



MY LIFE A FULL LIFE PROGRAMME

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

REPORT 72/16

10 OCTOBER 2016

The purpose of this paper is to provide a summary of meetings with senior staff of the My Life a Full Life programme, outline the models for Town and Parish Councils' engagement in the programme and ask the Town Council to determine its position in regard to the ongoing discussions.

No. DETAIL

1) BACKGROUND

- a) Although the division of the Island into three localities as the basis for the My Life a Full Life programme's commitment to integrated delivery of the Island's health and wellbeing services with a local focus was established in June 2014, the Town Council noted at its meeting of 18 May 2015 that there were still no proposals for the direct engagement of Town and Parish Councils.
- b) The meeting resolved in Minute 67/15 that:
 - i) the Town Council believes that direct involvement of the Town Council with the South Wight Locality Team is justified by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment prepared for the town by Public Health as part of the Our Place Programme;
 - ii) asks its Clerk to prepare and present the case for that involvement to the Deputy Director of Public Health as the Public Health Lead for the South Wight Locality Team; and
 - iii) approves the Town Clerk's proposal of its Community Development Officer Tony McCarthy as the Town Council's representative in that regard.
- c) The case was presented to Anita Cameron-Smith, the Deputy Director of Public Health on 26 May and although her initial response was positive – *this is very timely. I will take to the South Locality Team Meeting on Thursday and report back to you after* – her email of 15 June instead proposed a different model that simply included Town and Parish Council as part of the voluntary sector represented through a Community Action IW staff member.
 - a) The resulting model of quarterly Forums in each Locality absolutely failed to deliver anything approaching community engagement and the Town Council's continued pressing of its alternative model was ignored until a meeting was finally secured with the My Life a Full Life Programme Director, the Interim Director of Adult and Social Care and the Chief Operating Officer of the NHS Trust on 18 July this year as reported to the 8 August Town Council meeting.
 - b) That meeting responded positively to the approach the Town Council had been recommending and opened the way for the sequence of meetings summarised in the next section of this Report.

2) MEETINGS

- a) *Meeting of 13 September*

The first of these took place at the Innovation Centre where the Mayor, Clerk and Community Development Office were joined by Freshwater's Clerk Michael Mills to meet with the Whole Integrated System Review (WISR) Director, his colleague responsible for transforming community services and Communications Consultant Claire Robertson.

It was readily acknowledged by the WISR team both that the existing community engagement arrangements had not proved fit for purpose and that achieving genuine resident engagement was essential to the programme's success.

The request for £5,000 to fund the activities of each of the three lead Councils was acknowledged and the following day brought a request for the Outputs and Outcomes that might be expected from that funding – they were supplied and are attached to this Report.
- b) *Meeting of 20 September*

This meeting was at Bembridge with the My Life a Full Life Director Nicola Longson and

Claire Robertson coming to discuss with our Mayor, Clerk and Community Development Officer and the Clerks of Freshwater, Michael Mills and Bembridge, Emma Goldring.

As the meeting opened with Emma Goldring saying that Bembridge did not have the resources to be the lead Council for the North and East Locality and she was accompanied by several Bembridge Councillors it was not only diverted but Nicola Longson tabled a different model for the engagement than the one we had discussed with her WISR colleagues a week earlier.

c) *Meeting of 14 October*

A further meeting has now been arranged to take place at Salisbury Gardens for Nicola Longson and Claire Robertson to meet with the Mayor, Clerk and Community Development Officer to discuss the respective models for securing community engagement through Town and Parish Councils.

3) MODELS

- a) The model tabled by Nicola Longson at the 20 September meeting is attached to this Report.
- b) Although the previous discussions are included in the Key objectives and outputs section of the diagram, the Community Partnership Group as the sole means of their delivery through the relationship with the Locality Management Group is discouraging.
- c) Our response to this model was set out in a document headed Community Engagement that was circulated to all those involved in the discussions to date on 22 September and is attached to this Report.
- d) That document both identifies concerns about the tabled model and outlines the alternative model that the Town Council has been developing since May 2015.
- e) Nicola Longson's response to it has been encouraging and it is hoped that the meeting of 14 October will provide an acceptable way forward.

4) RECOMMENDATION

Members are recommended to consider the emerging models and provide guidance for the Mayor and Clerk around their approach to the next meeting.



O (0 2

TO: CLAIRE ROBERTSON
DATE : 15 SEPTEMBER 2016
FROM: DAVID BARTLETT , TOWN CLERK
SUBJECT : MLAFL FUNDING OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES

The £5,000 funding for each of the three lead Town/Parish Councils will deliver:



Outputs

- 1) Agenda items for the majority of Town & Parish Councils in each Locality.
- 2) Preparation of printed and digital information on the Model for use by Clerks.
- 3) Visits to Town & Parish Council meetings as requested.
- 4) Appointment by the majority of Town & Parish Councils of a MLAFL advocate.
- 5) Initial meetings of advocates in each Locality by the end of November.
- 6) Bi-monthly meetings of advocates in each Locality thereafter.
- 7) Regular liaison between the three lead Town & Parish Councils.

Outcomes

- 1) Engagement with the MLAFL and WISR programmes by Town & Parish Councils and their communities.
- 2) Ongoing consultation by Town and Parish Councils on health and wellbeing issues with the voluntary and community organisations in their areas t 70 in Ventnor, for example.
- 3) Inclusion of MLAFL developments in the routine consultative arrangements Town & Parish Councils have with residents t a digital forum with 375 residents in Ventnor, for example.
- 4) Credible and effective community engagement mechanisms in each Locality for the MLAPL and WISR programmes.

Town & Parish Community Partnership Discussion



Key objectives and outputs

- Co-ordinate and lead community partnership group in each locality
- Output: Meeting in each locality with cross-section of community representatives
- Regular input and liaison with Locality Management Group to ensure two-way dialogue around community services (and across-island) gaps and opportunities
- Output: Attendance at Local Management Group meetings (and vice-versa) and regular liaison between the three lead clerks
- Co-ordinate, communicate and improve understanding across all Town and Parish Councils of My Life a Full Life
- Output: Appointment by town and parish councils of My Life a Full Life advocates in each locality by end Nov.
- Communicate, consult and engage with public on My Life a Full Life
- Output: Distribution of information and consultation materials, support with local events
- Working alongside Community Action Isle of Wight, put in place a mechanism to ensure people in each locality are aware of and know how to access other health and wellbeing services and are central to developing thriving communities
- Output: Continued delivery of bi-monthly health & wellbeing roadshows in each locality



This is a response to the meeting with MLAFL's Programme Director Nicola Longson and Communications Consultant Claire Robertson at Bembridge on 21 September and to the model tabled at it.

1) PREAMBLE

- a) There appeared to be no connection between the discussion we shared with WISR Director James Seward and his colleagues on 13 September and the consensus that we thought had emerged from it on the one hand and the Localities model tabled at yesterday's meeting on the other.
- b) The proposed Community Partnership Groups of that model look like an extended version of the one that has already been tested to destruction: failing to deliver either community engagement or effective outcomes.
- c) We understand that the programme might find Locality-based meetings of other agencies useful, but that is for the MLAFL programme to assess and convene should that be the case: what they will not deliver is community engagement.
- d) We know that community engagement is a significant element of the Vanguard prospectusⁱ and we believe that the model we explored in the previous week's meeting offered effective and innovative mechanisms for delivering it.

2) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- a) Road Shows, Exhibitions and extensive publicity do not deliver either community engagement or co-design of services; nor have the 18 months of Locality-based forums.
- b) The meeting in Bembridge provided an evidence cameo of what we know to be typical responses to the MLAFL brand, ranging from ignorance to anger.
- c) Effective community engagement in programmes requires residents to have access to accurate, relevant information in a context providing genuine opportunities to influence outcomes over a period of time.
- d) Community engagement is fundamental for Town & Parish Councils: they are directly accountable to the residents of their area, required by statute to be transparent in their decisions and actions and uniquely knowledgeable about the nature and needs of the communities within them and committed to working with them.
- e) The model we outlined at the meeting of 13 September for this reflects that understanding of community engagement and is based on our considerable practical experience of it.
- f) It provides for a group of advocates for the MLAFL programme objectives, one from each Town/Parish Council in each Locality, meeting bi-monthly to develop their knowledge of its objectives and the proposals for their implementation. The meetings will provide the opportunity to challenge and comment on proposals and equip them for their advocacy role in their own communities.
- g) A lead Town/Parish Council in each Locality – Ventnor (South), Freshwater (West) and Ryde (North) – will provide staff support to liaise with all the others Town/Parish Councils in their Locality and assist with recruitment of the advocates and the organisation of the bi-monthly meetings.
- h) A direct link for the staff member with the Local Management Group is an essential element of the Model as is the participation of members of that Group in the advocates' meetings.

3) FUNDING

- a) Each lead Town/Parish Council will need funding of £5,000 for one year's work on the implementation of the Model.
- b) The funding will be used to provide the staffing commitment and the expenses for the meetings including travel expenses to them for volunteers.

4) SUMMARY

- a) We hold that this is the most effective means for the programme to achieve its responsibility to ensure genuine, ongoing community engagement with the demonstrable outputs and outcomes previously submitted.
- b) It will be provide an innovative addition to the emerging Business Case and provide a foundation for actual co-design of the New Care Models.
- c) Ventnor Town Council is ready to begin implementation of the proposals as soon as the authority to do so and the associated funding are agreed within the My Life a Full Life programme.

New Care Models: Vanguard – developing a blueprint for the future of NHS and Care Services, page 5, support area 5: Empowering patients and communities – working with the vanguards to enhance the way in which they work with patients, local people and communities to develop services
