

Notes of SHA Central Council, Unite HQ, London, 6.7.19

Present: Alex Scott-Samuel (ASS) Chair, Jean Hardiman Smith (JHS) Secretary, Diane Jones (Acting Treasurer), Alison Scouller (AS), Brian Fisher (BF), Punita Goodfellow (PG), Kathrin Thomas (KT), Vivien Walsh (VW), Norma Dudley (ND), Tony Jewell (TJ), Vivien Giladi (VG), Tony Beddow (TB), Irene Leonard (IL), John Lipetz (JL), Mike Roberts (MR), Corrie Lowry (CL), Carol Ackroyd (CA), Nicholas Csergo (NC), Coral Jones (CJ), Chris Bain (CB), Mark Ladbrooke (ML), Jos Bell (JB), Brian Gibbons (BG), Judith Varley (JV) Meetings Secretary

Observers: Ken Smith (KS), James Gill (JG)

1 Apologies: Jessica Ormerod, David Mattocks, Peter Mayer, Nigel James, Katrina Murray, Andy Thompson, Steve Bedser

2 Minutes of previous meeting, 30.3.19

Agreed except that TB requested the comment by the Guest Speaker (Julie Morgan, Deputy Minister Health and Social Services, Welsh Government) 'no services (in Wales) are performance targeted' should be removed from the record

3 Update on the database

KS reported that Kal Ross (Liverpool SHA) and Fraser Booth had looked at this alongside KS. Kal had suggested developing a new system (expensive and would take time), whilst Fraser had thought amending the current system would be cost effective and had agreed to help with some of the difficulties. Both supported the valiant efforts of KS in sorting out the muddle he'd inherited. KS had now managed to sort and cross reference the membership, apart from the 150+ new members in Greater Manchester. KS favoured having a back-up server which would enable designated people to access the database, so it is no longer dependent entirely on one individual. TB asked for the pros and cons of a new system and to consider required specifications - matters like reminders, CLP memberships, follow-ups etc to be discussed and agreed. BG asked if an open source database might be available. MR proposed looking at the BT365 system as BT did all the background work and the system would be properly tested before it came into full use. Credibility had to be absolute, the spec needed to be written down, GDPR recognised and Greater Manchester issues properly resolved.

BF accepted the unusual issues affecting the Manchester database and its need to be sorted by the Officers before we could have branch elections. KS confirmed that there are no records for 75% of the Manchester members joining last year, although Manchester is by far the largest branch. ASS stated that other outstanding issues include the 7 month gap before a former paid up member can be considered to have lapsed; the cut off date for the 2018 Manchester membership 'surge' will be the end of October, so branch elections for 2019/20 could not be started until November. ML commented that some people don't pay the full fee and that should be properly documented. Ideally, someone should be able to pick up and run the system in future without the current ambivalences. In summary the issue is whether to have a new system or modify the current system by appointing two project managers to work together, KS being one of them. JG (auditor) suggested the cost would likely be in four figures. TB doubted it could be costed without clarifying the specifications,

and how it's to be linked to governance so as to be maximally useful. ASS asked the technical group to investigate the options and come up with a recommendation for the next meeting.

Notwithstanding the database problems, TJ wanted the SHA to have a November AGM. ASS then pointed out that the Constitution would not allow this since branch elections must happen 3–12 weeks before the national election process commences. December could be feasible.

4 Governance Review: structural options for the SHA

TB stated the structural options for the SHA – stay as we are or become a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG). His paper listed the pros and cons of both. Currently we have relative informality and becoming a CLG is a more drastic change, but one that befitted a professional association, and would require the current Constitution to be changed. ASS said this latter issue should be taken to the next AGM after the Governance Review group had considered all the options. He thanked TB and the group for their work. CB suggested the alternative of a Community Interest Company (CIC). This aroused considerable discussion; however, BF and TB confirmed that a CIC was regarded as an inappropriate structure for political parties and pressure groups.

TB reminded us that SHA has become a targeted organisation, the situation may worsen and in that event, we needed proper protection. **A vote was taken on the options of remaining an unincorporated association, or becoming a CLG: 6 voted for an unincorporated association, 15 for a company limited by guarantee, with 2 abstentions.** ASS thanked Central Council for taking this historic decision and asked the Governance Review group to pursue this matter further.

5 Delegations

JB raised the matter of the numbers of SHA delegates per CLP: ASS confirmed that up to 5 per CLP is permitted. One (unnamed) CLP kept asking to swap delegate names although some were not SHA members and had joined the Labour Party only a few weeks previously. Delegates to CLPs are there to represent the SHA on health matters. Much internal strife had been generated in consequence and the situation needs regularising. ASS thought that 6 months membership of the SHA and Labour Party were required to be an SHA delegate to a CLP; if there were not enough members to fulfil that, a minimum of 3 months membership would suffice. If someone steps down, we need formal notification. He welcomed JB's initiative and recognised that it was relevant to all branches. It should be brought back as an SHA policy proposal to be implemented in all branches and Labour movement organisations. PG confirmed similar problems in the North East. JHS commented that delegates could not be tracked under the previous recording system, but KS had now resolved that problem. TB suggested this issue required a revision to the Constitution.

6 Policy Development

(i) TB said we now had policy documents on Public Health, Mental Health and the Integration of Health and Social Care, with some plans under consideration for a policy group on Carers. Brief summaries for Public and Mental Health were presented.

(ii) TJ, who convenes the Public Health group, said policy ideas had been provided by many contributors following an earlier draft at the Cardiff CC. He had adopted a 'chest of drawers' approach – brief themed policy papers with references within them. It was unclear how policies would be pulled together at this stage but he had asked for concise information, stating why the policy is important and a maximum of 10 priorities in each. Planetary health, social and wider determinants, protecting and promoting health, air and drinking water quality are included. He wanted a strategic approach, 'public health in the round', inclusive of social, and cultural norms and the life course -eventually producing a 'top 10' policies. How could this be done? He would like branches to consider this current draft and feed it into their constituencies. His presentation and the document was widely approved; there was support for its going on the website, that healthy eating and green space should not be forgotten and intergenerational issues (currently being undertaken in Manchester schools) should also be included. PG wanted work in universities incorporated - like antibiotic use, the role of AI and where we're going as human beings. ASS suggested we adopt the paper as work in progress and thanked TJ and his team.

(iii) JV presented a brief summary of the Mental Health policy document to date. There are overlaps with Public Health and several delegates offered to contribute to this document from their different perspectives and specialist knowledge; these contributions are welcome. Please send them to JV. JG suggested getting some input from Trade Unions. VG publicised the Mental Health day conference on 28 September.

(iv) BF spoke on both the Social Care and Carers and Care policy papers. JHS and CA offered to help steer the Carers policy group. CA suggested Social Care and Carers had different agendas, she proposed JHS and BF as joint leads for the Carers Group and asked that the paragraph around English Integrated Care systems should be expanded so it was not about Integrated Care Providers, and therefore really about commercial contracts to the NHS. BG said the English focus neglected what was happening in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland where capital supports were about twice those in England, making much good experience available outside the commercial market. NC said the Labour Party view was to change to an Integrated Care policy. JL said JHS and CA must clarify the crucial importance and differences between informal (family / friend) carers and paid carers. He suggested organising a meeting with John McDonnell as he understands how critical this situation is. ASS agreed to do this.

7 Labour Party Conference Motions

Four had been circulated; these no longer have to be 'contemporary', and can be submitted any time after January. ASS thought the NHS and the Social Care motions could not realistically be composited. JB suggested the priority should be the risk to the NHS of 'vultures'. A vote was taken: 14 favoured submitting an NHS motion, and 11 a Social Care motion. It was pointed out this is an English problem, not relevant to Wales. After discussion of the two NHS motions ASS agreed to withdraw his motion. It was agreed that the motion from NC be submitted, with a small amendment – proposed by ND – to mention the need for active campaigning in support of the motion's objectives.

8 Secretary's Report

DJ and JHS are doing the Facebook page between them. The newsletter needs to be completed and there have been 11,000 tweets.

9 Finance - Acting Treasurer's Report and 2018 Audit Report

DJ reported that SHA's legal expenses in 2018-19 had been £4,000. The 2018 accounts had been audited by JG and ML who were thanked for their work and their report, whose action points had been referred to the Governance Review. JG asked about the costs of the CC meetings, and whether there were effective ways of reducing them - maybe reducing the numbers of meetings or the size of the Committee. Losing the Director and the Treasurer in a 6 month period was not ideal. Do we have objectives for the coming year? Could we have e-meetings? Should we have a Special General Meeting to verify membership? DJ asked for liaison with various officers, working parties and Labour Party organisations to fill out her report and asked to be contacted by e-mail. ASS thanked the auditors for their report and comments. It was good to know we had come through troubled times in good health financially and in terms of membership.

In general discussion, VG thanked the finance and audit reporters and agreed these were very heartening. She thought the CC was too large to work administratively, and the Governance Group should comment on its future size. KT thought we should plan for where we're going: Officers are overwhelmed with what's to be done. At the next CC we need to plan for next year. JHS commented that we don't have a Treasurer, PayPal is costly and ASS is the sole signatory (two signatories being essential). JB suggested access and inclusivity might be promoted by e-access. PG raised the necessity of ensuring comprehensive cover of the country and that video conferencing is not straightforward in practice. TB said the Governance Review was considering the size of the CC, and the employment of staff. A Company Limited by Guarantee needs a paid employee with a proper job description and also needs Standing Financial Instructions. This and several other areas of the Governance Review would require task groups.

VG formally proposed the adoption of the Finance and of the Audit Report; this was seconded by TB and agreed unanimously (with applause).

10 AOB

(i) JB spoke on knife crime in London. This is a serious public and mental health problem amongst young people, requiring police provision and pooled resources.

(ii) TJ repeated that in his view, SHA needed an AGM this calendar year to make a public demonstration that we are in good health with plans on various aspects of health and to develop as a company, notwithstanding irregularities in the Manchester group. JHS commented that we would be accused of undemocratic practices if we didn't include Manchester, as Manchester accounted for about 20% of the notional membership. The Manchester branch needs to be regularised urgently. ML acknowledged branch frustrations with delays, however, the priority is clarification of the database and it would look distinctly odd if we had a delayed AGM in November 2019, then another in February / March 2020. TB accepted the views of TJ and ML. We need to know the results of the Manchester enquiry, have its membership problems resolved and to be seen to be both robust and clean. BF suggested it was

not a technical but a membership problem. Only paid up SHA members can participate, lapsed memberships need to be seen to be dealt with fairly, but also to be well managed. KS said there were many 'members' who had never completed a membership form, so he has no concrete evidence of their status one way or another. PG said this raised essential legal issues; Manchester membership must be reviewed and the database cleansed. JG said a Special General Meeting as opposed to an AGM might be held, and all Manchester members could be asked to complete membership forms. KT asked whether ML and JG could offer options as to how we as a CC might move forward on this, but ML objected, as that is not an appropriate role for independent auditors. ASS confirmed that the officers would come back with firm proposals.

(iii) BF suggested we support KS in developing the database pending further information. This was agreed in principle, as the resource implications would require consideration.

11 Next meetings: (Confirmed later)

1 September 7th - Birmingham)

2 AGM - December 7th - London