

	<p>Action: MJ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17/09 CoHoC, February – April 2018 Report - Wellness Centre. MJ advised that there was still an on-going issue with the legacy letter and a response from the executor's solicitor was awaited regarding the intentions of the original will. <p><u>Matters arising from the Ipswich Charitable Funds & Sponsorship Committee meeting held on 20 June 2018.</u></p> <p>2.1 Internal electric buggy – Evaluation of the impact of the introduction of the service to be added to the Post Project Evaluation Schedule for 6 months review. Action: SS</p> <p>The Combined Action Log was reviewed and updated as required.</p>	<p>MJ</p> <p>SS</p>
5/18	<p>Committee Terms of Reference</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee received the Terms of Reference for approval. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MJ noted that she had received an e-mail from Gillian Orves and also Sarah Higson, Patient Experience Lead regarding patient representation on the Charitable Funds Committee. The Committee discussed the e-mail received and the appropriate membership of the Committee, given the constraints of the FT constitution. AA advised that governor attendance at the Charitable Funds Committee had been written into the Committee Terms of Reference, the role of the governors being to represent patients and also to hold the Non-Executives to account. BB agreed that within a Foundation Trust the role of the governors was to represent patients. Following the advice of the Company Secretary the Committee was content that the role of the Governors in attendance at the meeting was to be the patients' representative. The Chair questioned the need for a clinical representative to attend meetings given that the Chief Medical Officer was a member of the group, this was discussed and the Committee agreed that this was addressed by the Chief Medical Officer being a member of the Committee. The Chair suggested that the Terms of Reference were agreed as presented, subject to annual review when any issues could be picked up, and the Committee agreed to recommend these to the Board for approval. The Chair highlighted the statement at the bottom of page 2 regarding "emergency or urgent decisions" and the need to be clear about which of the three options was being followed. <p>Outcome: The Terms of Reference were received and agreed by the Committee and recommended for submission to the Board for approval.</p>	
6/18	<p>Committee Forward Plan for financial year</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee Forward Plan was received for information. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> DS noted that as part of the Investment Group process at Colchester consideration had been given to whether benefits had been realised from investment made. SS advised that at Ipswich it had been agreed that when an investment case had been agreed by the Charitable Funds Committee the same benefits realisation report from the Investment Group would be used. <p>Outcome: The Committee Forward Plan was received and the content noted.</p>	
SECTION 2 - Investments, Management Accounts & Audit		
7/18	<p>Management accounts report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee received an update on financial performance of the Colchester Charity for three months of 18/19 to the end of June 2018 (Month 3) and an update on the financial position of the Ipswich Charity to the end of June 2018. 	

	<p>2. SS highlighted that regarding the Ipswich report the investment report had now been received from the Investment Managers and there had been an increase of £180k in investments since the report was written.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>3. The Chair noted that on the balance sheet for Colchester “creditors was high”. SS agreed to take this question back to Georgina Boxshall to clarify the figures, but commented that this might relate to the commitment for the haematology centre or be in relation to approval of the Time Garden. Action: SS</p> <p>4. DS questioned whether there was a view regarding the template for the report going forward. SS advised that she was planning to follow the report template from Colchester but would also include detail of the fund managers. MJ requested that the funds were ordered from the “largest down to the smallest”.</p> <p>5. MJ advised the Committee that a large legacy had been left to the Ipswich Charity and conversations were currently being held regarding the setting up of an Innovations Fund, to which £500k had been allocated, and how this money should now be used.</p> <p>6. The Chair questioned how the “static funds” would be shown/flagged going forward and stated that the definition of a “static fund” would be one which had had no income or expenditure during the last year. CE advised that discussion had been held at Ipswich previously regarding the requirement for fund holders to present their spending plans to the Committee. DS stated that the Committee would need to consider the organisations plans for investment and the links with the ESNEFT Investment Policy and advised that a review of the funds spending plans had been carried out at Colchester. SS advised that the Ipswich fund holders had been contacted; however, there had been a limited response. It was noted that some higher value funds had not had any movement over the past year and SS was requested to consider how these could be particularly identified in the report. Action: SS</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SS</p>
8/18	<p>Year End timetable</p> <p>1. SS presented detail of the Year End timetable to prepare the 17/18 Charity Annual Report and Accounts for the Committee’s information noting that this had been originally submitted to the Ipswich Charitable Funds Committee in March 2018.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. DS advised the Committee that as a Foundation Trust ESNEFT would have “consolidated” accounts and the process would need to be checked to ensure that the Charity accounts were “in parallel” to the Trust accounts.</p> <p>3. MJ commented that this timetable had been produced for Ipswich up to the end of April.</p> <p>4. The Chair noted the item which stated that the “Draft Annual Report and Accounts would be approval by CFSC in July” on the second page of the report. SS advised that the Accounts had been taken to a previous Ipswich Committee but the Annual Report was yet to be presented. MJ suggested that the Annual Report and Accounts were brought back to the Committee in August prior to the auditors visit.</p> <p>5. DS suggested that the accounts covered 15 months, the 12 month period for 17/18 and then 3 months from April to July with a “cessation report” for Colchester and for the Committee to note that there would be no Annual Report for the 3 months period for Colchester. AA advised that the auditors would prefer the 3 months from April to July to be linked to 18/19.</p> <p>6. The Chair requested that the Year End timetable was updated to reflect the different timelines (for CHUFT and IHT charities) following the merger and re-presented to the Charitable Funds Committee in August. Action: SS</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SS</p>
9/18	<p>Charity, Donations, Sponsorship and Charitable Funds Policy & Procedure</p> <p>1. The Committee received the Charity, Donations and Sponsorship Policy & Procedure for information and was advised that this had been ratified by the ESNEFT Board on 5 July 2018.</p>	

	<p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. The Committee requested that MJ update section 10.4.8.3 to remove the reference to “patient gifts” to improve clarity. Action: MJ</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the Charity, Donations and Sponsorship Policy for information.</p>	MJ
10/18	<p>Investment policy</p> <p>SS presented the Investment Policy for discussion and highlighted the following –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Ipswich Hospital Charity had invested £2.6m (value at 31st March 2018) of its reserves with Investment Management Company CCLA who had recommended that, prior to considering investing further funds following the transfer of the Colchester funds, the current investment policy should be reviewed. 2. Advice within the investment industry was that, due to potential market fluctuations, funds should ideally remain invested for a minimum of five years. The current policy for both Ipswich and Colchester was that the Policy, and therefore Investment Management Company, was reviewed every three years, therefore, the advice from CCLA was that this should be extended to five years so that the Charity did not lose out by potentially moving investments at the wrong time. 3. Ipswich Hospital Charity had had funds invested with CCLA for around 18 months, under current policy, the Investment Management portfolio would be put out to tender for review in roughly 18 months’ time. CCLA had recommended that a desktop review was undertaken at this point in order to inform the Committee regarding where the funds should be invested for the next five years. At this time the Charity would also need to review its reserves policy in order to determine the level of investment that the Charity would wish to make over five years in order to try to avoid the need to “pull out” parts of the investment over that period. 4. The Committee was asked to note the contents of the report in order to inform the future combined Investment Policy for the Charity and to discuss the way that the Committee would like to take forward the current and future investments. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. MJ advised that it was proposed that following the discussion at this meeting the Investment Policy would be updated and brought back to the next meeting for approval. 6. The Chair advised that the Colchester Committee had discussed the different investment companies available. 7. MJ noted that CCLA had been chosen after an intensive tender/interview process 18 months ago. 8. DS stated that due to the current fluctuation of the market she would propose that the Charity did not go out to tender at present but discussed options for improving investments with CCLA. 9. MJ highlighted that the Committee would need to consider the level to be set for the Reserve. 10. DS advised that the business case for the Cancer Centre was due to be taken to the Board in August. 11. The Chair advised that discussion had been held by the Committee at Colchester in November of last year and requested that the outcome of this was reviewed with any particular issues raised to be considered at the next meeting. Action: SS/MJ <p>Outcome: The Committee received and discussed the Investment Policy and noted that this would be updated and brought back to the next meeting for further consideration and approval.</p>	SS/ MJ
	<p>SECTION 3 – Business Case Consideration & Approval of Requests</p>	
11/18	<p>Chair’s actions</p> <p>The following Expenditure Requests for Endorsement of Chair’s Action were received from Georgina Boxshall, Financial Accountant -</p>	

	<p>Breast Surgery Unit 801F Aplio I Premium Ultrasound Scanner £ 53,160.00 Mammography biopsy mobile chair £ 6,275.00</p> <p>Mary Barron Suite 807F Blood analyser - On Agenda £ 11,030.16</p> <p>Fundraising and Governance 810B – form to be presented at meeting Fundraising office costs 2018/19 £ 22,348.96 (Salaries £ 21,929.45 Materials £ 234.09 Travel £ 185.42) Governance costs 2018/19 £ 8,967.08 (Admin fees £ 8,250.00 Internal Audit £ 658.41 Bank fees £ 58.67)</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair advised that the Aplio Premium Ultrasound Scanner and the Mammography biopsy mobile chair had been approved in June, and highlighted that the figure reported for the Mammography biopsy mobile chair differed from that she had approved. SS to check and clarify figures for the Mammography biopsy mobile chair purchase. Action: SS The Chair advised that she had “bounced back” the Blood Analyser request for consideration by the Committee due to the lack of detail in the request received and this was on the Agenda. SS noted that the Ipswich business case proforma would be followed going forward. BB questioned whether the consumables would be part of the ongoing costs under a revenue budget and also questioned whether purchase had been found to be cheaper than a managed service. SS advised that the detail of the Fundraising and Governance costs had only been received on the morning of the meeting and she would be looking to understand the process going forward with the expectation that the budget for these costs would be approved at the beginning of the year. The Chair commented that the Committee had only received these costs in recent months and historically these had not been received. DS noted that there had been a difference in approach between the two organisations and the charging process would be changing following the merger and agreed that the Committee would not need to see this item at future meetings. DS explained that when Colchester had transferred the League of Friends funds they had agreed to be “transparent” regarding how much was used for fundraising admin costs. <p>Outcome: The Committee received and ratified the Chair’s Actions as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Breast Surgery Unit 801F</u> Aplio I Premium Ultrasound Scanner - £53,160.00 Mammography biopsy mobile chair - £6,275.00 – Subject to clarification of amount approved. <u>Fundraising and Governance 810B</u> Fundraising office costs 2018/19 - £22,348.96 Governance costs 2018/19 - £8,967.08 	SS
12/18	<p>Fund change requests (opening, closure or amend designated fund objectives) None received for this meeting.</p>	
13/18	<p>Blood Analyser Request - Mary Barron Suite</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> DS noted that a fuller business case had been presented to the Investment Group. The Chair requested that further clarity was obtained and the case brought back to the Committee with the full business case for their consideration, or if considered “urgent” the case was forwarded for “Chairs action”. Action: DS <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MJ advised that it had been requested by the Charity team that in future full business cases were brought to the Charitable Funds meeting. 	DS

	<p>Outcome: Full business case to be brought back to the next Committee or if “urgent” request to be forwarded for Chairs action.</p>	
14/18	<p>Birthing Pools Request – Brook Ward, Ipswich</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MJ advised that the Ipswich Charitable Funds Committee had previously approved £17,100 for the purchase of birthing pools subject to funding by the Trust of other installation costs; however, the work on the area had not been commenced, this request remained for charitable funding of £17,100. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. DS stated that she would recommend “pausing the case” until there was clarity regarding the development of the ESNEFT Clinical strategy. 3. SN questioned how this message would be received by staff in the area and advised that the Committee should take care not to “demoralise” staff by rejecting the request. CE noted that previously the Ipswich Charitable Funds Committee would not have approved a business case unless it had been approved by another group such as the Planning & Investment Group or EMC. 4. BB noted that the maternity tower block had been highlighted as the “highest possible clinical risk” by the area and this needed to be considered when deciding whether to fund investment in equipment into this area. <p>Outcome: The Committee had requested that the request be “acknowledged and paused” until there was clarity regarding the development of the ESNEFT Clinical Strategy.</p>	
15/18	<p>Education Request</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee received a request from the Associate Director of Nursing and Clinical services – Integrated Pathways for funding of £3,400 of a Professional Doctorate Programme focusing on mental health provision. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Chair stated that the Committee would expect to receive evidence of support from the Education Funding Panel with any requests for educational funding. 3. MJ advised that due to the time scale involved, rather than awaiting the response from the newly formed Education Funding Panel the request had been brought to the Committee via the e-mail request but this would not be the process going forward. 4. BB commented that she would in general support funding of educational programmes such as this that would be of benefit to the organisation. 5. The Chair questioned whether the applicant had received any previous funding. 6. MJ stated that if agreed by the Committee the request could be taken retrospectively to the Education Funding Panel at Colchester and an impact report would be expected. 7. The Chair requested detail of the process for future educational requests was provided to the Committee to ensure that an equitable process was in place. Action: MJ 8. MJ advised that it was proposed to circulate the new process for educational funding requests from charitable funds to the wider leadership team. <p>Outcome: The Committee approved the request for £3,400 funding subject to confirmation that the application met the Education Funding Panel’s proposed criteria.</p>	MJ
16/18	<p>Post project evaluation schedule</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee received the schedule of Post Project Evaluation (PPE) reports in respect of approved charitable funds investment business cases. SS advised that all Ipswich projects which had been approved over the last year were listed in the report with the assumption that the Committee would want to review all projects. <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p>	

	<p>2. The Chair noted that there had been no formal “follow-up process” at Colchester.</p> <p>3. DS advised that the Investment Group requested a PPE report was provided 6 months after the projects had concluded with a completed benefits realisation form and would suggest this approach was followed by the Charitable Funds Committee with the items with the highest value being prioritised and Colchester projects from the last 6 months looked at. Action: SS</p> <p>4. SN recommended that the metrics which would show the “benefits” were built into the business cases together with the alignment to the values and strategy of the organisation.</p> <p>5. The Chair requested that the PPEs were mapped on to the Committee Forward Planner. Action: SS/MJ</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>SS/ MJ</p>
17/18	<p>Diabetes Project Interim Report</p> <p>1. The Committee received the interim 6 monthly Diabetes PPE report for information presented by SS.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. MJ suggested that the Committee received sight of the original business case, or executive summary, to enable them to consider the PPE against the original case. Action: SS</p> <p>3. BB questioned whether lessons could be learnt from this project by Colchester.</p> <p>4. DS stated that the “quantative benefits” would need to be considered in the PPE report.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted that this would be updated and represented to the Committee with the original business case or executive summary.</p>	<p>SS</p>
SECTION 4 - Fundraising & Communications		
18/18	<p>Fundraising report</p> <p>MJ presented the Fundraising Report for May – July 2018 provided by Caroline Bates, Head of Fundraising for information and highlighted the following -</p> <p>1. Discussions were being held by the CEO regarding the Wellness Centre.</p> <p>2. Children’s Appeal – the Appeal had been “slow starting” but further opportunities to promote the Appeal were being considered and Jimmy’s Farm had now become involved with the fundraising.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>3. DS noted that the Children’s service would need to consider their care pathways to ensure that the final Appeal funds were spent in the correct areas. MJ advised that there was Project Management in place for the Appeal.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	
19/18	<p>ART For Cure Donation</p> <p>MJ presented detail of a proposed £100,000 donation to the Blossom Appeal from ART For Cure for approval by the Committee and highlighted that the donation was subject to acceptance of the following terms and conditions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £75,000 payable to the appeal now to be directed towards - the waiting area - the quiet room - artwork for the centre. • £25,000 payable in December 2018 towards the activity room. • That Art For Cure’s name will be associated with these rooms or areas in a formally named way reflecting our donation. • We are invited to be part of the planning from initial stages of these areas where appropriate. • If for any reason the proposed breast care unit does not proceed to the point of conclusion that Art For Cure’s donations will be refunded in full. 	

	<p>Outcome: The Committee approved acceptance of the £100,000 donation to the Blossom Appeal from ART For Cure and the associated terms and conditions.</p>	
20/18	<p>Communications report</p> <p>A verbal update was received from MJ who highlighted that the Charity team had developed a good working system with the Communications team. SN stated that she welcomed the approach which had been adopted.</p>	
21/18	<p>Fundraising strategy</p> <p>1. MJ presented the Fundraising Strategy for approval noting that the Trustee had a responsibility to approve a Fundraising Strategy.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. The Chair noted that the statement on page 7 “Albeit the charity will not become a legal entity until July 2018” would need to be amended and expressed concern regarding the statement in Section 4 “10. cross sell contacts for events and community fundraising”. MJ advised that this statement would be clarified and related to “exchanging contacts” but confirmed that the Charity would not “sell” information.</p> <p>3. The Chair stated that she felt that the “success measures” needed to be clarified and measurable.</p> <p>4. MJ advised the Committee that she was involved in the development of the Trust Strategy.</p> <p>5. The Chair requested that “deep dives” into individual streams were scheduled for the Committee.</p> <p>Action: MJ to update the Fundraising Strategy following the Committee’s discussion and to schedule “deep dives” into individual streams as requested by the Chair.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received and approved the Fundraising Strategy subject to the amendments discussed.</p>	MJ
	<p>SECTION 5 - Risk & Legal</p>	
22/18	<p>Update on charity merger</p> <p>1. MJ presented an update on the charity merger and highlighted that the supplemental deed had now been received from the Charity Commission, however, the bank accounts could not be changed until the Charity Commission had completed the change of name. The Colchester and Ipswich websites had been amended to show that the change of name was pending with the Charity Commission.</p> <p>2. MJ advised that with regard to the operation of a single shared CRM database across sites, the data sharing agreement was being located; manual processes had been put in place to work around the system issues with Harlequin and Integra.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	
23/18	<p>ESNEFT Proposed Risk Register and actions</p> <p>1. MJ advised that there had been no definitive risk register at Colchester, the presented Risk Register had, therefore, been based on the Ipswich Risk Register which had been developed last year following conversations with Ann Alderton, Company Secretary and Denver Greenhalgh, Director of Governance.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. SN commented that she felt that there were valuable lessons to be learnt from the issues which had taken place at Great Ormond Street.</p> <p>3. DS advised that the formatting of the Register be reviewed and commented that she felt that some risks needed to be “better described”. MJ advised that the formatting was from the Datix system.</p> <p>4. The Chair requested that detail of the leads for the risks was shown and noted that she would expect the review dates to be before April 2019.</p> <p>5. AA suggested that the Risk Register was updated and reviewed at the next meeting and</p>	

	<p>thereafter annually. Action: MJ to update the Risk Register and re-present to the Committee in August 2018.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the proposed Risk Register and noted that this would be updated following the discussion held and re-presented at the next meeting.</p>	MJ
24/18	<p>Recent changes to legislation or guidance</p> <p>1. MJ presented to the Committee for information an update on the recent changes to legislation.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments</u></p> <p>2. The Chair questioned which items were “applicable/not applicable” to the Committee and stated that if items were applicable these would need to be flagged with the action required by the Committee. MJ advised that all the items on the report were applicable to the Committee and that for future reports she would highlight the action required.</p> <p>Outcome: The Committee received the report and noted the content.</p>	
25/18	<p>SECTION 6 – Presentations None received for this meeting.</p>	
	<p>SECTION 7 - Any other business/matters for escalation</p>	
26/18	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>1. No other business was raised.</p>	
27/18	<p>Matters for escalation to trust board as Corporate Trustee</p> <p>No matters were raised for escalation to the Corporate Trustee.</p>	
28/18	<p>Date of Next Meeting – 21 August 2018</p>	