

MINUTES

Tuesday 17 January 2017

10.00 am – 12 noon

Lucraft Room, The Bridge Community Education Centre

Present

Carolyn Bristow	Children's Services, BHCC
Val Cane	Community Works
Gareth Davies	Sussex Police
Cllr Emma Daniel	Joint Chair & BHCC (<i>Chair for this meeting</i>)
Geraldine Des Moulins	Joint Chair & Third Sector Equalities Representative (Disability)
John Francis	BHCC
Laura Jayne Hill	Community Works (representing Laura Williams)
Olivia King	BSUH NHS Trust (representing Barbara Harris)
Cllr Leo Littman	BHCC
Emma McDermott	Communities, Equality & Third Sector, BHCC
Simon Newell	Brighton & Hove Connected
Cllr Dee Simson	BHCC
Emma Snowdon	Brighton & Hove NHS CCG (representing Jane Lodge)

Apologies

Freiya Benson	Community Works
Jane Cossutta	Kent, Surrey & Sussex CRC
Reuben Davidson	Community Works
Barbara Harris	BSUH NHS Trust
Melinda King	East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service
Jane Lodge	Brighton & Hove NHS CCG
Brian Warren	Business Representation (Chamber of Commerce)
Laura Williams	Community Works

Action

1 Welcome & Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Round-table introductions were made and apologies noted. EM explained that the meeting would be recorded, as a reasonable adjustment for the minute-taker, and no objections were raised.

2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

2.1 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting on 18 October 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

2.2 Matters Arising

- It was noted that the NCE Committee was now to have 'Inclusion' in its title and had been renamed the NICE Committee.
- EM to liaise with LB on a) bringing the Migrant Needs Assessment (MNA) back to Equip and b) circulating the MNA survey to Members for their input.
- All other actions had either been discharged or were on the agenda.

EM

3 Feedback from the City Employment and Skills Plan Services Action Group

SN explained the background to the City Employment and Skills Plan Services Action Group (SAG). The four objectives of the SAG were noted. SN highlighted the following points;

- The SAG had been identified as the most appropriate of the four CESP Action Groups to consider the findings and recommendations of the research projects on Race Equality in Employment and Barriers to Employment for Disabled People.
- Membership of the SAG had been taken from a cross-sector of city organisations and included a range of people from the partnership. Importantly, many of the members had frontline expertise and therefore an understanding of changes required and how to effect those changes. It was noted that people with more specialist knowledge would be invited onto the SAG as required.
- Those identified as furthest away from the labour market would be segmented into a number of different work streams for the purposes of the SAG's work, with specific interventions developed around each cohort. Initial strands of this work to include identification of common and systemic barriers and blockages across these groups, and current baselines and targets to provide context.
- The SAG would work with the other CESP Action Groups on skilling up employers to work with the different cohorts. The chairs of the four Action Groups would be discussing this and the various work streams involved at an upcoming Chairs' meeting.
- The SAG would work with provider organisations in order to understand different pathways to employment and to unlock blockages. This would impact on the development of individual plans.

- The SAG would work on two or three workstreams at a time to identify gaps in information and knowledge, and gather intelligence around potential changes, e.g. wider changes within the council, changes around special schools, etc.
- Although in its early stages, SN felt that the SAG had made significant progress since its initial meeting.

Discussion followed;

- EM said that the two council-commissioned research projects were a good place to start as they had produced some very practical solutions within the council's and other partners' control, and opportunities to link with other initiatives could be considered. SN added that as the research had already been done, the actions and solutions could be picked up and implemented quickly as part of the groups that the SAG would be focusing on.
- ED queried why the 'discovery' stage of scoping and identifying issues had continued beyond the completion of the research projects. It was noted that this situation had arisen largely due to relationship building.
- SN gave a timescale of between 3 - 6 months for the SAG to agree the actions it would be taking forward to achieve its objectives.
- JF commented that there were several specific practical pieces of work going on that individuals were taking back to their organisations involving data control and data protection teams across organisations.
- ED asked SN to take a recommendation back to the SAG to ensure that measures were in place to assess the impact of its work. It was noted that impact measurement had already begun and would be closely monitored by the SAG. However, SN cautioned that it might be difficult to attribute change to the work of the group.
- SN confirmed that the SAG's discussions would include the issues addressed by the Government's recent green paper on health and its recommendations regarding supporting people to stay in employment.
- It was noted that EM would sit on the SAG for the foreseeable future.
- ED thanked SN for his presentation and proposed that he should be invited to a future meeting to report back on practical actions, changes and impact, and to discuss what support Equip might be able to give.

SN

EM

EM

(SN left the meeting.)

Action

4 **Equip's 2017 Priorities and additional five Fairness Commission recommendations**

4.1 Equip's 2017 Priorities

The 2017 priorities had been proposed at the last meeting and taken away for consideration. The priorities were as follows;

- Leadership on the Collaboration Framework
- Equalities skills development in the city, starting with EquipP
- Cumulative impact of public sector spending cuts
- Fairness Commission delivery and oversight

Cumulative Impact

- It was agreed that cumulative impact of public sector spending cuts was a critical priority. DS felt that the council had fallen behind on this and had not sufficiently looked into taking this out to partners.

Equalities Skills Development

- ES advised the group that the CCG was continuing to work on embedding equalities skills development across the organisation, including leadership.
- The group endorsed the skills development priority and agreed that it would be vital to keep the spotlight on equalities and inclusion at all times.
- ED requested some partnership support for partnership members on the development of ideas around this priority, and in ensuring that leadership and governance structures were right.

EM

(Olivia King left the meeting.)

- The issue of taking equalities development forward as a partnership was discussed. It was agreed to include this as an item at a future meeting so that the partnership could agree on an action plan.
- GDM suggested including in the equalities development work a focus on 'disability confident' as a demonstration of leadership on the agenda, to reflect the government expectation that public sector bodies would become disability confident. It was agreed that this would be very useful to include in the action plan above. GDM offered the support of Possability People with this in terms of undertaking assessments and approaching public sector bodies about how they were addressing the expectation to be disability confident.

EM

EM

Action

- ED highlighted that feedback showed the council needed to focus on itself as an employer in relation to employing and retaining BME and disabled staff and it would be very important to keep to that objective.
- ES highlighted the importance of capturing data and evidence to help measure the impact of equality interventions. Getting the health community on board with this was key for the CCG, but could be challenging.
- ED commented that there needed to be better use of data to inform changes in practice. EM agreed that currently, some outcomes were difficult to measure and this point had been picked up by the EFLG assessment.
- GD reported that Sussex Police was not as representative of the community as it could be in terms of recruitment and retention of BME and disabled people, particularly in terms of officer recruitment. This had been acknowledged as a major, force-wide issue by Central HQ and work was ongoing to identify the reasons for under-representation and tackle blockages, but targets were far from being achieved. GD advised the group that it would be easier to have an impact on this problem locally and then start to influence towards central recruitment. He felt that local best practice advice and input, together with pressure from groups such as Equip, would be vital.
- The group appreciated GD flagging the above issue and pledged their support in tackling it. It was agreed to add 'supporting each other on workforce equalities' to the action plan noted above. EM and the Communities & Equalities Team to advise on how Equip could take this forward in practice.
- Although BHCC, the CCG and Sussex Police were all now based in Hove Town Hall, it was felt they were not currently maximising the opportunities this provided. It was noted that the John Street police station refurbishment was soon to include the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), and further opportunities for co-location might be explored.

EM

The group agreed the four priorities with no additions. It was felt that the discussion had refined what the group wanted to achieve with each priority and highlighted the main areas of concern. The following further actions were agreed;

- EM asked partnership members to advise their organisations/sector that these four priorities would be Equip's focus for 2017. EM asked members from public sector organisations in particular to take this back and encourage buy-in in terms of sharing information, given that cumulative impact had proven a difficult area to share information on to date.

All

- Dave Tonkin, Sussex Police HQ Diversity Lead, to be invited to the next meeting, and potentially for the rest of 2017, to assist the group's focus on its leadership role in this equalities area. EM
- GD to ask DT to contact EM with the data around BME recruitment in Sussex Police. GD to also check whether this data was in the public domain. GD
- Chief Superintendent Lisa Bell, new Divisional Commander for Brighton & Hove, to be invited to the next meeting. EM
- ED proposed capturing data as a whole partnership on workforce equalities. EM suggested that the most robust VCS sector-wide data was probably from Taking Account (2013) the social and economic audit of the VCS. LJH to arrange for Community Works to put a call out to the sector for data; ES to send LJH an example of the CCG's Workforce Recruitment Equality Statement to assist with this. This information would then be pulled together for discussion at a future meeting. EM
LJH
ES
EM

4.2 Equip's five additional Fairness Commission (FC) recommendations

In addition to taking responsibility for the FC actions that the BHCC Communities Team were leading on, the partnership had been asked to consider whether it wished to have oversight of 5-10 additional, pertinent FC recommendations.

- DS voiced some concern about potentially overloading the partnership and felt that it would be better to focus on a few recommendations and do them well.
- LL suggested that it would be useful for the Brighton and Hove Connected Partnership to consider which of the FC's total 117 recommendations they felt should be prioritised. He suggested that the recommendations prioritised by the council's elected member working group could be circulated to the members of Equip and BHC for information and consideration of support and input.
- It was agreed to also consider the possibility of inviting the lead on a particular recommendation to present to Equip on progress or provide a written update. Partnership members agreed to feed suggestions back to EM for the 2018 forward planner. EM
- CB commented that the scheduled updates on the Fairness Commission at the council's NICE Committee could also come to the Equip.
- It was agreed that Equip would have oversight of the FC recommendations led by BHCC CETS. The group decided not to take on oversight of any additional recommendations whose implementation the group felt less confident about and consider those for Equip oversight.

Action

5 **Community Collaboration Framework**

EM gave some background to the development of the Community Collaboration Framework (CCF) from the refresh of the Community Engagement Framework (2008) and thanked GDM and other members of the Working Group for their support in helping SW develop the new Framework to be as clear and simple as possible, emphasising the benefits of collaborative behaviours, relationships, organisations etc.

- Although the document was high level, EM explained that it needed to be, in order to be as effective as possible for the city. However, case studies from across the city would be included to make it 'real', and EM asked for examples to be sent to Sam Warren at sam.warren@brighton-hove.gov.uk.
- JF raised the issue of establishing the CCF with operational managers and frontline services to inform development, change and service redesign. EM explained that embedding the CCF would involve facilitating conversations around what needed to be in place.
- EM advised the group that ELT had asked that the group propose a couple of items that ELT could sign up to, e.g. collaborative commissioning.
- GD was unclear if the Framework applied to the police also. EM said it did. DS emphasised that everyone should have a part to play in embedding the Framework throughout an organisation. EM explained, as an example, that in the council collaborative behaviours had been embedded into its new Behaviour Framework, which would be reinforced in training and performance review processes, with evaluation against those behaviours.
- EM advised the group that SW was working on an action plan around the specifics of what needed to be in place and this would address the issue of where communities should go for advice and practical guidance on collaboration.
- EM confirmed that the group's comments would be taken away and used in developing the CCF and action plan further. It would then come back to the group for sign off and members would be responsible for taking it back to their organisations for approval.
- ED proposed a Leadership Workshop on collaborative behaviours across the sectors, organisations and communities and including elected members. It was agreed that this should be scheduled to take place in April or May to get buy-in from leaders before sign-off in June.
- GDM requested a template for the case studies, to include the impact as well.

All

EM

EM

SW

Action

- LJH asked about BME engagement in the CCF and EM confirmed that the working group had decided that they already had a significant bank of knowledge from engagement done over recent years and had therefore not undertaken any unnecessary additional engagement.

6 Any Other Business

6.1 Mental Health First Aid

VC was interested in getting involved in mental health first aid. It was suggested that she contact Grassroots about their Suicide Prevention Course, and Brighton Housing Trust. In addition, Public Health may be able to signpost to this training. ES to check whether the CCG funded any mental health first aid training.

ES

6.2 Community Works Conference

LJH alerted the group to the next Community Works Conference on 16th March, where the focus would be on empowering, and asked everyone to save the date.

All

7 Close and date of future meetings

Tuesday 25th April, 10.00 am – 12.00 pm
 Tuesday 18th July, 10.00 am – 12.00 pm
 Tuesday 17th October, 10.00 am – 12.00 pm

Ivory Place
 Friends Meeting House
 BMECP

Glossary of Abbreviations referenced in minutes:

BHCC: Brighton & Hove City Council
BME: Black & Minority Ethnic
CCG: Clinical Commissioning Group
CCF: Community Collaboration Framework
CESP: City Employment & Skills Plan
Equip: Equality & Inclusion Partnership

FC: Fairness Commission
MNA: Migrant Needs Assessment
NICE Committee: Neighbourhoods, Communities, Inclusion & Equalities Committee
SAG: Services Action Group