Healthwatch Oxfordshire Board of Directors

Date of Meeting: 24th November 2015	Paper No: 8

Title of Presentation: Minutes of the Project Group meeting held on 10th November 2015

This paper is for	Discussion		Decision		Information	x

Purpose and Executive Summary (if paper longer than 3 pages):

Financial Implications of Paper: Funding of external projects totalling £13,590

Action Required: The Board is asked to:

- **note** the minutes of the Project Group

Author: Carol Moore

Title: Project Fund Sub group notes	
Date: 10.11.2015	**Time:** 2.00 – 4.00pm

Venue: Whichford House

Chair: Tracey Rees	**Minute taker:** Carol Moore

Item	Description
1	**Welcome and apologies** Tracey Rees (TR) opened the meeting and welcomed Caroline King (CK), Rachel Coney (RC) and Carol Moore (CM) to the meeting. CM gave apologies from Richard Lohman (RL). Eddie Duller (ED) sent a note that he would be a few minutes late
2	**Declarations of interest** None registered
3	**Notes of the last meeting (02.09.15):** • Accepted as an accurate record – no matters arising • RC gave an update on the Dignity Event, and read some of the positive feedback received. The group was pleased to receive the feedback and congratulates the team on their efforts
4	**Project Fund – Consideration of current applications** General comments: • Pleased to see that 3 of 5 applications came from organisations who had attended a • Suggest running that workshop again should we have further funds available – it was a good way of building skills. • The decision-making tool prepared by Kanika Lang was seen as very useful and put a context to the lengthy application. RC asked if we could add a column briefly summing up the project. • RL had sent in his thoughts on the fund over the phone, and recommended that we follow the staff team's assessment of the projects **Refugee Resource** • Feedback was that it was a thorough project with a clear target group, audience for eventual recommendation and clear assessment of risks. • Right organisation to do the job • **Group unanimously supported this project** ED arrived at the meeting

	Restore • A good application – and credit to Restore for the work they are doing locally • Given the strength of the other applications, and that we've done work on mental health recently it's not top of the list • RC mentioned that the project seemed mostly to cover the evaluation of their core business. As they must be contractually obliged to monitor these things, it isn't the most appropriate use of the project fund. • **In light of the above the group consensus of the group is not to fund this project** **Sportsbox** • TR stated it was difficult to pull out of the application what the project would cover. • ED found it difficult to understand what the project was looking at • **The group recommends not to fund this project** **Oxford Against Cutting** • An excellent and clear project with a very seldom heard group. The methodology being tested seems like a good project for us to be involved in. • RC mentioned the change in law requiring professionals to report to the police any disclosure of FGM. Wondered how this might affect the project in terms of methodology, the safeguarding processes or the officers conducting the research. • TR asked if we could have a breakdown of staff costs either by day rate or by activity • **Once the group is assured the project is feasible given the change in law, the group would like to recommend we fund this project** **Cruse Oxfordshire** • Strong application from an organisation that is small and run primarily by volunteers • **Group recommends this project is funded.** Therefore the project group gave unanimous approval of the staff team's recommendations subject to the viability of Oxford Against Cutting's project. CK asked that thanks were passed on to Kanika for the notes of guidance.
5	**Child Sexual Exploitation Project** • CM presented a paper outlining the timeline of the project. Due to time pressures on key workers it was recommended that we not continue with this project at this time. • ED – understood the timing pressures – it's a project that needs to be done, but perhaps is something for the future • TR mentioned it was an important project, which should be done by an independent organisation not commissioned by the council or the policy. If not now, keep in mind for the future. • RC – supported the recommendation that we not carry on at this time. • CK with so much activity occurring in this area it's not surprising that the timing is important

	The group recommends that we revisit this project in 12 months' time, to see if the ground has changed in this area. Agreed to offer ¼ or £500 of the fee to the national working group for work already completed.
6	**CRM project update – Verbal update** CM gave an update on the staff team's work to use the CRM. We held a training session for all staff with Healthwatch England on site. Their update to the system resolved many of the issues that the staff team had with the site's usability. A project plan to prepare us to go live with the updated system is in place. We should have our first CRM reporting for the end of 2015-2016 Q4.
7	**AOB** RC presented the updated Terms of Reference. With the addition of 'role of the group' point h) the group approved the terms of reference. ED mentioned how valuable the work we do with the voluntary sector is and asked how we communicated with them. RC explained that Kanika Lang was having several networking meetings with local groups. We also communicate to them through our mailing lists, events and newsletters and network meetings which we attend. TR asked if we are doing any work with veterans. RC explained a formal letter was sent after a meeting with veteran groups earlier this year. ED asked if it was possible to have detailed costings with all new projects when they are proposed.
8	Close