



Executive Meeting

24 January 2005

14:00-16:00

CNET Building, Room 2

Notes of meeting

Item		Action
1	<p>Present: Martin Baines – West Yorkshire Police, Gill Bowskill – Lkley CVS/Able All, Anthony Clipsom – Bradford CVS, Phil Cutler – BACC, Sue Gledhill – Community Network, Eleanor Green – Bradford NHS, Jane Gregory – LGB Network, Ann Griffin – Bradford District Women’s Forum, Roz Hall– CBMDC, Frank Hanley – CBMDC, Caroline Schwaller – Keighley CVS, Jenny Scott – Springfield Tenants & Residents, McMillan Serrant – ABCD,</p> <p>In attendance: Evie Chandler, Mick Charlton, Titch Kavanagh, Steve Skinner – CBMDC Community Development Policy Unit, Liz Hanney – Bradford Vision, Rob Mooney - CBMDC CDS, Chris Murdock – North Bradford PCT.</p> <p>Apologies: Sally Collins – Bradford Vision</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of last meeting Approved as accurate except Gill Bowskill did give her apologies.</p>	

<p>3</p>	<p>Matters Arising – Meeting on 20/10/04 Most items on minutes were on the main agenda for today's' meeting</p> <p>3.3 Attendance at meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It was noted that Pam Hardisty was not present. She has been replaced in her post. Rep from Vision on NR to be clarified. b) A list was circulated showing recent attendance. c) Need to clarify position with Vision. d) Some departments/organisations are now concerned for attendance e) Those elected and not turning up – role of elected reps to be looked at in the review.. f) Dave Rogers – over extended/not attended all year. g) Salma Yasmeen – no response to emails. 	<p>Write to organisations to ensure better attendance.</p> <p>Please give Evie any contact details.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Compact Delays caused by LAA work.</p> <p>Situation is now better regarding Council support.</p>	<p>Caroline, Evie and Frank will organise a compact development meeting.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>New proposal for allocation of NR Funding 3.4 Infrastructure Commissioning Sub Group BCP has been asked to respond with comments to Bradford Vision (by 31 Jan). Summary circulated on this for discussion. Different examples of how criteria applies were briefly reviewed.</p> <p>Main points in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New criteria is based on much smaller geographical areas – there are there are different options. • Bradford is unlikely to loose out due to the new criteria based on any option. • Concern that Central Government XXXX • Concerns that Communities of Interest are not addressed in an area based approach • Criteria for small grants in single community programme will be affected by this. • Concern that the language in the consultation document is not accessible • Concern about link with LSP performance. • Issues about borderline issues are not addressed • Will it tackle social exclusion? • Are issues of participation addressed effectively? Is this view XXX about distribution nationally rather than how its used at local level? • Welcoming XXX in liveability as addressing quality of these issues. 	<p>EC and CS will collect comments and email response by closing date</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Future of CDS Mark Caroline gave a summary of the current position with CDS in Bradford Council. On 11th Jan a report went to both Council Exec and Full Council. Over a period to early September a review will be carried out with proposals for future direction. Council Exec still do not see the council as providing front line CD services but that this should be commissioned out, with a strategic hub remaining to organise this. It will be a council review, not involving external bodies/advisers.</p> <p>Terms of reference and officers involved are yet to be clarified. It will look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What front line services if any should be based in CBMDC. • If not how best organised • Relationship with BCP and its secretariat role 	<p>MC Mark Caroline MF Mark Foster CS Caroline Schwaller</p> <p>MC to report back ASAP on support of BCP from CBMDC</p> <p>MC to report back on XXX of consultation.</p>

	<p>Budget is constantly XXX but savings still being looked for. Copies of the Council Exec report were looked at. Main points in discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will CBMDC consult with BCP in the review? Mark Foster said this is not open to ideas from BCP – yet to be defined – will also involve CVS’s – open to ideas from BCP • How will the review consider the wider context of community development provision across the district? MF. This review is its part of the patch work of the community development services. And will have to have regard to links with the voluntary sector based provision. The central support teams role will need to be based on some consideration of this. MC • Is cost cutting still the main priority? MF. This is not the main issue during the period of the review, there is not some incremental savings may still be made during this process eg where some organisations wish to move to ‘independence’. • Would a private enterprise be eligible to provide front line services? MF. No clear difference between voluntary sector provision and private organisations, if appropriate; this would be looked at as part of the review. • BCP would like to contribute views from its member bodies – from health agencies especially as having similar involvement in funding CD services; wish to be to be part of it rather than just react to (be part of the solution). MC welcomes involvement of health in the review. • There will be two layers to the review, a lead group and a wider group. • The review would not just “go for a chat” with BCP but would develop an ongoing relationship with the partnership. • The Department of CD&LL will still be dismantled from 1st April. CDS is destined for Social Services in terms of its department base. • MC As soon as terms of reference are defined the council will contact the BCP • CS concerned that the secretarial role is 	
--	---	--

	<p>continued during the review process. MC to get back to BCP regarding this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question of what the new 'policy' might be in the council executive report. MF. Could be an opportunity to include the compact however 'policy' is likely to be based in the issue of CD support • MF. Welcomed the process on BCP on its role in a changing content and its links with Vision. Relationship with CNET may need looking at. 	
7	<p>Local Area Agreement CS Updated on progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 sessions happened already, there will be a further session on 27th Jan. • Draft submitted to government office; safer and stronger communities section to be worked on. • CS concerned as CNET negotiator she is not trying to dominate; welcomes CNET's further involvement. • 'Safer' side based on safer and stronger communities existing plan. • Focus is especially on the infrastructure • CS asked government office for greater flexibility and time to XXX a response/develop new targets. • Concerned that traditional methods are only being used in measuring progress in strong community areas; it is a pilot and needs to use new approaches in some cases. • Concerns that the funding streams dominate the agenda; need for BCP to use its strategy on CD to inform the process 	<p>DECISSION</p> <p>CS's role as CNET negotiator was endorsed</p>
8	<p>BC Action Plan Will be looked at during the awayday .</p>	<p>Latest draft to be circulated</p>
9	<p>Awayday Helen Plats will be brought in to facilitate for the day. The day will look at past present and future. What achieved? What are the gaps? Relationship with other partnerships/CNET. Ideas from the membership for the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XXX • Our effectiveness and measurement issues • What is critical for CBMDE to provide for CD? 	

10	Commissioning TM gave a brief update on new set or recommendations being circulated with opportunity for representatives	Fuller update at next meeting.
11	A.O.B Firm foundations possible conference in May to be discussed at awayday.	