



**Bristol Ageing Better Programme Board
Tuesday 2nd June 2015
Age UK Bristol, Canningford House**

Present: Alan Carpenter (Chair) (AC), Karen Hurley (KH), Bob Maggs (BM), Claire Miller (CM), Gloria Morris (GM), Cherry Hartley (CH), Kay Russell (KR), Mandie Lewis (ML), Robin Means (RM), Zehra Haq (ZH), David Cotton (DC), Brian Richards (BR) Mark Baker (MB), Ruth Richardson (RR), Bianca Rossetti (BRo), Aaron Hamilton (AH)

Apologies: Judith Brown (JB), Guy Robertson (GR), Keith Sinclair (KS), Rosa Hui (RH), Mina Malpass (MM)

1. Welcomes, introductions, apologies and previous minutes

Alan welcomed all to the meeting and introduced KH from the Carers Support Centre (deputising for KS) and BRo, the new BAB Programme Administrator. It was explained that GR will be absent until late August due to his operation and subsequent recovery.

With regards to the previous minutes, ZH clarified that she had provided apologies in advance. Otherwise the minutes were approved as a true and accurate record.

2. Chair's introductory remarks

AC shared his thoughts on what the next stage for the board is now that the programme has officially begun. AC expressed the view that we should see the next five years not as a finite initiative, but as the start of a transformation in how Bristol provides for and views its older residents. AC stressed the need to oversee all projects with sustainability in mind, ensuring successful initiatives are able to continue past five years. AC also shared that the BAB brand is already very strong. It's also important that we ensure we're using the partnership to share best practice and work closely together to develop the brand and ensure different areas of Bristol are more aware of each other.

AC shared that he, CM, DC and BM recently met to talk about Board Development. They concluded that we need to focus on the purpose of the board alongside the strengths and knowledge of its members and plan a scheme of delegation. AC offered to write a paper following a facilitated session to be held before the next board meeting to discuss assets. CM and DC expressed the desire for the board to be more directing and for its members to be more firmly in the driving seat of the programme. BM felt the board's purpose could be made clearer.

3. Programme Team Update

MB gave an update on BAB recruitment, to which the support and guidance of the partnership has been integral. BRo joined the team three weeks ago, which has made a big difference to the team's capacity to move things forward.

The deadline for applications for the Communications Officer role is Monday 8th June. External communications consultant Liz Bell has been an excellent asset to the team and has helped determine the requirements for the Communications Officer.

Since the last board meeting, AC, RR and MB have reviewed what can be done to better understand the role of Programme and Partnership Director (PD), following a lack of suitable candidates when it was first advertised. The relationship the PD will have with RR, MB and AC has been explored in more depth and the job description has been made sharper, which should make it much more likely that we will find a suitable candidate. The salary has been increased to £44,000 p.a. and will be re-advertised on Monday 8th June, with a deadline of 6th July and interviews w/c 13th July. MB hopes that board members can be available for the interview process. BM asked whether the contract for the PD is still 5 years fixed term; MB explained that the role is being defined as permanent as we are hoping to sustain the programme beyond the initial term of 5 years. DC felt that the board need to be able to advise on the context of the role, but not necessarily the detail of the job spec. RM commented that the salary is a little low to attract candidates from the private and public sectors, but this isn't necessarily a bad thing as it may attract strong candidates from the third sector. DC suggested we are open to salary negotiation with the right candidate. KR suggested that perhaps we need to be flexible with the hours the PD works, even if we aren't flexible on the salary. This way forward was supported by the Board.

The Community Navigator Project Development Officer role will be advertised in mid-June, with the Older People's Engagement Worker to follow later in the year, in consultation with the Older People's Steering Group.

4. BAB Evaluation

a) Update on Ecorys

It was explained by RR that Ecorys are evaluating the Ageing Better (AB) programme nationally and the Common Measurement Framework (CMF) is a way of evaluating the effectiveness of different interventions across all 14 funded areas. The CMF won't necessarily be applicable to all BAB services, as it is really only suitable for evaluating people who have long-term contact with the services, rather than ad-hoc users or those who have fleeting contact. Ecorys have accepted the De Jong Gierveld emotional and social loneliness scale as the tool for monitoring isolation. Ecorys are in the process of developing their national database, which all 15 AB projects will feed into. BAB need to provide feedback to Ecorys by 16th June, so on the 8th June the Evaluation & Evidence Group will look at which projects the CMF is applicable to, which we are yet to determine the evaluation requirements for and which we will certainly need to evaluate differently, such as the Aardman film.

There will also be a networking meeting between the AB programme deliverers and Ecorys on 8th July. RM expressed the concern that Ecorys' approach seems to be one of us needing to adjust to meet their needs rather than vice versa. RM also expressed the importance of not overlapping our evaluation within the programme, e.g. Community Researchers shouldn't be running similar questionnaires and overloading the service users. CM expressed the view that we need to be certain that all programme evaluation is in harmony and we need to provide transparent guidance on data collection to partners. RM said that we need to be able to see data from the CMF in an anonymised form. The core evaluation will be self-administered (given to people to fill out in private). KR suggested that it may be helpful for Kate from BCC's Performance and Intelligence team to come to an E&E meeting, as she is currently applying similar performance measures with ACFA.

b) Evaluation & Evidence Group Terms of Reference

RR shared that the original Terms of Reference (ToR) were written three years ago at the start of BAB, and have now been re-drafted by the group. The revised ToR were presented to the board for agreement and discussion. RR is now chair of the E&E group having taken over from RM. Going forward, RM shall be preparing formal reports from UWE to present at E&E Group meetings, which will be shared with the board.

CD noted two corrections to the ToR – an instance of ‘partnership board’, where ‘programme board’ should be written, and ‘Evaluation & Evidence’ written back to front. CM felt that the ToR should be circulated to the partnership in order to ensure transparency. The board formally agreed the ToR with these amendments. **Action:** BRo to make corrections.

c) Payments to BAB Community Researchers

RM explained that although the CRs are currently voluntary with expenses, the long-term vision is that the initiative develops into a community enterprise, which will require funding once established. All board members are in agreement.

RM noted one correction to the document – the figure of 312k on line 1 should be corrected to £12k. **Action:** BRo to correct.

d) Programme Outcomes (Baselines)

RR explained that we are awaiting information from the Quality of Life survey, as well as the publication of a mini survey through the Bristol Older People’s Forum (BOPF) newsletter. The board shall be sent a presentation that further explores the baseline measures.

5. Selection of Delivery Partners policy & procedure

RR explained that there have been a couple of changes made to the document since the last board meeting after feedback from board members, namely the inclusion of an additional paragraph about disputes, complaints and appeals procedure on page 5. The revised page 5 was approved by all.

DC expressed the view that the proportionality of the bid documents was quite high compared to the modest contract values and that this could be reviewed after the first completed tender process. RR confirmed that the policy and procedure will be reviewed after each tender process, and feedback sought from the BAB partnership.

One correction to page 2 was noted – ‘partnership’ written in place of ‘programme’. **Action:** BRo to correct.

6. BAB Narrative and Communications Strategy

MB provided an overview of the finished Communications Strategy (CS). RR confirmed that it is a working document, and will be evaluated and revised soon, especially once the Communications Officer is appointed. AC felt that the creation of the strategy was a useful exercise in itself. RM queried a potential disparity between the focus on ‘isolation’ in the CS and ‘loneliness’ in the narrative. RR explained that the programme identifies that isolation and loneliness, while often occurring together, are different states of being. In response to queries about the inclusion of people aged 50+ in the narrative, RR explained the ‘risk factors’ of isolation that have been identified for over 50s (bereavement, care homes, carers, sensory impairment and drug/alcohol misuse). MB

explained the link between economic disadvantage and reduced lifespan; ailments that those who are financially secure see as affecting elderly people are more prevalent in people aged 50-60 in poorer communities, so we need to be flexible with the age range. CM stressed the importance of the positioning statements in informing all communication, and that it should be clear that BAB is a community.

CM asked what the narrative has been written for. RR explained that the current version is not final, and it's something we want to work with the entire partnership to develop, so that we have a clear document defining the context of the programme with input from all involved. KR expressed the understanding that the narrative is a concise, easily digestible document, whereas the CS is much denser and in all likelihood won't be read in its entirety by all partners. Once finalised, the narrative can also be added to the website and handed out to potential partners. CM emphasised that the narrative needs to be in line with the CS and should be developed with the BAB Comms group. MB explained that Liz Bell is assisting with the narrative and will ensure that the two marry up. RM suggested that a new section is added to the narrative, headed 'What is BAB?'. This section should be the length of a two-minute spoken piece that can be used on the radio.

7. First Contact Checklist

MB explained that the First Contact Checklist (FCC) enables household visitors, such as fire safety officers, to conduct questionnaires that look at older people's requirements for disability access, social opportunities etc. This information is then fed back to BCC. BAB has been asked by some of the partnership to bring this forward from year three of the programme – one reason for this is that in areas that already have community development a mechanism is needed to link everything together, and another is that under the requirements of The Care Act BCC will have a greater responsibility to ensure that these kinds of initiatives are implemented. BAB may not need to spend £15,000 on the FCC this year – it is more likely that year one will be spent forming a task group including key people from BCC and WE Care & Repair, facilitated by a BAB staff member. CM stated that she would like to see representatives of the Multi Agency Group facilitated by LinkAge being included in this group. AC confirmed that the funding is 'test and learn' based, so it will be possible to bring the funding forward if needed. All board members were happy with this project being brought forward.

DC queried whether bringing this forward would mean that other initiatives would need to be brought forward in order to meet the increased demand for services. KR stated that it makes sense to start on this now as BCC are currently devising similar integrated systems, and it would be good idea to engage with the statutory sector on this to increase the likelihood of it being picked up after five years. KR also expressed the view that it would be best for the FCC to be led by BAB due to the anticipation of resistance from those at BCC based on the scheme trialled in 2010 that failed. ZH stated that the voluntary sector is already carrying out similar initiatives but without a checklist, so many organisations would greatly welcome an evaluation system such as this that they can use and adapt. ML noted that the NHS document 'Make Every Meeting Count' could be very useful for informing conversations. All feel that it's important that this is rolled out city-wide as services for older people are currently concentrated in particular areas. MB or RR will send out a briefing on the FCC to the partnership.

Action: RR to attend next Multi Agency Meeting to discuss further with BAB partners

8. Performance Report

RR explained that this is a new agenda item, which will eventually include a finance update.

a) Community Development

Lots of people attended the briefing sessions and sent over clarification questions, and the tendering process for both Greater Bedminster and Henbury & Southmead closed on 3rd June. (NB: we received two bids for Greater Bedminster and one for Henbury & Southmead.) The evaluation of the bids by the panels will now begin, and we're still looking for some people with experience of community development to join the panels. Successful delivery partners will be notified w/c 22nd June. BAB will be evaluating this selection process so that it can be streamlined for future commissioning. The next areas to be commissioned are Greater Fishponds and Ashley, Easton & Lawrence Hill. The CRs will begin asset mapping the Greater Fishponds area and the information gathered will help to inform the commissioning process.

b) Age Friendly City

George Ferguson has supported our aim to become an Age-Friendly City (AFC). A baseline conference will be held at the beginning of October 2015, towards the end of the Celebrating Age Festival. The main purpose of the conference will be to look at where we currently stand with regards to the WHO's AFC requirements, and what our next steps should be. There will be senior officials from BCC to present on the 8 key AFC factors (housing, social participation, respect & social inclusion, civic participation & employment, communication & information, community support & health services, outdoor spaces & buildings and transportation) and hopefully a presentation by Paul McCann from Manchester Council.

There will be an Age Friendly City strand at the Festival of Ideas, as well as a walking tour around Southville/Bedminster, which will entail participants filling in a checklist to assess the age-friendly aspects of the area. There will then be a presentation on the age-friendly developments in Bedminster.

BM queried how many UK cities currently have AFC status. RR confirmed that Manchester and Leeds are both AFCs, and more have been added since the requirements were loosened. MB thanked BCC for the funding to apply for AFC status. RM stated that representatives from Manchester will likely be very keen to help us; AC shared that a teleconference with representatives from Manchester has already happened which was very helpful.

c) CPCE

Since the last board meeting a project group has been formed, chaired by Phoebe Wishaw, BCC Social Work Manager. The first meeting will be held on 17th June and will be an opportunity for the project management capacity to be discussed and agreed – there is funding for a part-time post if it is determined that we don't currently have the capacity within the BAB team. Minutes from this meeting will be passed to the board. KR explained that Mike Hennessey, Director of Adult Social Care, is representing Bristol on the national CPCE board. DC queried whether 'Combining Personalisation with Community Empowerment' is too wordy and difficult to remember – other areas have better titles, such as Leeds' Community Links.

d) Aardman Animation

The animation brief has been agreed by the Comms group and sent to Aardman (RR shall send this to all board members for reference). Aardman are very comfortable with the brief and have worked with the third sector before. The following timeline has been confirmed:

Interviews with Older People: 8th – 19th June (20-30, of which around 6 will be used and animated)

Approval of Character Designs: 26th June

Final Approval of Animation: 7th August

Delivery of Final Film: 14th August

Launch: Celebrating Age Festival, 27th Sept

The distribution will be twofold; there'll be a 'local focus' version of the film shown in Bristol featuring a final screen with the BAB website and phone number, and a national version with the final screen featuring the details of an organisation such as Campaign to End Loneliness or Age UK National, who would fund the distribution. CM suggested that Silverline could be an appropriate organisation, or an anonymous helpline to make contact less intimidating. RM queried whether the film's primary purpose is raising awareness or signposting. RR explained that it is intended to be a positive spin on the traditional ageing narrative, encouraging people to take steps to reduce their loneliness.

An evaluation strategy for the film is currently being devised, which will be discussed at the next Comms group meeting on 7th July.

9. A.O.B.

CM queried whether the BAB website is currently set up for lonely older people to access information. RR explained that BAB is currently looking at making the website better fit for purpose.

All present felt the meeting worked well, though AC and KR felt the agenda was perhaps a bit tight and there is some discussion that will need to be picked up at the next meeting.

Date of next meeting: 28th July, 2 p.m. – 4 p.m. at Age UK Bristol