walters from GCC had shared a presentation on employment for vulnerable people.</p> <p>There was a conversation around Gloucestershire Healthy Lifestyles and a review of what they’ve achieved now that their contract was ending. There was the possibility of the VCSE co-ordinating a bid for this tender for April 2024.</p> <p>There had been a discussion around the “Core 20+5” agenda around reducing inequalities in healthcare.</p>	ML  JP

	<b>ACTION: AM to share slide on “Core 20+5” agenda.</b>	AM
<b>39.</b>	<b>Governance of Representation Activity</b>	
	<b>a. Process for appointing representatives</b>	
	<p>JP reflected that the governance of representation activity was a key element of the group’s role.</p> <p>JP reminded the group that the current ILP Representative role descriptions had been agreed by the Task and Finish groups. Where there was no reference group in a district, it was currently the role of the group to appoint ILP Reps.</p> <p>In Gloucester City there was a vacancy and two candidates. Although there was now a reference group in place, JP had paused the election to clarify the group’s position on governance over ILP Rep recruitment.</p> <p>There was an in-depth discussion, and it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The intention to pass appointment of ILP Reps over to the reference groups remained, but processes needed to be put in place and the group would hold the responsibility for the next twelve months.</li> <li>- The self-nomination form could be enhanced to define the criteria for ILP Reps more clearly.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: JP to e-mail group inviting a decision on the two candidates for the Gloucester ILP role.</b></p>	JP
	<b>b. Support and sustainability</b>	
	<p>JP reported that, at a recent Representatives meeting, Reps had felt strongly that it was important to use existing networks as reference groups, and each district had different ideas. JP reflected that the use of existing networks would assist engagement in the short-term but posed problems about consistency and governance for the group.</p> <p>The group suggested that a clear, uniform aim across groups would be useful, although JP reported that a circulated “terms of reference” document for the groups had proved unpopular.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Strategic Partnership should create a culture of learning, and that the reference groups should be able to organise themselves differently. It was felt that a mechanism needed to be put in place for reference group members to be able to report if their Rep was not acting appropriately.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Strategic Partnership and ILP reps to meet annually. JP to arrange.</b></p>	JP
	<b>c. Transparency</b>	
	<p>The group agreed that clear guidance for Reps was important and suggested creating a “Code of Governance” and within it, a guide to managing conflicts of interest.</p> <p><b>ACTION: JP to develop a code of governance for reps.</b></p>	JP
<b>40.</b>	<b>Getting On Board</b>	
	ML had circulated a document in advance of the meeting.	

	<p>ML clarified that the document didn't make clear where the pool of trustees would come from but informed the group that the intention was for them to come from the ICS, and also from within the VCS.</p> <p>The group agreed with the proposal, but suggested that the work should include trustee development, rather than just onboarding. Details of a <a href="#">trustee shadowing scheme</a> were shared.</p> <p>The group noted that what was missing from the circulated report was an analysis of which organisations need to recruit to trustee positions.</p> <p>PJ was aware of an organisation in Bristol who specifically worked with young trustees, and those from global majority communities.</p> <p>It was unanimously agreed that we need to buy in external expertise to deliver on this initiative as that expertise does not exist within Gloucestershire.</p> <p><b>ACTION: PJ to work with ML on the project proposal to ensure that analysis was included.</b></p> <p>It was agreed that ML should draw down the funding for the project, and recruit Getting On Board to deliver the project.</p> <p>A working group would be set up from within the Strategic Partnership once the project was underway.</p>	PJ/ML
41.	<b>Comms</b>	
	Postponed to a later meeting due to time constraints.	
42.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p><b>a) KF request for comments and questions on funding</b></p> <p>KF informed the group that he had been invited to speak about the challenges of obtaining funding at the House of Lords and invited comments or questions from the group.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Group to send any comments or questions on funding to KF in advance of the next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>b) Agenda for next meeting</b></p> <p>JP informed the group that Stuart Jackson from ICE had offered to run a workshop for the next session around coproducing a leadership development proposal for the VCSE sector. This would take up the full meeting time.</p> <p>The group agreed. JP would circulate the details in due course.</p>	ALL
43.	<b>Community Investment Fund</b>	
	<p>ML had circulated a document regarding decision making for two expressions of interest received for the administration of the Gloucester ILP Community Investment Fund funding.</p> <p>Comments had been received in advance of the meeting to suggest that the group felt that the role of the group was not to make decisions about who should be awarded funding, and ML invited further comments.</p> <p>After an in-depth discussion, it was agreed that ML would contact the development officers for the ILP, providing them with the EOIs received, but informing them that the group did not think it appropriate for them to make the decision.</p>	

	The meeting concluded at 3:55pm  The date and venue of the next meeting is:  <b>1:30 – 3:30pm – 6th February 2023, venue TBC</b>	

<b>Acronym Key</b>	
CPB	Clinical Programme Board
CPG	Clinical Programme Group
EOI	Expression of Interest
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