



**Confirmed Minutes of the Charitable Funds Committee**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> November 2020 9:00am – 12:00pm**  
**Via Microsoft Teams**

**Present:**

Akmal Hanuk	AH	Committee Chair and Independent Member - Community
-------------	----	---

**Members:**

Susan Elsmore	SE	Independent Member – Local Government
---------------	----	---------------------------------------

**In Attendance:**

Joanne Brandon	JB	Director of Communications
Martin Driscoll	MD	Executive Director of Workforce and Organisational Development
Nicola Foreman	NF	Director of Corporate Governance
Fiona Jenkins	FJ	Executive Director of Therapies and Health Sciences
Christopher Lewis	CL	Interim Executive Finance Director

**Secretariat:**

Nathan Saunders	NS	Corporate Governance Officer
-----------------	----	------------------------------

**Apologies:**

Mike Jones	MJ	Chair of Staff Lottery Bids Panel
Sara Moseley	SM	Independent Member
John Union	JU	Independent Member - Finance
Ruth Walker	RW	Executive Nurse Director

<b>CFC20/11/001</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>  The Committee Chair (CC) welcomed everyone to the meeting.	<b>Action</b>
<b>CFC20/11/002</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>  Apologies for absence were noted.	
<b>CFC20/11/003</b>	<b>Declarations of Interests</b>  There were no declarations of interest.	

CFC20/11/004	<p><b>Minutes of the Committee Meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020</b></p> <p>The Committee reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 as a true and accurate record.</p>	
CFC20/11/005	<p><b>Committee Action Log</b></p> <p>The Committee reviewed the Action Log and noted that all items were complete, included on the agenda or superseded.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee noted the Action Log.</p>	
CFC20/11/006	<p><b>Gareth Bale Fund - Proposals</b></p> <p>The CC asked the Director of Communications whether all of the bids qualified and met the criteria set out by the Bale Family.</p> <p>DC responded that not all of the bids did, however a discussion could be had as Committee went through the bids and then a further discussion could be had with the Bale Family regarding the bids.</p> <p>The CC asked for clarification regarding the financial limit for Committee approval, it was confirmed that any item over £125,000 would need to go to the Board of Trustee.</p> <p><b>Bid 1 - Safer And Improved Ward Environments For Patients And Staff – UHW</b></p> <p><b>Bid 2 - Safer And Improved Ward Environments For Patients And Staff – UHL</b></p> <p>The DC advised the Committee that bids 1 and 2 were very similar, the only difference being cost and the site.</p> <p>The bid had been previously submitted and not approved. It had been resubmitted today due to COVID-19 changes in the bid.</p> <p>The Interim Executive Director of Finance (IEDF) commented that these 2 bids were more like core business and it would be difficult to roll out the scheme in UHW and not other sites.</p> <p>The Committee agreed and that the bids should be added to the shortlist for another fund in future.</p> <p><b>Bid 3 – COVID Memorial Garden Spaces at UHL, UHW, CRI, St David’s and Barry Hospital.</b></p>	

The DC advised that the bid would cover all Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (UHB) sites.

The bid did not specifically meet the Bale Family criteria, but there was an option to split the bid.

The DC commented that the Bale Family specified that donated money was to be used on the UHW site, however this would be discussed with them as it limited the majority of bids.

The Executive Director of Workforce and Organisational Development (EDWOD) commented that it was hard to imagine that the UHB would not have something like this in place post COVID-19 and that at some point this would need to be looked at again.

The Executive Director of Therapies and Health Sciences (EDTHS) commented that now may not be the right time to consider this bid as we were in the middle of COVID-19 wave 2, but agreed with the EDWOD that it needed to be looked at in the future.

It was noted that this bid did not fit the bid criteria and the CC recommended that it be put on hold to see what would be a better fit.

The DC clarified that the bid would go onto the shortlist but not as part of the Bale fund and would need future consideration.

#### **Bid 4 - Conscious Inclusion**

The DC advised that this bid appeared to cover all UHB sites.

The EDWOD commented that this bid did not appear to fit in with the Bale Family criteria and the IEFD and EDTHS agreed.

The CC commented that the UHB had a statutory requirement to be inclusive and diverse and that this bid did not fit and also needed to be complimentary to the core business.

The CC suggested that this bid not be shortlisted but added that there was a possibility to revisit it in the near future with perhaps an alternative funding stream.

#### **Bid 5 – Proactive Wellbeing support for Staff and Managers**

This bid had an emphasis on psychological resilience. A areas in the bid related to COVID-19 but the bid followed staff in their career and not just during COVID-19.

The EDWOD commented that 2020 had seen an increase in the requirement to support UHB staff and that it was likely to continue to increase.

The Independent Member – Local Government (IMLG) warmly supported this bid and commented that staff were very tired during the first wave of

	<p>COVID-19 and now, taking into consideration the 2<sup>nd</sup> wave and winter pressures, it was a very important area to consider.</p> <p>The EDTHS fully supported the bid but commented that although Occupational Health was based at UHW, it also covered other areas.</p> <p>It was confirmed that this bid would go onto the shortlist and the EDWOD was asked whether the UHB had something similar in place that it could be integrated with once funding ended. It was confirmed that there was currently limited support for staff and the bid would enhance this.</p> <p>The EDTHS added that the UHB had core psychological services and that this bid was specific for current issues (COVID-19) and supported this bid.</p> <p>The bid was put onto the shortlist.</p> <p><b>Bid 6 - St David's Children Centre Environmental Improvements post Covid.</b></p> <p>The DC highlighted that this bid focused on St. David's Hospital and so did not fit the Bale Family criteria however it did loosely support the COVID-19 criteria set out by the family.</p> <p>The CC acknowledged that the bid did not fit very well into the criteria.</p> <p>The EDTHS commented that perhaps a smaller bid would have been more appropriate and that lots of departments had a need for new furniture.</p> <p>The CC confirmed that this bid would not be shortlisted.</p> <p>The DC confirmed that feedback would be given to the bid applicant that a smaller bid would be looked upon favourably and funding from a different source would be considered.</p> <p><b>Bid 7 – Covid-19 Patient Experience Support Project</b></p> <p>The DC advised that this bid met the Bale Family criteria in relation to COVID-19 but that it did also extend to all UHB sites. The DC added that the bid was good for deprived groups with no access to digital services and that the Patient Experience Team had been very valuable during COVID-19, enabling people to connect with loved ones.</p> <p>It was agreed that the bid would be put onto a shortlist but not the Bale Family Fund shortlist.</p> <p>The CC commented that these bids showed a need for more staff and the need to move staff around. He queried whether this required a charitable response or whether it should be looked at as core business. The EDWOD responded that he would be discussing posts with the IEFD, however Committee should be aware that fundamentally there was not the money for this.</p> <p><b>Bid 8 – SSSU Changing Room Refurbishment</b></p>	
--	---	--

The (IMLG) commented that this was a difficult call as it met some of the criteria (being on the UHW site) and added that she was disheartened that the refurbishment had not already happened without the need for charitable funding especially as this was a key area used by staff.

The EDTHS commented that although it was not ideal that the refurbishment had not happened, she did not think the Bale Family intended their donation for this use.

The DC advised that the bid was an estimated cost given by the estates team and that another conversation would need to be had to see if they were able to include in their portfolio of works to be done.

The (IMLG) asked whether this work would jump the queue in the estates portfolio if shortlisted. The DC responded that the refurbishment would go onto the already existing list of estates jobs and that it could be a while before it was started.

The EDTHS commented that it would not be practical to refurbish the area whilst COVID-19 was ongoing as it was a vital area that was in currently in use.

The CC confirmed that this bid would not be shortlisted.

#### **Bid 9 – Recovery and Wellbeing College Senior Peer Trainer**

The DC advised that Digital Communities Wales were involved with this bid and that the bid dealt more with people outside of the UHB and was not specific to UHW.

The EDWOD commented that this bid least met the Bale Family criteria.

It was agreed that the bid be removed from the shortlist.

#### **Bid 10 – Keeping Me Well and Recovery from COVID**

The DC advised that this was a 3 year programme and related more to an interactive platform. DC commented that it was a large bid and covered all UHB sites.

The EDTHS advised that there had been some changes since the paper was uploaded. The bid was to focus on the digital platform (website) which was at a cost of £75,950. This digital platform would require multidisciplinary allied staffing as clinical knowledge would be required for the website and the interactive platform. Other funding for staffing was actively being sought and the current cost of the bid was £163,771. The interactive platform would encourage staff self-management.

The IEDF commented that this bid would enhance the service and that he supported it especially if we could source match funding from different clusters within Cardiff and the Vale.

The DC confirmed that this bid would be added to the shortlist with a reduced cost of £163,771 which would be rounded up to £164,000.

### **Bid 11 – Provide a Staff Haven at University Hospital Wales**

The EDWOD commented that during COVID-19 the lack of facilities for UHB staff had been most apparent. The bid fitted the Bale Family criteria well and would be very well received.

IMLG asked if we could clarify how many individuals a Staff Haven could house at any one time. The DC responded that she would ask for clarity from the bid author.

EDTHS commented that staff work all different shifts and knowing that there was somewhere to go would be very well received.

The IEDF agreed that this bid met the criteria well and was probably the strongest bid out of the 11 in this sense.

The CC agreed that operational details needed to be looked at and confirmed that this bid would be shortlisted.

### **Summary**

The DC then summarised the Committee discussion about the bids.

2 out of the 11 bids (Bids 3 and 7) were supported by the Committee but the Bale Family funding would not be used and these bids would be looked at another time.

3 bids were approved for the Bale Family shortlist (Bids 5, 10 and 11). All 3 of these would go forward to the Trustee meeting.

The IEDF highlighted to Committee that in relation to the 3 approved bids, the total cost would be approximately £564,000 and it would be good to see if the figure could be brought down to £500,000 so that the Bale Family could fully fund these 3 bids.

The DC advised Committee that another donation of £50,000 had been made the week before from another source.

The EDTHS asked whether this additional money could be used alongside the Bale Family fund.

The DC responded that the £50,000 would not be used within the Bale Family fund as they had received more bids from other channels.

The CC commented that there was the opportunity to go back to the applicants and obtain a more precise bid to hopefully reduce the figure to the amount donated by the Bale Family.

The IEDF advised Committee that for bids 5 and 11, we would be able to secure 80% of what had been asked for.

	<p>The CC confirmed that it would be good to be able to give credit to the Bale Family for 3 bids and that the careful consideration of the Committee demonstrated that all the bids had been thought about.</p> <p>The DC advised that these bids would now go to the next Trustee meeting.</p> <p>The CC advised that it would be good to ensure that we have the answers to any questions the Trustees may have.</p>	
<b>CFC20/11/007</b>	<p><b>Art Programme Fund - Proposals</b></p> <p>The DC highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Match funding of £59,494 had been agreed which was the amount needed to secure funding from the Arts Council in Wales;</li> <li>• Arts Fund Ring Fenced Monies at £70k per annum. £70k agreed for one year and the Committee to reconsider at a later date for years 2 and 3 – depending on availability of funds.</li> </ul> <p>The CC highlighted to the Committee that a decision to continue funding needed to be made.</p> <p>The IEDF asked whether the Arts Council were definitely match funding the £59,494. The DC responded that they were and were very keen to move forward.</p> <p>The IEDF further queried what would happen if funding was not provided for this. The DC responded that the post that enabled the UHB to run the various programmes would be lost, programmes like the popular “Forget me Not” choir.</p> <p>The DC commented that arts were not always seen as “core” business but went alongside wellbeing and were proven to be beneficial.</p> <p>The IMLG supported this wholeheartedly and commented that if we were not able to fund this then we would be doing the staff, patients and citizens of Cardiff and Vale a disservice. If unable to fund then other sources of funding would need to be found as it benefited the wellbeing agenda.</p> <p>The EDTHS added that whilst it was a nice thing to have and we would be able to double our effort with the match funding, services like massage and reflexology were not provided by the UHB because there was not enough evidence to suggest a medical benefit.</p> <p>The IEDF asked if there was any flexibility in the “Make it Better” charitable fund to help support this. The DC responded that there was and provisions could be made from it and dormant funds.</p> <p>The DC commented that though the Art Programme may not be medically evidenced, the patient experience side of the programme was well evidenced.</p>	



	<p>The EDTHS agreed that it was valuable but not in a Cochrane type evidence based medical way, and that Staff Havens offered a wider space for reflectiveness and wellbeing and that mindfulness was evidence based.</p> <p>The CC confirmed that it would be good to look at other finances.</p> <p>The IEDF commented that match funding was important in relation to the budget to develop the arts and that the cloth had to be cut accordingly across the whole charity as to what could be afforded.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Committee noted the activity and achievements of the Arts Programme to date;</li> <li>(b) Agreed that funding options should be explored in order for the Arts Programme to continue to benefit the wellbeing of patients, their families and our staff.</li> </ul>	<b>JB</b>
<b>CFC20/11/008</b>	<p><b>Surgical Clinical Board Application for Endowment Fund Spend</b></p> <p>The IEDF advised that this item had been brought to Committee as any items over £25,000 had to come for sign off.</p> <p>The Committee was advised that all criteria had been met and was happy to support.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Committee approved the spend of £35,646.00 from the Surgical CB Endowment Fund - CURE 9537 to purchase ultrasound equipment.</li> </ul>	
<b>CFC20/11/009</b>	<p><b>Health Charity Financial Position Update – period ended 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020</b></p> <p>The IEDF highlighted that Table 1 showed the financial performance for the 1<sup>st</sup> part of the year which had been quite strong and was ahead of the previous 2 years at the same point.</p> <p>The Committee was advised that donations were beginning to slow down however Table 4 showed a steady back out and that moderate growth was expected for the remainder of the year.</p> <p>The IEDF suggested that this item be higher up the agenda at future meetings. The CC agreed to this as it provided a good overview.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Committee noted the financial position of the charity;</li> <li>(b) Noted the latest income position;</li> <li>(c) Noted the commitments against general reserves and actions being taken to mitigate these financial risks.</li> </ul>	<b>NF</b>



CFC20/11/010	<p><b>Benefits and Outcomes from COVID-19 Funds &amp; Action Taken</b></p> <p>The DC advised that detailed spreadsheets outlining where money had been spent were available for scrutiny.</p> <p>DC advised that all money had been allocated except for £40,000 in the over £25,000 allocation as well as the £50,000 received previously.</p> <p>The Committee were also advised that we were eligible to bid for money from 'NHS charities together' but the criteria stated that we must be transparent on what we spend the money on.</p> <p>It was requested that the online bid application process stopped temporarily until new funds were secured.</p> <p>The CC asked about feedback/outcomes from bid applicants and when they were received. The DC responded that feedback was usually obtained a few months after a bid was successful and actioned.</p> <p>The IEDF asked that it be noted how grateful the Trustee was for the management of these funds.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Committee noted the contents of the report on the allocation of Covid funding;</li> <li>(b) Agreed a temporary cut-off date for further applications of the 03.11.20 until further Covid funding was available.</li> </ul>	
CFC20/11/011	<p><b>Update of the Health Charity Partnership with the Change Account</b></p> <p>The DC advised that since the writing of the paper, the Change Account had ceased operation.</p> <p>Committee was advised of an ongoing investigation by the Financial Conduct Authority of a company used by Change Account.</p> <p>Change Account were looking at rebranding themselves as well as providing a new offer to the UHB. The priority was to safeguard staff and information around Change Account had been removed from the UHB website.</p> <p>The Committee was advised that when a new offer was received this would be taken to the Staff Benefits Group.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) A further review in six months of the position of the Change Account's partnership agreement with the Health Charity.</li> </ul>	
CFC20/11/012	<p><b>Reporting Feedback on Successful CFC bids – Sustainable Travel</b></p> <p>The DC advised that this was a very well received scheme with multiple benefits not just to staff and visitors but also on an environmental level.</p>	

	<p>As a pilot scheme, this had enabled a great service which had been embedded into the UHB with a broader benefit.</p> <p>The IEDF highlighted that the funding for this was nearly over but the UHB would be supporting its further funding.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee accepted the report as an accurate update.</p>	
<b>CFC20/11/013</b>	<p><b>Staff Benefits Group Report</b></p> <p>The Committee was advised that the EDWOD was the new Chair for the Staff Benefits Group.</p> <p>The EDWOD highlighted that good support had been seen from Nathaniel Cars.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee approved the Staff Benefits Group report.</p>	
<b>CFC20/11/014</b>	<p><b>Staff Lottery Bids Panel</b></p> <p>The DC highlighted that the Staff Lottery had gone from strength to strength with a large increase in users off the back of an email sent to all staff.</p> <p>£11,000 was raised through this channel and other health boards were looking at our Staff Lottery due to the revenue raised from it and were hoping to implement similar systems.</p> <p>The EDTHS commented that it was pleasing to see the range and diversity in which the lottery funds were being spent.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee noted the report.</p>	
<b>CFC20/11/015</b>	<p><b>Health Charity Fundraising Report</b></p> <p>The DC outlined that the report detailed activity and appeals. There had been a lot of cancellations due to COVID-19 but the profile of the Health Charity had been maintained through virtual events.</p> <p>The Committee were advised that legacy donations were being actively sought.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee noted the progress and activities of the Health Charity as advised.</p>	

CFC20/11/016	<p><b>Wales for Africa</b></p> <p>The EDWOD advised that Wales for Africa had been in place since 2006 and had been active around the Arts for Wellbeing.</p> <p>The CC asked what “Africa” meant and if we were able to expand to other areas noting that there were many communities living in Wales that originated from Africa.</p> <p>The EDWOD responded that we needed to be conscious of what we could achieve but agreed that other areas could be looked at.</p> <p>The CC added that there were a number of UHB staff members from Africa who would be willing to help with Wales for Africa and asked that this be explored.</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <p>(a) The Committee noted the report.</p>	
CFC20/11/017	<p><b>Health Charity Annual Report</b></p> <p>The DC advised that the report needed to be approved and would be reviewed by the Auditor General with the final version coming back to Committee.</p> <p>The IMLG asked whether “approved” meant “review and comment” or simply “approve” noting also that some areas appeared incomplete. The DC agreed to take this back to check.</p> <p>The Director of Corporate Governance (DCG) asked whether this process was always done in this way and queried if the report should come from Charity Trustee and not the Charitable Funds Committee as the accountability for Charitable Funds remained with the Charity Trustee. The IEDF responded that he would check this and ensure sign off of the audited accounts at the January meeting.</p> <p>The DCG added that it would be good governance if the report went to the Charity Trustee in draft.</p> <p>The DCG advised that the Charity Trustee should sign off the annual report after receiving recommendations from the CFC Committee. Also the annual report should include comment from the Charity Trustee Chair above the CFC Chair’s welcoming comment.</p> <p><b>Resolved that:</b></p> <p>(a) The Committee reviewed and commented on the Cardiff &amp; Vale Health Charity draft Annual Report 2019 – 2020.</p>	<p><b>CL</b></p> <p><b>JB</b></p> <p><b>JB</b></p>
CFC20/11/018	<p><b>Breast Centre UHL – Fundraising Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received the annual fundraising report on the Breast Centre Appeal.</p>	

	<b>Resolved that:</b> <p>(a) The Committee noted the external fundraising support;</p> <p>(b) Noted the loan from Charitable Funds had been repaid;</p> <p>(c) Noted the report and the assurances provided.</p>	
<b>CFC20/11/019</b>	<b>Items to bring to the attention of the Board / Trustee</b> <p>The CC noted that 3 bids would be going to the Trustee.</p> <p>The DC added that the £50,000 donation would also be taken to the Trustee and to clarify if bids could continue for this.</p>	<b>JB</b>
<b>CFC20/09/020</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b> <p>There were no items of other business.</p>	
<b>CFC20/09/021</b>	<b>Review of the Meeting</b> <p>The CC invited comments about the meeting.</p> <p>The IEDF commented that all participated well especially with the amount of bids presented. The IMLG agreed.</p> <p>The CC added that it was a good meeting and ran to time.</p> <p>The EDTHS concurred and added that papers were well prepared.</p>	
<b>CFC20/09/022</b>	<b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b> <p>Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021, 9:00am – 12:00pm</p>	