

**Better Start Bradford Partnership Board Minutes**  
**Thursday 18 July 2019**  
**Muff Field Wesleyan Reform Chapel, Tichborne Road West, BD5 8AN**

**Meeting Started:** 09.35

**Meeting Ended:** 11.35

**Present:**

Vipin Joshi	Community Board member (Chair)
Rosie McEachan	Programme Director, Born in Bradford
Talat Sajawal	Ward Councillor, CBMDC
Sarah Hinton	Board Member, Bradford Trident
Alex Spragg	Programme Director, Better Start Bradford
Tracey Hogan	Voluntary and Community Sector representative
Gwen Balson	Community Board member
Satnam Singh	Community Board member
Yaqoob Ayoob	Community Board member

**In Attendance**

Jenny Cryer	Assistant Director, Performance, Commissioning and Partnerships, CBMDC (in place of Mark Douglas), item 7 onwards
Gill Hart	Funding Manager, The National Lottery Community Fund
Gill Thornton	Head of Programme, Better Start Bradford
Josie Dickerson	Programme Manager, Born in Bradford
Jill Duffy	Implementation Manager, Better Start Bradford
Shaista Ahmed	Finance Manager, Better Start Bradford
Dea Nielsen	Research Fellow, Innovation Hub
Guy Dove	Programme Administrator, Better Start Bradford

**Apologies for Absence:**

Kev Taylor	Shaheen Khan	Marium Haque	Sarah Muckle
Ruth Hayward	Julia Elliot	Gemma Priestley	Ludmila Novosjolova
Zuhair Bashar	Duncan Cooper	Tabia Afsar	Mark Douglas

**1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**

Vipin welcomed everyone to the meeting, asked everyone to introduce themselves to each other and noted the apologies.

## **2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 20 June 2019**

The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

## **3. Matters Arising actions table**

Alex said that Julia Elliot is expected back at work quite soon. We can help to develop the sharing Better Start Bradford learning with integrated teams model involving VCS partners with the support we give to the Family Hub. It was agreed that this action point can be removed from the table.

The independent performance review of BSB is on the agenda for this meeting.

Alex confirmed that the satisfaction survey has been issued to all Partnership Board members. As of this morning there have been ten responses with the deadline being next week. A summary of responses will be given at our next meeting.

## **4. Declarations of interest**

Rosie mentioned her role at the Innovation Hub which is on today's agenda.

Yaqoob and Satnam are involved with Athletico who are a partner in an Innovation Fund bid which is also on today's agenda.

## **5. 'Getting to know you session'**

This was not covered this month but the agenda is fairly full. Josie agreed to cover September's session.

## **6. ESOL for Pregnancy end of contract review**

Jill confirmed that the ESOL for Pregnancy project's current contract, delivered by Shipley College, ends on 31 October 2019. The amount of the contract is £64K over three years. The contract review has been held and reports completed by the delivery partner and the Innovation Hub. An options appraisal was discussed at the Commissioning Advisory Group on 4 July.

Jill gave a summary of the project which is language courses for pregnant women with poor English to help them communicate and engage with their midwife. She went through the project's performance. The first progression criteria is recruitment which has been a challenge with a 'Red'-rating but there has been an improvement due to the project lead at Shipley College, who has worked hard to engage other agencies and improve referrals. Implementation is another progression criteria which is also rated Red with less courses being delivered than the target due to low numbers. Satisfaction is the final progression criteria which is Green rated. Very few satisfaction questionnaires have been returned but those women who did so really liked the project.

Jill pointed out there is lots of other antenatal education provision available, some of which Better Start Bradford funds. About one third of eligible women in our area have no or little English, but these also tend to be the most difficult to engage. Recruitment has been a challenge but initiatives like the neighbourhood project and the cascade model for

Personalised Midwifery should help. We are also doing work on antenatal referral pathways to our projects.

Jill said the Commissioning Advisory Group considered three options. Option A is to continue the project but with a service redesign. This will reconsider the outcomes we expect, the logic model and the theory of change. It will also look at ways to boost recruitment. Shipley College are suggesting outsourcing engagement to local community organisations and there is anecdotal evidence that this helps recruitment.

The project has good retention rates and satisfaction scores. The challenge has been recruitment and referral routes and Option A would include improving these. It would also consider supplementing the project with ESOL Stepping Stones, which includes parents of babies and toddlers and is volunteer delivered and well attended.

Option B is to look at alternative provision which would mean having to go to the market. Jill explained that other ESOL provision is about wider language development than just for pregnant women. ESOL for Health has pregnancy modules but we would be moving away from the original outcomes. We do not know if recruitment would be any better with other ESOL provision.

Jill confirmed that Option C is to decommission the project and then we would consider what else we might want to deliver instead.

The Commissioning Advisory Group have recommended Option A. Jill asked for queries and comments and Yaqoob asked if the women recruited were all from the BSB area and it was confirmed that they were.

Talat noted there is lots of other antenatal education provision and queried the timing of the project, with pregnant women having better things to do and they may already have children. He suggested funding an ESOL course after the birth and running a creche alongside it and said that the service users would rather have an interpreter sat with them than go on the project as it stands. Talat said it takes several months to learn another language and most antenatal provision has low recruitment. Jill took the point but observed that we do not know why pregnant women do not engage with the project. She explained that ESOL for Pregnancy is not really a course for pregnant women to learn English, but to enable them to communicate their wishes and choices to health professionals.

Dea confirmed that ESOL for Health and ESOL Stepping Stones have more options. ESOL Stepping Stones allows volunteers to run courses for mums and dads and they can bring children along, and the course teaches common terms. ESOL for Health includes pregnancy, women's health and early childhood.

Gwen remarked that ESOL for Pregnancy is about confidence building and this was not clear from the paper. Recruitment is about building trust and as Shipley College are already using community organisations for engagement elsewhere, she queried why this was not happening yet for ESOL for Pregnancy. She felt we were going around in circles and it showed a lack of foresight.

Gill Thornton observed that we are already funding ESOL Stepping Stones via Parents in the Lead and we could fund a lot more delivery. We cannot appoint Shipley College to run ESOL for Health – it would have to go out to tender with that process leading to a delay of up to a

year. We do not know if ESOL for Pregnancy is working but she confirmed its aim is to get pregnant women familiar with terminology and is not so much about learning English and the courses is delivered by a midwife. Recruitment has been disappointing but eight years ago there were far more midwives to do referrals than now.

Tracey asked for more details about option A and Jill confirmed it would involve Shipley College sub-contracting with local community organisations and delivering ESOL Stepping Stones alongside ESOL for Pregnancy. We are already funding ESOL Stepping Stones via Parents in the Lead.

Tracey said in her experience if a VCS provider had not met its targets for three years then they would not be asked to continue. She raised advertising, the name of the project, promotion of it and what the posters looked like. Her workplace works well with Shipley College but Tracey's team do all the recruitment for them. Other organisations do the recruitment as well and it does work and Jill confirmed that this is the model we are now suggesting.

Gill Thornton confirmed, in response to a query from Gwen, that the project does include funding for creche provision and childcare although it has proved hard to do due to the small numbers. Sarah asked if funding is available for recruitment by sub-contractors and Gill Thornton confirmed that it is.

Gwen recalled that she had observed an ESOL course where there was no creche and children being present was distracting. Satnam said communication from the hospital then beyond is important and he agreed that pregnant women have other priorities.

Rosie suggested that sub-contracting could lead to a risk of diffusion of responsibility and asked who would be accountable for recruitment and getting the right data. Jill said Shipley College would be accountable for both and the contractual terms are clear in relation to this. Gwen remarked that asking the opinion of organisations who have already recruited for Shipley College would be useful.

Talat asked if the sub-contracting would mean the project would cost more and Jill said it may do. We need a service redesign, including asking sub-contractors and we would have a different model. The Partnership Board would have to approve a significantly higher budget. Guy asked if there is an underspend on this project that could be used and Gill Thornton confirmed that there is. We would be in a position to pay for the recruitment and see this as an element of the wider engagement work.

Tracey confirmed that her workplace do all the recruitment, and arrange venue hire, facilities, creche provision and refreshments and split the costs with Shipley College. Jill said we would need to cost out the model including use of underspend, think through the sub-contracting and bring the project back to the Partnership Board for information, including funding ESOL provision after birth. If there is an increase in budget that is sufficiently high enough the Partnership Board would have to give its approval.

Vipin said this was an instruction to go and negotiate and this project is about empowering women and we do need it.

**Decision: The Partnership Board agree to take Option A, to recommission ESOL for Pregnancy with a review of service design and implementation, noting all the comments and views above.**

## **7. Innovation Fund applications**

(confidential item)

**Decision: The Partnership Board agrees the following:**

- **Womenzone's application is approved subject to agreement to develop a more detailed description of activities, monitoring and evaluation plans and revised budget**
- **The Sharing Voices proposal for Resilient Dads is approved subject to agreement to develop a revised description of activities, monitoring and evaluation plans and a revised budget**
- **The ChildsSide Older Yet Wiser course for grandparents is approved**
- **Inclusion of the Habit intervention is included as part of MECOSH, subject to formal agreement by MECOSH and revised budget**
- **The BSB team will continue to support Horton Community Farm,**
- **All decisions to fund Innovation Fund Projects to be submitted to the National Lottery Community Fund for authorisation (or not)**
- **The Partnership Board instructs the team, led by Gill Thornton as Head of Programme, to review this first round of the Innovation Fund, highlight lessons learned and return to the Commissioning Advisory Group and Partnership Board in October to agree any changes prior to the next round (scheduled to start in January 2020).**

## **8. Innovation Hub annual update and proposal**

Josie presented the Partnership Board with an update of the work undertaken to date and then outlined the Innovation Hub's proposal for the second phase of the BSB programme, Years 6 to 10 as their current contract only covers Years 1 to 5, ending 31 March 2020. Currently the research teams are split by BSB outcomes but now there is now an opportunity to restructure and refocus.

Josie gave a presentation covering the highlights of the last four years. She is very proud of BiBBS with over 2,000 people recruited (although with less success at recruiting partners) who originate from all over the world speaking over 50 languages. BiBBS is making a difference already with lots done regarding system change and Bradford leading research in early years and the work towards having a single child record.

At this stage in the BSB programme the Innovation Hub need to think about sustainability, the aims of the National Lottery Community Fund and consider feedback from the projects. Josie proposes having three monitoring and evaluation workstreams, for data quality, BiBBS and evaluation. There will also be teams for community engagement, systems change and knowledge translation and dissemination.

Currently the Innovation Hub have one data analyst for 20 BSB projects and they propose recruiting a second data analyst. They also want to have an implementation coordinator which

would be a new joint role with BSB. For evaluations, research fellows would work across projects and see how they interact with standard services. BiBBS will continue to be important.

In community engagement, the focus will change to what type of projects families want. Sustainability would come under the knowledge translation and dissemination area.

Josie explained that Born in Bradford have pulled in a lot of extra funding in addition to what they receive from BSB e.g. from the Nuffield Foundation and the UK Prevention Research Partnership.

Talat asked about data and what we are seeing and if there is any evidence of improvement regarding child outcomes. Josie said putting together the national data dashboard has been very complicated but it is due in September and we should be able to see if trends are moving. It is hard to say at this point though and things may get worse before they get better. Rosie added that BSB are in full implementation now and we may only be able to identify improvement when the child reaches age 5 or starts school so currently it is too early to say for the children and families we are working with. Josie noted that her team can provide a trends over time report to the Partnership Board.

Jill said the data dashboard survey will ask the Partnership Board what they want to see from it. Talat raised community readiness and asked how we know what BSB families want. Josie replied that we can see if people turn up to our projects and low recruitment may be due to projects or the referrals. Rosie recalled that we had to say what projects would be in the bid which was arrived at following extensive consultation but Family Nurse Partnership may be an example of when the Partnership Board have had to say that something is not working and this may occur again with projects in the future.

**Decision: The Partnership Board agree the proposed plan and structure for the Innovation Hub for the five years from April 2020 to 31 March 2025.**

## **9. Year 4 final accounts**

Shaista presented the accounts to 31 March 2019. There was a £400K overspend at 31 March 2019, split between the team (£97K) and projects (£303K).

The main reasons for underspends on the team include salaries (leavers and gaps before replacements are recruited), Learning Together (£17K) and the Area Wellbeing Survey. For SystemOne purposes we had budgeted to purchase eleven laptops but we only bought three. The Area Wellbeing Survey relates to the ethnographer and we estimated a £30K cost but this overlaps over two financial years and only £19K came under the year to 31 March 2019. Shaista confirmed we do look for ways to make savings.

Shaista explained that for projects, underspend is just for this 12 months and other underspends were carried forwards from previous years. Family Action Perinatal Support show an overspend but this came from the use of underspend in previous years which allowed them to fill a need by recruiting central and eastern European engagement workers.

The Finance and Audit Sub-Committee considered the accounts and reports last week. Vipin said that as a result future reports will show more history in them.

Jenny raised the underspend on conferences and community support/engagement and said instead spending on these should be maximised. Gill Thornton confirmed that this is the purpose of underspend plans and a business case for the use of underspend could be signed off by Alex or herself and not have to go to the Partnership Board.

**Decision: The Partnership Board notes and accepts the accounts to 31 March 2019.**

#### **10. Independent review of BSB's performance**

Alex explained that the paper in the agenda pack is the same as the one presented to the June meeting, at which we could not make a decision due to being inquorate. The suggestion to have an independent review of BSB's performance came from the May Partnership Board. The paper suggests the scope of the review and we have received no further feedback since the last meeting and there have been no changes except for the timescales having slipped due to the delay.

Jenny felt that the purpose of the review needs to be stated very clearly. Josie said that similar objectives were used for a review of the Innovation Hub which was useful.

**Decision: The Partnership Board agree that an independent review of BSB's performance be carried out.**

**Action: BSB to draw up a contract brief and advertise the opportunity to potential reviewers.**

#### **11. Warwick National Evaluation**

Gill Hart said the National Lottery Community Fund have reviewed the national evaluation. This was commissioned at the very start of the programme and it was necessary to review whether what was proposed remained fit for purpose. A Better Start is a test and learn programme for the National Lottery Community Fund as well as each site, and at the commissioning stage they had limited understanding of which sites would be selected and how the evaluation would fit in with the work being done in those successful areas. As things have progressed, timescales and priorities have changed. They have reviewed the national evaluation plan, which is a significant cost, to see if it provides what they want.

After the review, the National Lottery Community Fund have agreed to change the original form of the national evaluation. There has been a pause, and now they have decided not to commission such a large cohort study. A different way forward is needed and although the national evaluation is still going ahead, the Fund need to make sure they get the best value. The national evaluation needs to show whether ABS has worked and gives better child outcomes. The aim is for ABS to improve outcomes for babies and children but if ABS makes no difference, the evaluation needs to pull out the learning from this so that it can inform services and approaches going forward.

The National Lottery Community Fund do not want a national evaluation which uses the wrong method, asks the wrong questions and tells them nothing. They will work with all sites and stakeholders to develop it.

Rosie asked Gill Hart if they will be working with the same provider and it was confirmed that they would be. The aims of the evaluation have not significantly changed. The timescales for

a full commissioning process would be a concern. Gill Hart confirmed that there is learning from the Warwick Consortium in the implementation evaluation.

## **12. Programme Monthly Report**

Jill confirmed we have commissioned two lead organisations to deliver the neighbourhood project (West Bowling Advice Centre and BD4 Community Trust). We have also retained £100K to deal with any engagement gaps which may emerge. Contracting meetings will take place next week at which we will discuss set-up. We are renegotiating with West Bowling Advice Centre as we want a reduced service from what was in their tender.

Gill Thornton clarified that the oral health proposal in objective six on the first page of the report is complimentary to that offered by Leeds Dental School. In section 2.2 of the report, we are doing the School 2 School system to contact families with young children directly in conjunction with Family Hubs.

The visit from Clarissa White of the Warwick Consortium went well and Gill Thornton thanked all who had helped with her visit.

In item 3.3.2, Gill Thornton confirmed we have extended the deadline for Parents in the Lead applications as none were received by 30 June. There may need to be publicity, case studies and open days.

Gill Thornton noted that the Big Little Moments campaign is very active.

Talat noted that all the projects rated as 'Red' in section 3.2 of the report are antenatal ones and he asked if we are offering too much and affecting other antenatal programmes. Josie said low attendance at antenatal education is an international problem. Jenny suggested asking people why they are not attending via community engagement and Alex said this would be done via the neighbourhood project.

Alex explained that there is a wider piece of work about the antenatal offer and referral routes. Gill Thornton noted that HAPPY has an action plan regarding referrals of women with high BMI and only a fraction of pregnant women are eligible and it is not seen as 'normal' to attend antenatal classes. However there is research that it does improve birth outcomes which is why we do it. She confirmed the only reason Personalised Midwifery is rated as Red is that we have not yet agreed the finances.

Gwen asked if we are seeing the same women going to the same antenatal programmes and Jill said our projects are designed to recruit different women. It would be possible for a woman to go on all three antenatal projects but Josie confirmed that if they accept one programme they will not be offered another.

Gill Thornton raised a request from St Matthew's Primary School to send a representative to our Commissioning Advisory Group meetings for 12 months. This will help them to achieve the Wellbeing Award for Schools and enable the group to test the value of having a school representative. The terms of reference for the group allow for community representation.

**Decision: The Partnership Board agree that a representative from St. Matthew's attend our Commissioning Advisory Group meetings for 12 months.**



Alex reported that the interim Community Engagement Co-ordinator post has been extended for six months towards the end of 2019 to help with the set-up of the neighbourhood project.

### **13. Any other business**

Jill confirmed the national data dashboard will be released in September and the Partnership Board and the Commissioning Advisory Group will be asked what they want it to show (and also for the local data dashboard). There will be an online survey sent to the Partnership Board about this after the satisfaction survey. She asked all to complete this and explained that there will be a short timeframe. Gill Hart observed that the national data dashboard may not be able to show everything and the five ABS sites have been set up in very different ways.

Rosie thanked all who had participated in the air quality consultation. The Area Wellbeing Survey is piloting with 100 families next week and the one after and soon all 2,000 families will be contacted. She also mentioned the Science Festival this weekend.

Alex reminded all Board members to respond to the satisfaction survey.

Finally Vipin asked if everyone had felt they had an opportunity to contribute to this meeting and all agreed that they had. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and Muff Field Chapel for hosting us.

### **14. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting is on Thursday 12 September 2019 at the Mayfield Centre, starting at 5.30 pm.

The meeting closed at 11.35 am.