



# Meeting Minutes

## Board Meeting

**When:** 23 May 2019

**Where:** Meeting Room 1, Watson House, 54 Baker Street, London, W1U 7EX

### **Present (Board)**

- Paul Burstow, chair
- Mark Atkinson
- Mary McKenna
- Sean Holland
- Sue Gower
- Rachel Armitage
- Peter Hay
- Margaret Lally
- Katie Brennan

### **In attendance**

- Tony Hunter (Chief Executive)
- Ewan King (Chief Operating Officer)
- Pearl Sebastian (Head of Finance)
- Michaela Gray (Corporate Governance & HR Officer) – minutes
- Ryan Wise (Staff Representative to Board)
- Linda Jackson (Associate – for Item 4 only)
- Helen Norbury (Senior Business Development Manager - for Item 5 only)
- Pete Fleischmann (Head of Co-Production – for Item 6 only)

### **Apologies**

- Alex Fox
- Annie Hudson
- Bev Searle
- Eustace DeSousa
- Ossie Stuart
- Sally Warren

### **Apologies and welcome**

1. The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and in particular new Trustees who had recently been appointed and noted apologies.

## **Minutes of the Board meeting of 21 March 2019 and matters arising**

2. The minutes were agreed with minor amendments.
3. TH noted that with regards to paragraph 9, monthly informal calls are being arranged with Katie Brennan and he is keen to have a programme of activities tying into the Business Plan and Task Groups. TH also noted that SCIE is making use of some associate time to support this.
4. There were no matters arising not on the agenda.

## **Chief Executive's report**

5. TH presented his report to the board.
6. TH noted that Appendix 1 is a first draft organisational narrative and welcomed comments. The Chair advised the Board that text should be agreed in 2 weeks.
7. SG suggested that with a view to extending SCIE's offer, we need to look at the language and use terminology such as scrutiny, assurance, innovation, and impact, in order to connect with people working in Children's. SG added that "lived experience" tends to be used rather than "voice of the child".
8. ML advised that she would email over her detailed comments. BS noted the need to be clear about who the narrative is intended for, and added that she would also email her detailed comments.
9. TH advised that the finished narrative would be prominent on the website, and noted the need for SCIE to be more consistent in how we describe ourselves and ensure that our message is enough to resonate.
10. RA queried the phrase "non-proprietary" and noted the need to be careful with regards to IP. TH agreed and responded that this is in regards to the improvement partner work and conveying how we add value without occupying their space. There was a brief discussion around whether "enabling" or "collaborative" would convey this more effectively.
11. The Chair added the need for the final narrative to flow through the rest of the website wherever that is possible and easy to do. We need to articulate clearly who and what we are. The Chair asked for comments to TH by 7 June.
12. The Chief Executive's report was noted.

## **Business Plan 2019/20: draft**

13. TH introduced Linda Jackson, a SCIE associate working to coordinate and drive the business planning work.
14. LJ gave an overview of the draft plan and noted that the theory of change model had also been circulated. LJ stated that the green sections of the change model arose from SCIE's values and USPs; and the blue sections had been discussed with and contain input from the Senior Executive Team and the Co-production Steering Group, and are about people, culture changes, processes, and digital platforms. The model also highlights the three key areas which have arisen from SCIE's work, and link back to outcomes in the business plan. The second half of the model relates to what SCIE does externally and our offer to the four sectors of children's, safeguarding, integration, and improvement partner.
15. TH noted that SG's earlier points about language can also be applied here. SG agreed and added she found the section on the different sectors helpful.
16. BS noted that the engagement of staff is really vital. BS suggested there may also be something to include about an outward looking requirement, so we can understand what is happening externally and how to respond in a flexible way. This might help shape thinking. SG suggested adding a "for future" box to the foundations section.
17. ED suggested SCIE's evidence based aspect could be stronger. SH agreed. ED suggested the same could be said for SCIE being ethical, which is implied but not implicitly stated. ED also queried whether adults should be specifically mentioned alongside the other sectors. This was agreed.
18. SH suggested adding something about being agile. ML added that responding to emerging needs should capture and reinforce agility.
19. RW noted that being an evidence based organisation had also been brought up by staff, who are also trying to get their heads around what we do and how we divide work.
20. The Chair suggested that leading positive change could include more on leadership. The Chair suggested that this be kept as a live document and be referred back to. This was agreed.
21. BS added that the discussion made her think of SCIE's impact on the lives of people and on its staff, and it might be useful to highlight this. KB agreed and added she felt there is a clear link between high value and impact.
22. TH gave an overview of the business plan and noted that the 11 areas are a fresh look at the organisation and are not all priorities.
23. EK stated that coming out of the business plan are three Task Groups. EK is chairing the Business Systems Task Group which met yesterday and mapped out the business processes. This will enable us to look at margins etc at a much more granular level. The Methods, Standards, and QA Task Group will look at

consultancy, e.g. what our improvement offer looks like, what it entails and how we quality assure it.

24. MG stated that she is chairing the HR Systems Task Group and noted that while we have a HR framework in place, the Task Group is looking to tighten and enhance policies and procedures to ensure HR is linked more closely to the business plan, and to ensure a consistent approach across the organisation. So far the Task Group has updated the annual appraisal form to include the overarching business objectives to help staff align their individual goals more closely; from the appraisals process will arise work on PDPs and the wider organisation learning and development plan as we identify common themes and skills gaps; supervisions will also be linked back to the appraisal process and business plan; a new induction process has been introduced including a buddy system; the handbooks is being reviewed and updated; and workplace wellbeing initiatives are also being considered and mental health training offered.
25. MA stated that the business plan covers a lot of different areas and asked what capacity this would leave for any additional things that may arise. MA added that KPIs should be specific and measurable. TH responded that the plan is all encompassing and almost by committee, and agreed that some objectives could be more challenging than others. EK added that the performance report goes into resources and priorities.
26. BS stated that we need systems in place to know when to pause or stop work on something if necessary bearing in mind SCIE's finite capacity.
27. SH added that it might be helpful to produce a visual way of looking at delivery dates to ensure an even spread throughout the year. RA agreed and added an indication of priorities would be helpful for staff. PH also added that this would help staff get more involved and asked what the rules are for emerging things.
28. PH stated there is a cultural question about how the smaller organisation hangs together better, and asked what we as a Board are trying to influence.
29. ED suggested that it might be helpful for the business plan to include the relationship building work done by TH with other leaders. ED also suggested that there may be other key partners to be included under partnerships. ED added that with regards to risk management, it doesn't take much in a small organisation to reach a tipping point. ED also added that we would want anyone working for SCIE to reflect its values and ways of working.
30. KB stated she supported more transparency and thought SCIE had produced a clear vision. KB added there is a challenge about how we use this for multiple audiences. The Chair suggested this be discussed in more detail at a later time.
31. The Chair felt the annual plan is good, but there is also a need to look ahead to year 2 and year 3, which would help with phasing and financial planning as we will be constantly reviewing how what we are doing helps us reach the Board's target of a 5% surplus. The Chair agreed that we need to articulate what the rules are for off-plan items, and this should be included in the logic model. The Chair added that TH

and the management team need to consider ensuring there is sufficient headroom and what we would drop from the plan to add capacity for new opportunities.

32. MM agreed that we need to capture relationship building and ensure people understand why it is important. SG added that the potential for expansion on some of our offers could also be included, as we need to be able to seize the moment if something works well. ML suggested measuring relationship building through opportunities. The Chair suggested a metric based on conversion rates and value of work. MM stated she is not sure it would be possible to get that direct correlation with money earned. EK felt there is something around developing advocates externally, for instance through blogs. BS suggested describing measures as “leading and lagging indicators”. TH noted that we are much tighter than we used to be on building our profile, and it’s about getting the balance right to ensure effective use of time. The Chair stated that this would be discussed in more detail at the July away day, and we would follow up on the points about rules for off-plan items.
33. The plan was noted as a work in progress and colleagues thanked for their work on it.
34. ED asked if there is a plan to develop a 2-3 year plan. The Chair stated he would follow up with the management team offline.

### **Performance report (pipeline, finance, Audit and Risk Committee TOR)**

35. PS gave an overview of the Finance report.
36. The Chair asked that the Audit and Risk Committee consider the Risk Register during their next phone call. This was agreed.
37. EK gave an overview of Appendix 5.1. EK noted that we are growing a number of clients who are giving us larger pieces of work. In terms of capacity, we have short term support from associates, and three new Practice Development Managers are joining shortly. We have a good starting position for the year, but we will need to improve by autumn as work won in later months tends to be paid for in the following financial year. HN added that including the number of larger pieces of work is important as it addresses some of the challenges, e.g. uncertainty across the sector. HN also added that we could do more to consolidate our successes.
38. SG felt that this is the right approach as it gives a sense of joining statutory budgets in local authorities and is easier to cross cut.
39. The Chair asked if we know the extent to which work has more than a single year impact on SCIE’s income. HN responded that there is a lot of repeat business in the pipeline but there is also new work won this year. There is also a lot of similar work in the pipeline which is very promising and healthier than last year.
40. MA asked where the early performance in the graph has come from, and whether looking at the pipeline do we also need to look at how this matches with our phasing and timing in the business plan. EK responded that we could indicate when “highly likely” work is likely to crystallise to give a better sense of timing.

41. MM stated that SCIE has done an amazing job, and asked if we know about the work we are not winning and whether it comes back around and we ask for feedback. HN responded that we do request feedback but could do more to interrogate as a matter of course. EK added that we do have some categories but we could be more systematic. The Chair suggested that this be an offline conversation.
42. The performance report and need to refresh the Risk Register was noted.
43. KB gave an overview of the revised Audit and Risk Committee TOR. KB noted new content at paragraphs 19 and 20, and added that other additions were general housekeeping updates. The Chair asked how often this should be reviewed. KB suggested annually.
44. The Board agreed the new Audit and Risk Committee TOR and for it to be reviewed on an annual basis.

## **Coproduction Business Plan**

45. TH gave a brief overview of co-production, how it operates internally and externally, and generates income.
46. PF gave an overview of the pipeline and noted the targets are ambitious. PF also flagged the possibility of a Co-Production Quality Mark, and asked the Board for their thoughts.
47. ML felt this is a good idea in principle but noted her concern that a lot of organisations produce similar products. ML suggested testing interest and getting a sense of who is likely to buy in. PF responded that a small investment is unlikely to test interest, but NDTI have done it and think it is possible.
48. ML noted her concern about charging professionals to attend the Co-production Festival. PF responded that this year has been an experiment, and having aimed for 60 attendees we have been successful in getting 57 so far.
49. ML suggested that with regards to marketing, it might be helpful to speak at the National Care Forum.
50. MM asked if a professional bid writer has been considered. PF stated that a professional bid writer was used on the National Lottery bid. MM suggested looking into European funding.
51. MM asked if we know why we didn't win the bid with Southampton and Bristol. PF responded that it was very competitive so we bid in partnership, and received praise for our part.
52. SG stated that the Co-production Quality Mark might be of interest to umbrella organisations such as Age Concern. RA agreed and suggested we may also want to offer this to royal colleges alongside our accreditation offer. SH added that we might also want to consider approaching organisations who are struggling to meet

their commissioning targets. ED agreed and added it may also be helpful to look at CQC reports. ED also stated that SCIE's reputation would ensure this was seen as a good offer.

53. ED asked if we are demonstrating in an evidence-based way why co-production is important. PF responded that the evidence base is growing but could be more solid.
54. ED suggested approaching DHSC. BS agreed and added it may also be worth approaching the CQC itself. TH noted that the new Chief Inspector of Adult Social Care is Kate Terroni who we have worked with successfully in Oxfordshire.
55. The Chair noted that we should mainstream the co-production offer into the business plan discussion and think about where that sits with our other priorities.
56. The Chair felt that with regards to SCIE's pre-existing relationship with Kate Terroni, we need to translate that into something tangible.
57. The Chair stated that the Quality Mark could help organisations who are up for inspection and this could be something to discuss with Kate Terroni. It would also be helpful if she could back the call for more research with regards to NIHR.
58. The Chair added that if our part in unsuccessful academic research funding bids has been highlighted as good, we should think about how we can promote that.
59. The Chair summarised that co-production must be part of the core business and business plan rather than a separate discussion.
60. PH stated there is legislation in the Care Act being ignored including co-production, and there is something about the sector stepping up to the plate. PH suggested thinking about contacting ADASS or other similar organisations.

## **Board annual agenda plan**

61. It was agreed that the Co-production Business Plan be discussed in October.
62. ED queried when the long term plan would be discussed. The Chair confirmed this discussion would take place at the July away day.

## **Any other business**

63. The Chair noted upcoming Panorama episodes on social care. EK felt that it is good if we continue to be seen as a positive voice in social care. The Chair agreed it would be good to reiterate best practice guidance.
64. RW flagged general themes from staff as: the need to be more digitally savvy; capacity concerns for the progressed staff; and the buddy system for new staff has been very well received. MM asked for clarity around the need to be digitally savvy. RW responded that this is around the website and the need to be more up to date

with presentations and pitches. EK noted that a designer has been commissioned to look at our presentations. EK added that there has been a delay with website development due to staff changes, but this remains a priority.

65. KB stated that the Audit and Risk Committee will consider how to support the economic case for change for co-production.

**Date of next meeting: 18 July 2019**

**Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_