



Report of meeting between Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Panel and Chairman of the LINK's Governors held on 26 February 2010

Present:

David Dye, Chairman, LINK Priorities Panel
Lyn Gallimore, Vice Chairman, LINK's Priorities Panel
John Fletcher, Chairman, LINK Governors' Group

Also present:

Graham Hills, Operational Director, Kent & Medway Network
Sophie Swain, Project Worker, Kent & Medway Networks

Introduction

The meeting had been called to discuss future working arrangements of the Priorities Panel and working relations with the Governors' Group.

Process for dealing with issues

Various suggestions were discussed for improving the process by which issues were referred to the Panel:

1. Sophie was already ensuring that issues were not automatically sent to the Panel without the more obvious information being researched and obtained before the issue was passed to the Panel for adjudication. In this task Sophie was able to seek advice from Ray Harris, who had been nominated by the Panel for this purpose. In turn, he can seek advice from other members of the Panel. Alternative arrangements to this were discussed, such as all members being notified of every issue at the time when the issue is first received and suggestions for additional information/research sought at that early stage.
2. For issues that are filtered out by KMN, or those that are not ready to be considered, it was **agreed** that a report should be made available at each meeting on the current status of such issues.
3. John Fletcher indicated that he was keen to ensure that all issues being put forward were well defined and that it was absolutely clear what was being required of the LINK.
4. It was **agreed** that an action sheet be produced to keep track of issues.

Notes of meeting between Panel and Governors held on 26 February 2010

5. Consideration was then given to the decision making matrix. Each element was considered in turn and the following changes were proposed:
 - a. An issue can be rejected by the Panel if it is considered that the LINK is unlikely to be able to make an impact on the issue. This should be the first question the Panel should address before considering panel members' individual scores. If the answer is no, then the matter does not proceed to consider the scores of panel members.
 - b. The following elements of the decision making table be deleted:
 - i. Ability to impact within timescales
 - ii. Can LINK make a difference?
 - c. The element that relates to the impact on the community be split into two, as follows:
 - i. To what extent will those involved in the issue be affected
 - ii. To what extent will the community of Kent be affected.
 - d. Element (g) be amended from 'What is the impact on inequalities in health and social care / equality impact assessment' to 'Does this issue contribute to improving equality in service (provision to all sectors of the community)?'.

It was noted that the alterations at (5) would require a change to the LINK's Governance arrangements and that a recommendation for such change to its decision making arrangement would have to be approved at the LINK Annual Meeting in May 2010.