

**MENTAL HEALTH REVIEW**

**FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING. WEDNESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2002  
AT THE DUNADRY INN**

<b>Present:</b>	Professor Bamford (Chair)	Mr Martin Daly
	Mr Brian Dornan	Rev Trevor Williams
	Dr John Owens	Dr Paschal McKeown
	Mr Leslie Frew	Professor Alan Ferguson
	Mrs Martha McClelland	Dr Fred Browne
	Mrs Maureen Dodd	Dr Oliver shanks
	Mr Patrick Convery	Mrs Mary O'Boyle
	Dr Raman Kapur	Mr Winston McCartney
	Mr Mark Timoney	Dr Walter Boyd
	Professor Tony McGleenan	Mrs Maureen McCartney
	Ms Marie Crossin	Mr Roy Keenan
	Mrs Eileen Sherrard	Mr Michael Kelly

<b>In Attendance:</b>	Dr Ian McMaster	} DHSSPS
	Mr John Park	
	Dr Vanessa Chambers	

<b>Apologies:</b>	Professor Roy McClelland	Mr Brendan Mullen
	Mr Geoff Shepherd	

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

1. Professor Bamford welcomed everyone to this first meeting of the Steering Committee. Explaining that the Review would take at least 2 years to complete, he thanked everyone for agreeing to give this additional time commitment on top of what he knew were already busy workloads.
2. He stressed that the Review was independent, although supported by staff and resources from DHSSPS. He explained that the 3 DHSSPS professional advisers would only attend this first meeting because of the valuable input they had given to the work on the Review to date. Members then briefly introduced themselves.

**INITIAL WORK ON THE REVIEW**

3. The Chairman gave a brief resumé of the work undertaken on the Review since his appointment on 1 October, as summarised in Paper SC4/02. The main activities were:
  - his letters to a wide range of organisations (over 200) on 4 and 16 October, seeking respectively, initial submissions on key issues and priorities for the Review, and relevant current research/strategy documents they had undertaken or commissioned;

- the appointment of Professor McClelland as Deputy Chair;
  - writing to key statutory, voluntary and other stakeholders in the Review, offering initial meetings to discuss the project (meetings which were now under way);
  - drafting Terms of Reference and discussing the proposed structure for the Review with professional advisers in DHSSPS;
  - determining the membership of the Steering Committee and preparing papers and arrangements for this first meeting; and
  - pursuing research support for the project.
4. Professor Bamford also drew members' attention to the Papers SC1, 2, and 3/02 tabled for their information. These provided some background on legislation on and provision for mental health and learning disability in the rest of Great Britain and in the Republic of Ireland. A copy of the recent Press Release, which included a reference to an extra £8m for these services, was also provided. He stressed that learning disability was central to the Review.

#### **OUTCOME OF REQUEST FOR INITIAL SUBMISSION**

5. Roy Keenan gave a short presentation on the outcome of Professor Bamford's letter of 4 October, which requested submission on key priorities which the Review should address. This was supplemented by Paper SC5/02, which was issued to members and which summarised the responses in greater detail. Annexes to the Paper listed the replies to date to Professor Bamford's letter of 16 October, and summarised the main points arising from the meetings being held with Stakeholders.
6. Mr Keenan explained that an updated version of these papers would be available at the next meeting.

#### **PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

7. Introducing Paper SC6/02, Professor Bamford explained that it was important to get these right, as they set the tone for the whole Review. The draft was based on the overall remit set down by the Minister. The aim was to keep them general and concise, as with those adopted by the Scottish Review. He asked for members' comments, particularly on whether:
- the balance between mental health and learning disability was correct; and
  - any key issues were missing from paragraph 2.
8. In discussion, members made the following key suggestions:

- the order in paragraph 1 should be “reversed”, as policy always led to legislation;
  - the meaning of “stakeholders” in paragraph 2, point 5 should be expanded/spelled out;
  - consideration should be given to making the tone less “businesslike”, and to emphasise the principles, values and personhood of people which would be central to the Review’s ethos.
9. As regards membership of the Committee, it was pointed out that there was no representative of users of learning disability services. The question was asked as to how best this could be achieved. Members also considered that there should be representation from other Departments (such as Education, NIO, Social Development, Regional Development) and Agencies (such as the Police Service of Northern Ireland, the Probation Service and the Ambulance Service) because of these organisations’ key responsibilities in the mental health and learning disability fields.
10. Professor Bamford acknowledged these points. He advised that a discussion paper on how best to effect user/carer involvement in the Review was planned for the second meeting. He stressed the need to keep the Committee to an optimum number, and that many people could (and some actually preferred to) make their contribution through the proposed expert Working Committees. Nevertheless, he and Professor McClelland would give further consideration to the issues. A user/carer representative would be sought for the Committee. He also advised that a representative from Scotland was being pursued. As regards the Terms of Reference, the Support Team would consider and provide a revised version for final agreement at the next meeting.

#### **MODUS OPERANDI FOR THE REVIEW**

11. Moving on to Paper SC7/02, Professor Bamford explained that this aimed to place on record at the start of the project the proposed way in which the Review would be conducted, members’ responsibilities and some procedural issues.
12. The aim of the Review was to submit a report to the Minister for DHSSPS, which would lead to a new policy document or documents and revised legislation on mental health and learning disability. Consultation was a key element of the Review, and a website was being worked on for launching early in 2003, to keep everyone up to date on progress. Members discussed and were content with the proposals in the Paper.

#### **PROPOSED EXPERT WORKING COMMITTEES**

13. Professor Bamford introduced Paper SC8/02. This set out the proposed number of expert Working Committees which would examine a wide range of issues and report back to the Steering Committee. The aim was to keep these Committees to a manageable number. He recognised the need for collaboration between them and the likelihood that each would need to establish sub-groups/committees to look at specific topics.

14. He also explained that feedback from his meetings and the responses to his initial 2 letters was highlighting other areas and issues which were being suggested as meriting a separate Working Committee. These included:

- education services;
- dementia services;
- sensory impairment;
- best practice models of therapeutic intervention, treatment and care.

He asked for members' comments. The aim was to establish an initial 4 Working Committees early in 2003.

15. Members broadly agreed the proposals. Key points made included:

- the importance of agreeing on which Committee would lead on reviewing issues which impacted on the considerations of several Committees;
- the importance of agreeing which Committee would examine issues such as personality disorder, brain injury and ECT, which did not easily fit into any one Committee's remit;
- the need to examine and report on management systems; and
- that all the Committees would look at learning disability; this would not be confined to the Committee on that subject.

16. Summarising, Professor Bamford said that he and Professor McClelland would consider the points made and that a further paper on the issues would be brought to the next meeting. As regards the management of services, this could possibly be looked at again in due course, but there was obviously a need for the Committee Convenors to regularly exchange views on this and to discuss with him and Professor McClelland. The issue could also be built into the Generic Terms of Reference for the Committees. On a final point, a bid was being made for 2 staff to work with and service the Working Committees.

## **GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE WORKING COMMITTEE**

17. Paper SC9/02 was for members' information at this stage. The issue would be addressed in greater depth at the next meeting. It was recognised that some fiscal analysis and background information on current financial costings would be needed in order that Committees could come up with "costed" proposals.

## **SEQUENCE OF WORKING COMMITTEES**

18. Referring to Paper SC10/02, Professor Bamford asked for members' views on:

- the concept of sequencing;

- the proposals for the first 4 Working Committees to start early in 2003; and
  - potential convenors and membership of these first 4 Committees.
19. Members agreed the sequence and proposals. Professor Bamford asked for nomination for Convenors/Chairs and members of the initial 4 Committees to be submitted to him by early 2003, at the latest. Like the composition of the Steering Committee, there needed to be a balance of representations on each Working Committee. A further paper on the issues would be brought to the next meeting.

#### **DRAFT ACTION PLAN**

20. Paper SC11/02 was for information. It would be kept under review as the project progressed. Updated versions would be discussed on a regular basis.

#### **DATE OF MEETINGS TO JUNE 2003**

21. These were agreed as follows:

- Tuesday 28 January; (at the Fitzwilliam Hotel)
- Tuesday 25 February;
- Tuesday 25 March;
- Tuesday 29 April;
- Tuesday 27 May;
- Tuesday 24 June.

22. Meetings would normally begin at 10.00am and finish with lunch at 1.00pm.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

23. Dr Owens advised that the Department of Health in the Republic of Ireland was carrying out a Review on similar issues and suggested that some harmonisation/cross-fertilisation of ideas etc would be beneficial. Professor Bamford welcomed this proposal and said that cross-border co-operation and harmonisation would form an important strand of the Review as it developed.

#### **CONCLUSION**

24. Professor Bamford thanked everyone for their participation in what he considered was an excellent start to the Review.