**Big Local SW11**

**Minutes of Partnership Committee Meeting**

**Thursday 14 September 2017**

**10.30 am at Providence House**

Present:

Stephen Holsgrove

Helen Garforth

Marlene Price

Senia Dedic

Jane Eades

Sharon Grant

Syeda Islam

Robert Musgrave

Tessa Strickland

Helen Taylor

Also present: David Stone

**Next Meetings – 10.30 am Providence House:**

Thursday 7 December 2017

Thursday 15 March

Thursday 14 June

Thursday 20 September

**Other Important dates**:

**AGM:** TBA Evening Venue TBC

1. **Apologies for absence**Apologies for absence were received from Donna Barham, Wendy Speck. and Helen Taylor
2. **Minutes of the Partnership Meeting of 15 June 2017**Sharon asked whether it was important to mention, under Item 8 Discretionary Fund, that the murder was not on the Winstanley Estate. Marlene pointed out that the document did erroneously state that it did take place on the Winstanley when it did not. It was agreed that in a point of order the document presented to the Meeting was incorrect when it is fact it was the York Road Estate. The Minutes were then agreed as a true record.
3. **Matters Arising Not on Today’s Agenda**There were no Matters Arising that would not be on today’s Agenda.
4. **Declaration of Interest**Syeda declared under Item 10 Intergenerational Project that she is an Executive Member of WoW. Marlene reminded the meeting that in Syeda’s Register of Interests her position with WoW is listed and was always known.
5. **List of AOB**There was no request for any items to be added under Any Other Business**.**
6. **Register of Interest**As we start a new (Plan) year we are all reminded that an updated Register of Interest will need to be completed. Marlene handed out copies and a number of them were completed and returned. Stephen asked for copies to be emailed to those not present.

1. **Code of Conduct**Stephen stated that arising from a complaint to Local Trust we all need to be sensitive about our online activity and having looked at our Code of Conduct it became clear that we need to include some words as regards our social media activity. We need to be seneitive as without any contexualisation people can see things from a different aspect and could be taken as potentially contentious. Syeda commented that if there was a complaint then as a member of the partnership she should have been told. Sharon also agreed with Syeda’s comment and that she felt that she should also have been told. Helen and Stephen confirmed that it was headed off and did not become an official complaint and the matter was sorted. Jane stated that we should have a system that if someone has an issue there must be a way that they could raise this.  
     
   Stephen then shared some words with the Committee which were: *Partnership Committee Members must ensure that their online activity will not bring the Big Local SW11 Partnership into disrepute.* The members present all agreed that the Code of Conduct should be amended to include these words.  
     
   Stephen also reminded everyone that the Code of Conduct requires that no one should talk to the Press without recourse to the Chair.
2. **Introduction of Outreach Worker**Stephen stated that we are 99.4% confident that we have an Outreach Worker. We had invited her to be present today but last night an email was received that she would not be attending the meeting. Stephen further reported that she met with Robert and Marlene and some amendments were made to the contract to suit her working arrangements. Marlene then stated that her title will be that of Outreach Support and not that of Outreach Worker. She was a client of our Building Futures project and would probably see this as a step back into fulltime employment. She did have some very good jobs including that of a youth worker. David has met her and commented that she is a good listener, is local and knows the patch and would be strong support for him.  
     
   The Outreach Support will be engaged under a self-employed contract with Providence House on our behalf and will report to Stephen but through a delegation to David.
3. **Strategic Partnerships and Building Futures Project**  
     
   Robert initially presented an outline of this project to the last meeting. We have a group of willing partners to assist us to take this project forward. There are 5 key partners willing to bring in others to increase our awareness within the patch. Subsequent to the meeting David had a meeting with Sian Pinner from Local Trust who met with Timeka from Caius, Helen from St Peter’s, George from Carneys, Aaron from KLS and Esther from Providence. The timetable will be in stages and will need co-working to reach some concrete proposals. There are 2 issues: 1 Big Local SW11 will be on board and 2: costs. An amount of £25k per annum will be available for the group to spend.  
     
   Budget and Timetable: There is a need to identify a number of things that the group can work together on. Guidelines will need to be set. The Finance does not lie with them. The £25k is to enable these 5 groups to come up with another £25k match fund. the additional £25k pot is in case there is a key project that comes of out of the budget. David stated that the potential budget is £50k and that we are keen to work on the Health and Wellbeing that at the moment we cannot reach.  
     
   Helen asked for the names of those representing BLSW11. Robert said that he will facilitate the 5 groups. It was then agreed that there must be Partnership members independent of the project and Stephen wondered how we can all get involved.  
     
   Robert then stated that we have 5 groups willing to work together. Syeda stated that some clarification is needed. If we are providing £25k to facilitate the development of the partnership we cannot say that it is matchfunding. Marlene asked for some clarification as she heard £5k mentioned per group and were they contributing the £5k each to arrive at the £25k but it was confirmed that the £25k is the funding from BLSW11. It was then agreed that any discussion on the finances be postponed to the December meeting.

Going around the table Stephen asked all those present for their thoughts on the project:  
Syeda asked that if any amounts are not machfunded will how will they go on to raise the balances.  
  
Jane felt that we are not extending any influences to the person next door. She would like to see something about contacting individuals who are not contactable by organisations. There is nothing to say about the overall aims. All about the organisations working together but nothing about extending to individuals not in those groups.  
  
Helen thought it was a fantastic idea of BLSW11 being a catalyst glue for working together. We have a pot of money set aside for projects but she is concerned on the process and there is a need for more than 1 Partnership member on the group. On the finance side what are the other organisations contributing. What are they investing. They can contribute to part of the contribution pot.  
  
Tessa agreed with Helen’s comment. She sees this as building BLSW11 into the wider context and opening the partnership within their own groups and agendas. She sees the huge benefit where we can identify and share projects and is where BLSW11should be prioritizing our activities.   
  
Sharon agreed with the comments especially those that Jane has made. She feels that we must be targeting people who are not currently involved, the children, the people, how do we become more inclusive.  
  
Senia asked why Carneys – why targeting these organisations. Who has chosen the organisations and how do we determine who can be involved.  
  
Marlene was concerned about the allocation of the money and could see this as being a bunfight.  
  
Stephen then summarized the thoughts. He said that he felt that we liked the idea, it has legs and wings but we need more detail before we can pin it down. If we can get this right it will be very good. If not it will be a potential risk. We appreciate the amount of work that David has put into this. He proposes that we agree in principle that it goes ahead but the team must go away and work on the projects. A subcommittee of Partnership members of Jane, Syeda, David and Stephen will also be part of the project. Syeda suggested that Jane thinks of another project that we can do to address the points she has raised. Sharon said that a lot of people would like to get involved but they do not have access to be able to. Helen suggested that we share the project with block champions.  
  
Marlene then commented that unlike how some of the previous projects were presented she liked how we all had the time to discuss our various thoughts and concerns on this project, especially as it is a large sum of our annual pot and a number of other organisations included.

1. **Intergenerational**Wendy has emailed her thoughts. She felt that the Intergenerational Project proposal needs more work and a different type of expansion.  
     
   She suggested that originally our Intergenerational Project work was simply that and WOW were the implementers, rather than it just being a WoW project as such. Wendy has no objections to it carrying on as is, but we need to monitor better numbers involved, who they are paired with and to look at the outcomes for monitoring purposes then expand to different people of all generations.  As an example she noted that 185 residents of Haven Lodge mentioned, but believed that only a few actually take part and we would need to see how the others could be involved. Also we should have some feedback from the youngsters already involved and how their numbers are increasing and from where. Wendy is also aware that the Kambala Residents Association have now taken on some of this work.  
     
   An expansion of the project shouldn’t be more of the same, but an expansion of the whole idea of intergenerational work.  
     
   There have been several discussions on intergenerational work at the meetings, it’s scope and how we involve more than just sheltered housing, as well as expanding into different shelters, which she knew Helen T did recently.  
     
   Wendy also felt that we should look again at different options and getting groups to do different parts of the intergeneration project, so we can see more sustainability after we are gone and gave an example of where one of the local schools is doing a history project with older people on the estate.  
     
   Senia then stated that she has partnered with NCS to break down the “hoodie” perception. They are finding that their funding is reduced and will match fund and put in bids with other organisations. She stated that there were not health and safety qualified to door knock.   
     
   Jane felt that we should widen out. Recently a local youth was building his university reference and asked if he could help with the gorilla gardens. She felt that we are targeting the same kids, the same sheltered homes. She wondered about students applying to universities how they could help. We need to be getting outside of the sheltered housing.  
     
   Helen said that she felt it is a moving project decided on a strategic basis but we must make sure the wider partnership residents have links to become involved. WoW do not have the capacity, volunteers on the partnership and the Outreach Support worker can help.  
     
   Tessa felt that intergenerational work is valuable but the key word is strategy.  
     
   Sharon felt that there is crossover with Community Voices. She did not like the use of the term “hoodie” and asked is it was used as a brush to target children. We must try not to stigmatise when we look at the children and not only children wear hoodie gear.  
     
   Marlene stated that she does agree with Jane with her comments and confirmed that there are no health and safety issues if you door knock the elderly. Robert stated that intergenerational has not stopped and there is more to do. He is happy with the increase budgeted amount but more work is needed and more members should be involved.  
     
   Stephen then stated that in summary the project is great. We need to get a team together and help and focus on how we engage with the people. Syeda stated that it is the same comments being stated over and over again.
2. **New Grants**  
   Sharon presented the proposed new project. The small grants programme is not changing but is also proposing an Innovation Fund of £5k. There is £15k in the fund and Robert wondered if this was sufficient.  
     
   Syeda asked if we did not say that we would not continue with the small grants programme and should we not have tracked the people that we funded.  
     
   Stephen stated that it will be much more targeted, not money but can help much more relating to our plan rather than grants. Jane wondered how do we get this out to the people. There are projects just alongside the roundabout in Granfield Road but between Maysoule and Tours Passage where people are now doing gardening. How do we inform others. One criteria should be reaching out to those who we have not reached out to before. We need a broader agreement.  
     
   Helen asked in our plans how do we spread this. She agreed that we need to track and draw people in. We should use our networks to get the message out. We should involve the people that get grants giving a report to the partnership. Senia wondered if those who have previously applied can apply again.
3. **Year 3 Plan**The budget will need to be tidied before sending to Local Trust. This is the final year of the 3 year Plan..
4. **Falcon Road Festival**Robert stated that the Festival was very well attended and there were lots of positive comments. There were a couple of things that needs to be changed for next year. Wandsworth Radio is very keen to continue being involved. Marlene stated that there is a balance of just over £1,000 and that the accounts are not fully finalized. The full budget of £15k will be needed for next year. The accounts will be circulated when they have been finalized.
5. **Community Fitness**Project still active. A report will be circulated.
6. **Partnership Review**Marlene circulated the documents which we all had to complete. For those who were not present she will send copies to be completed and returned to Helen.
7. **Any Other Business**  
     
   There were no matters tabled to be discussed.
8. **Dates of next meeting**Our next meetings are all at 10.30 am at Providence House:
   1. Thursday 7 December with a possible Christmas lunch
   2. Thursday 15 March 2018
   3. Thursday 14 June 2018
   4. Thursday 20 September 2018