



## Nottingham City Local Involvement Network LINK Processing Issues Working Group

29<sup>th</sup> April 10am to 12pm  
Unit E2 Southglade Business Park,  
Cowlairs, Nottingham, NG5 9RA

**Present:**

Laura Marano-	LM
Martha Highton-	MH (Minutes)
David Turner-	DT
Barbra Venes-	BV
Alan Humberstone-	AH
Nettie Johnson-	NJ

	<b>Actions</b>
<p><b>1. Welcome</b> LM welcomed everyone to the meeting, and BV chaired the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>2. Prioritizing issues</b> LM explained that the meeting today is to decide how the City LINKs will prioritise and process issues.</p> <p>AH enquired as to how many major issues the City LINKs had so far and LM explained that as yet there is one major issue surrounding physiotherapy, as there has been no process it has not been possible for City LINKs to constructively ask for issues but have been making people aware of what the LINKs does. Also that County LINKs has had a consultation event which as yet the City has been unable to organise.</p> <p>LM showed the group the processes which the County use for prioritising issues. Everyone looked at the 'Prioritisation of issues process.' NJ enquired as to what City LINKs has been doing as there have been no consultation events, stands, events etc. LM explained that the team has attended various events across the city by having a LINK stand. However, larger events particularly consultation events have not been organized due to delays in company registration and the election of the Board of Directors – to make effective budget decisions. It is important for the processing issues systems to be in place so that when consultation events are planned and the City LINK launch event takes place there are clear processes in place to address issues raised.</p> <p>AH suggested having an open meeting for people to come and tell us the issues surrounding health and social care, and also having press releases.</p> <p>LM stated that the board needs to be sorted so that decisions can be made, and there is an effective way of processing complaints. BV suggested having a panel that can see how they want the prioritising to work. LM suggested having a group of 4/5 people looking at issues coming in then that panel will change every couple of months to ensure that no bias decisions</p>	

<p>are being made.</p> <p>Everyone looked at the suggested process and it was decided that it would go to the selected panel first, then go to the LINKs team for research, then back to the panel to make a decision on whether to take it further and then to the Executive Board. <b>LM to adapt the original processes.</b> NJ also states that if the LINK is unable to deal with an issue then it can be signposted to an appropriate organisation.</p> <p>The group also looked at whether to group issues into themes similar to how the County groups their issues. <b>LM to change Children/Young People Social Care to Adult Social Care.</b> It was decided that they would put it themes when numerous issues arise.</p> <p>LM stated that it needs to be decided whether the scoring system will be put in place or the questions, she thinks that the questions are often quite open ended so believes it would be more effective to have both. AH states that there should be enough expertise in the group that it would not be necessary to have a scoring system.</p> <p>BV states that she dislikes the idea of the scoring system as it is scored by numbers and one person can have an issue and it is still important. LM replies saying that the LINKs is not an individual complaints service but is there to address community concerns and there are equality and diversity sections to make sure all groups are represented and not just prioritised by number of individuals affected. Also if someone has an individual concern then they can be signposted to organisations such as ICAS or PALS. BV states that she still is not happy with the numerical scoring system.</p> <p><b>Group looks at questions as a way of prioritising.</b></p> <p>AH suggested that he is willing to put together a new scoring system taking everyone's issues into account. <b>Agreed.</b> He states that he will be able to put it together within a week and so the board should meet again in a fortnight.</p> <p>BV asked if LINKs receives reports and information from PALS and LM stated that they only have access to documents that are public domain. BV asked LM to get this information from PALS.</p> <p>DT sums up the meeting stating that the group had roughly agreed the order of issues and a way of prioritising issues. Other issues were making sure that PALS information is received, that the panel adjustments are made and the relationship from the panel to the board.</p>	<p><b>LM</b></p> <p><b>LM</b></p> <p><b>AH</b></p>
<p><b>3. Date and time of next meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12<sup>th</sup> May 2009 at 10:00am to 12pm</li> </ul>	

Minutes taken by the Nottingham City LINKs TEAM

**Address:** Unit E2, Southglade Business Park, Cowlairs, Off Hucknall Road, Nottingham, NG5 9RA

**Tel:** 01159 754647

**E-mail:** [links@carersfederation.co.uk](mailto:links@carersfederation.co.uk)