

**STRONGER COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP BOARD
26 NOVEMBER 2019
BOARD MINUTES**

Date	26 November 2019
Time	14:00 – 16:00
Venue	Ernest Saville Room – City Hall, Bradford.

Present	
Bishop Toby Howarth (BTH)	The Church of England Diocese of Leeds – Area Bishop of Bradford
Ian Day (ID)	Bradford Council
Chief Inspector Karen Lindsay (KL)	West Yorkshire Police
Professor Amir Sharif (AR)	University of Bradford
Bernadette Gallagher (BG1)	Resident Sub-Group member (Keighley)
Ann-Marie Smith (AS)	ACAP
Cllr Abdul Jabar (Cllr AJ)	CBMDC - Councillor
Helen Speight (HS)	Thornbury Centre – VCS Alliance
Javed Khan (JK)	CNET- VCS Alliance
Mahmood Mohammed (MM)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
Michael Frazer (MF)	Resident Sub-Group member (Bradford East)
Tina Williamson (TW) (Deputising on behalf of Sue Soroczan)	DWP
Tony Dylak (TD)	Royds Community Association
Did Not Attend	
Cllr John Pennington (Cllr JP)	Economic Partnership
Ikra Shakoor (IS)	Young Ambassador
Maryam Anser (MA)	Resident Sub-Group member (Bradford West)
Ben Greener (BG2)	MHCLG
Wahidi Shaffi (WS)	Interfaith Member
Manoj Joshi (MJ)	Business Member
Apologies	
Tatiana Zaituni (TZ)	Resident Sub-Group member (Bradford South)
Adrienne Reid (AR)	Incommunities
Hamaad Ahmed (HA)	Young Ambassador
Zahra Niazi (ZN)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
Sue Soroczan (SS) – Tina Williamson to attend.	DWP
Damon Boxer (DB)	Opportunities Area
Loraine Hughes (LH)	Resident Sub-Group member (Shipley)
Louise Keighley (LK)	NHS- Health
Peter Tate (PT)	Bradford Youth Development Partnership (BYDP)
Guest attendees	
Barry Cusack (BC)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
Neena Punnu (NP)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
Shehla Khalid (SK)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
David Holt (DH)	Thornbury Centre
Nicola Cockshott (NC)	DWP

Mark Clayton (MC)	Policy Officer
Cain Lewis (CL)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities
Hannah Rushworth – Minutes (HR)	Bradford Council – Stronger Communities

No	Item	Actions
1.	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>Bishop Toby introduced himself and welcomed everyone, then invited everyone to briefly introduce themselves.</p> <p>Cain Lewis read out apologies.</p> <p>Bishop Toby advised he was hoping to welcome Manoj Joshi as a business representative and Wahidi Shaffi as an interfaith representative; however confirmation of attendance had not been received from either individual.</p> <p>Professor Amir Sharif explained that the University of Bradford wants to play a bigger role in community projects and initiatives going forward. He also confirmed that all are welcome to visit the university anytime.</p> <p>Bishop Toby asked if anyone had any issues to raise/discuss from the previous minutes. All agreed that the minutes were satisfactory and were signed off by Bishop Toby. Bishop Toby also reiterated if anyone wanted to visit any of the projects it just needed to be arranged beforehand, as per agreed during the last meeting.</p> <p>Bishop Toby queried the name of the board in view of the Bradford for Everyone branding. Ian Day explained that Bradford for Everyone was the name of the Integration programme and the board would remain as The Stronger Communities Partnership Board.</p> <p>Michael Frazer queried when the board would have a Facebook page. Neena Punnu and Cain Lewis confirmed this is in the pipeline and as per the Programme Status Report it should go live in December.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Declaration of interest</u></p> <p>Declarations of interests disclosed: Bishop Toby - Chair of the Linking Network. Helen Speight - Thornbury Centre - Commissioned to deliver Bfd As 1 (previously known as Street Life) Tony Dylak - Royds Community Centre - Awarded controlling migration fund and within LEAP. Javed Khan – CNET - Community Conversations contract and Roma Strategy.</p> <p>An extended discussion around this subject arose during the meeting – Bishop Toby confirmed a conflict of interest should not prevent members from being on the board; clear conflicts must always be shared and may raise questions as to whether members remain on the board. However this would be a question of perception –</p>	

	<p>e.g. if a member stood down due to a conflict of interest this could be viewed as the right decision as the conflict is too great; or the wrong decision as the position on the board was only sought to gain a desirable outcome for the individual.</p> <p>Ian Day suggested it would be unhelpful in terms of continuity and stability of delivery if members were stepping down from the board throughout the period of the projects.</p> <p>Javed Khan explained that some members will always be conflicted due to their involvement with VCS. There must be clear protocols in place to ensure clarity and transparency in all decision making.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><u>Standing Items</u></p> <p><u>3.1– Stronger Communities Together – Impact Measurement Framework</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shehla Khalid summarised the Impact Measurement Framework, which was broken down into eight strategic outcomes. • A set of indicators is being developed to measure progress against those outcomes. • The aim is to enable the team to have access to up to date data at all times. • All methods of evaluation, monitoring and research are used to measure impact; including focus groups and interviews. (Bishop Toby acknowledged the type of work delivered by projects makes impact difficult to measure). • Shehla ultimately aims to provide a concise document detailing local and national data. <p>Ian Day wondered how robust in house monitoring was in comparison with IFF. Shehla confirmed it is crucial to collect the right data clearly showing impact in order to inform future projects. She also advised we need more qualitative in house data such as case studies to compliment the quantitative data available, which IFF research weren't collecting.</p> <p>Helen Speight raised the difficulties for community projects completing IFF forms when the main language is not English and workers are not permitted to explain or expand on any of the questions.</p> <p>IFF Research is due to visit on 03.12.19 and an upcoming visit from MHCLG – Bishop Toby stressed the importance of discussing feedback regarding the difficulties in completing forms during these visits.</p> <p><u>3.2 - Programme Status & Financial Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop Toby invited Mahmood Mohammed to summarise the programme status. He also suggested that any members who required further information regarding individual projects could request a separate session (1 hour maximum) in order to facilitate this. Action - Mahmood Mohammed and Cain Lewis to co-ordinate this. • Mahmood summarised the financial report and confirmed any underspend will go into the Innovation Fund, although all spend is currently on track. 	<p>MM & CL</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further explained Appendix B – 8.3; which shows a breakdown of costs to continue the work of the team and the projects which was approved by the Board. • Confirmed that 15 groups had been shortlisted from 32 bids for a grant (£15k maximum per project), from the second round of funding from the Innovation Fund. The bids have gone to board members and the resident sub-group for the final decision on where the grants will be awarded. The process will be open and transparent throughout to ensure accountability. • Tony Dylak said there should not be an issue with conflicts of interest if clear procedures are in place. So if there is a conflict during discussion of a particular issue/decision then the person in conflict should leave the room whilst the discussion takes place and that this is clearly minuted. Therefore voting has to happen around the table, not via email to ensure 100% fairness even if that delays a grant award final decision by a month. • Professor Amir Sharif also suggested that projects who don't win bids should be supported developmentally. In similar scenarios at Bradford University their communications are clear with the message that affirms – “it doesn't end here!” • Barry Cusack reminded everyone that residents of the sub-group were part of the original panel and therefore they would need to be included. • Following the discussion around round two of the Innovation Fund approval system it was decided that the process of online voting by the resident sub-group and board members should be stopped. It was felt that to ensure openness and fairer decision making we should meet around a table. This would allow us to talk about the geographic spread of projects and the added value they offer, this can only happen if we are able to discuss projects together rather than online. • The board decided to postpone the current process and asked officers to arrange a date for board members and People Together to meet at a convenient time to approve the finalists from the shortlist of 15 projects. • Board members were reminded to return their profile information in order for the website to be updated. • Members were invited to get involved with the Holmewood Working Group and to let Cain Lewis know if interested. <p><u>3.3 – Programme and Project Performance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mahmood summarised this report and provided an update on each pillar. • He pointed out that some projects have only just got started and despite a great deal of work going on behind the scenes to enable this it is not possible to provide impact data at this stage. <p><u>3.4 – Projects</u></p> <p><u>Bradford Literature Festival</u> Neena Punnu circulated a written report.</p> <p><u>The Linking Network</u></p>	<p>CL</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>Bishop Toby left the room before discussion of this item began due to conflict of interest as previously mentioned. Ian Day summarised the item requiring a vote by the board as per the document distributed to all.</p> <p>Ian Day asked the board if anybody felt strongly against; nobody did and then asked for all members to vote by a show of hands for each option.</p> <p>There was one abstention from the vote.</p> <p>All remaining members voted in favour of the board allocating interim funding to ensure that the project can continue to deliver.</p> <p>Bishop Toby was invited back into the room to re-join the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Discussion Items</u></p> <p><u>4.1 – Intercultural Cities Report</u> Bishop Toby requested this is postponed until the next meeting.</p> <p><u>4.2 – Project Presentation Sector Based Academy - Street Life Presentation</u> Bishop Toby requested this is postponed until the next meeting.</p> <p><u>4.3 – Economic Partnership Presentation</u> Mark Clayton delivered the presentation which included information on the inclusive economy and highlighted how a healthy labour market is critical in breaking the cycle of deprivation.</p> <p>The Pioneering Confident and Connected – An Economic Strategy for Bradford District 2018 – 2030 – Annual Report 2019 was given out to all members in attendance.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Close</u> Meeting closed with thanks to all attending from Bishop Toby.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Date of next meetings</u> Tuesday 25th February 2020 - 2-4pm Open house session - 12.30-130pm Venue: Bradford University</p> <p>Tuesday 21st April 2020 - 2-4pm Open House session - 12.30-1.30pm Venue: Bradford University</p>	