

EAST SUSSEX LINK

The County's Local Involvement Network in Health and Social Care

Minutes

Core Group Meeting

16th June 2010 – 10.00 – 11.15

Meeting Room – East Sussex Disability Association

Attending: Ray Barrett (RB), Janet Colvert (JC), Ivy Elsey (IE), Tim Furlonge (TF), Alan Keys (AK), David Lawrance (DL), Maureen Lawrence (ML), Tony Moore (TM), Brian Rockell (BR), Margaret Stanton (MS), Sue Weiner (SW)

In attendance: Nick Tapp (NT) – CEO ESDA, Debbie Harris (DH) Administrator (notes).

Apologies: Perry Aldred (PA), Dominique Corbett (DC), Avril Fuller (AF), June Jarrett (JJ), Elizabeth Mackie (EM) Ambrose O'Boyle (AO), Baldev Soni (BS)

Item	Meeting – LINK business to be recorded	Actions
1.	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	JC welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
1.2	Apologies as stated above and AK has been delayed.	
1.3	Declarations of Interest: There were no declarations of interest in the items on the Agenda.	
2.	Minutes & Matters Arising Not on the Agenda	
2.1	Approval and signing of previous minutes (12 th May 2010) The minutes were unanimously agreed and signed by JC having been proposed by DL and seconded by IE.	
2.2	Update on Actions	
2.3	List of completed and outstanding actions Completed Actions noted.	
	Outstanding Actions – will be reviewed by EM once she returns from annual leave.	EM
	4. Project spend re-submission with costings of Rebranding of Website and Update Postcard for Sussex Autistic Community Trust	EM
	5. Representative Maternity Services Liaison Committee	EM
	6. Ask to have representative on panel reviewing Crowborough Birthing Unit and find representative	EM
	7. Mixed Bays Compliance Visits to be organised	EM

	<p>The Order of the Agenda was changed as AK had been delayed and was leading on item 3</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Older People’s Day Services Report</p> <p>IE reported on the Adult Social Care (ASC) response to the LINK report. It has been looked at in great detail. When it has been amended the report will then be sent out to the Core Group for their approval between meetings. Every member will need to respond even if they have no comments to make to the report.</p> <p>AK joined the meeting</p> <p>IE confirmed that a lot of the comments were to do with the phrasing of comments rather than inaccuracies in the facts.</p> <p>JC advised that she had met with IE and Jan Cutting (JMC) yesterday and looked particularly at the Enter & View Report. She stressed that in particular it needed to be made clear that the visits were carried out by volunteers not health/social care professionals.</p> <p>JC and JMC will be meeting to look at the main body of the report and then the two reports will be amalgamated and one complete report will be published.</p> <p>Both JC and IE stressed that no judgments were being changed in the report.</p> <p>MS asked if the changes were mainly because of language i.e. it wasn’t written in ‘Local Authority speak’. She stated that one of the purposes of LINK should be to write reports in language that is understandable to all without the use of excessive jargon.</p> <p>IE confirmed that this was the case. There had also been some confusion by ASC on specific details. IE stressed that what was seen by the representatives cannot be questioned. She thanked JMC for her report writing skills. Nothing of any substance has been changed in the report. Criticism is always hard to accept and this may be where some of the comments stem from.</p> <p>NT reminded the group that they need to get Statutory Partners along to a meeting so that the role of LINK can be explained. DH confirmed that the meeting previously cancelled was being rescheduled.</p> <p>IE confirmed that some changes have already been made because of the report.</p> <p>ML and AK thanked IE and all involved for a good job well done.</p> <p>JC asked that particular thanks be recorded to IE and JMC. She asked that everyone respond to the report when it is sent to them.</p>	

5.	<p>HOSC Nutrition report</p> <p>ML advised that a copy of the draft report was sent with the papers for this meeting. She had emailed JMC with some minor typing amendments. The report is based on what was seen by the representatives and by the brief provided by HOSC. No recommendations have been made as that wasn't the purpose of the report.</p> <p>It was agreed that on page 16 it should read UNannounced follow up. That will be amended.</p> <p>SW feels that Appendix 7.5.1. makes the data irrefutable. IE explained that all of the comments were recorded from comments made by patients themselves.</p> <p>What is apparent from the report is that those going into hospital have a very low expectation of the food.</p> <p>JC feel our partners have to bear in mind that if they go and ask a question they will get a different answer to that if LINK go in and ask.</p> <p>ML and JMC are going to the HOSC meeting when the report will be discussed. The Link Report is part of a larger picture of nutrition and hydration in hospitals: HOSC have received information and briefings from other interested parties, i.e. Hospital/Catering Managers and Age Concern.</p> <p>ML told the group that she feels there is a lot to learn about how we work with other links. Following discussion it was agreed that this subject would be on the next agenda and will be led by ML.</p> <p>SW asked whether reports from the other LINKs involved had been seen. ML confirmed that she had a copy of the report and that they had found different things to comment on.</p> <p>JC thanked ML for leading on this piece of work and thanked all of those who have taken part in it.</p> <p>BR asked that it be recorded that it was a very professional looking report and a good piece of work. He feels it holds the LINK up as a professional body.</p> <p>Following discussion the report was unanimously approved by the group having been proposed by DL and seconded by SW.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>
3	<p>TOR Priorities Group</p> <p>TF asked how an issue gets referred to the Core Group and who by.</p> <p>JC explained that anyone can raise an issue through the office. If necessary the host team will research the subject and may sign post the originator if that is appropriate. Otherwise the issue is referred to the Priorities Group who will review the exact nature of the issue and then refer it as necessary for more research or to the Core Group.</p>	

	<p>TF explained that he had conducted a 5 day survey at CAB and no staff or clients had heard of LINK.</p> <p>NT was disappointed by this as information is sent out through many channels locally and in particular through CVS.</p> <p>Following discussion it was agreed that DH would liaise with TF about raising the profile of LINK with the CAB.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the Priorities Group was unanimously approved having being proposed by AK and seconded by ML.</p>	DH
6.	<p>Issues List</p> <p>AK has attended a British Heart Foundation Conference which gave details of how it is envisaged the future of consultations with GPs and specialists would be. The objective is for healthier patients managing their health for themselves. There is a strong move to change the management of Long Term Conditions. AK agreed to work on a presentation about this conference for another meeting.</p> <p>BR reminded the Group that CQC would be registering NHS Primary Medical Services from 2012.</p> <p>JC said that it would be good to look at the way GPs work. She also reminded people that we should work with the Improving Life Chances Board – our representative is Pat Newton but IE and NT also attend this board.</p> <p>SW reported that the East Sussex Youth Cabinet was training inspectors to review services including health services.</p> <p>AK agreed to speak to Sara Geater at the PPI meeting next week to see what other work is being done in this area. He stressed that LINK do not want to cut across any other groups but if we are better informed as a group we can then use the information.</p> <p>SW asked if it would be possible to put a date against each issue on the list and the notes. JC agreed the priorities group would consider this at their next meeting.</p>	<p>AK</p> <p>AK</p> <p>Priorities Group</p>
	<p>JC asked NT to explain the staffing position in the host team following the recent appointments.</p> <p>NT confirmed that DH had been appointed as Development Worker to replace Val Young. The administrator post has been split into 2. Sara Willis will work 15 hours per week usually from 2 – 5 each day and Amy Cornish will work for 20 hours per week usually from 9 – 1 each day. NT detailed the main roles to be carried out by each person and agreed that lists of each person's main roles would be forwarded to the group. He stressed that questions and queries could still be sent/called into the office at any time, but that if there was a problem with any work EM should be informed.</p>	DH

Date of Next Meeting:-

Wednesday 14th July 10 – 12.30

Minutes agreed as correct at the meeting on 14th July 2010.

Corrections made:

Signed:

Date: