

PLYMOUTH CULTURE BOARD

Plymouth Life Centre
Wednesday 22 June 2011

Present:	Adrian Vinken (Chair)	AV
	Dawn Bebe	DB
	David Coslett	DC
	James Coulton	JC
	Tanya Griffiths	TG
	Councillor Glenn Jordan	GJ
	Sue Kay	SK
	Bob Sharpe	BS

Also present:	Peter Aley	PA
	Mark Rich	MR
	Katherine Williams - note taker	KJW

Apologies:	Carole Burgoyne	CB
-------------------	-----------------	----

Ref.	Discussion Point	Action
1.0	Minutes of 4 April meeting	
	Agreed.	
2.0	Matters Arising and AOB's	
2.1	Longer term Board membership, its executive support and the future agenda of the Board need to be discussed. [ACTION: AV/DC to meet with CB].	AV/DC
2.2	The 'Culture Crunch' event was successful, well attended by delegates from various backgrounds, with good information being received from the speakers. Perhaps there needs a more targeted audience in the future - or at least 'themed' events. DC apologised for not passing out the information sooner but information from the event is now available on the Culture Board website and attendees have been notified of this. DC thanked Helen for her assistance with this. PCB's feedback was that it was worthwhile investing in Mary Schwartz, although Board Members should have programmed in more planning time with Mary. The delegates came together well and there was a good atmosphere, although controversy was raised by the Civic Society as they felt that heritage was not advocated very well. This highlights the need for a Heritage Forum in the city. Cllr Jordan advised that he is the Heritage Champion within Plymouth City Council.	

	<p>This needs to be fun and engaging and to generate vibrancy. There is a desire to create a process that is not too rigid or constrained, with lowest possible barriers.</p>	
4.3	<p>Mark Rich produced a summary document of the Partnership Talents project. Peter Aley advised PCB that, no matter what type of process is set up for the Vital Sparks project, there is likely to be considerable administration involved and also that complaints are likely to be received, so procedures and resources are required to deal with this. This needs to be accessible but also accountable.</p>	
4.4	<p>ACE(SW)'s view was to try to keep this as a 'light touch' and was possibly willing to view an aggregation of small projects as a community 'festival'. HLF would require a different approach. The system could be set up so that applications can be filtered to either ACE or HLF as appropriate.</p>	
4.5	<p>Who would be the accountable body? Perhaps the University as it would be seen to be 'sector neutral'.</p>	
4.6	<p>Management input - DC had the impression that CB had suggested that PCC could provide support with this. PA said that this was now not possible given restructuring within PCC. There was a discussion on the possibility of recruiting an experienced external Project Manager, who could set this up, undertake the marketing and oversee the scheme. This would need additional administrative support - possibly from PCC? Part of the agreement with ACE(SW) was that Plymouth's contribution would be in-kind support. [ACTION: AV/DC to raise with CB re support.]</p>	<p>AV / DC</p>
4.7	<p>There was a discussion about potential support from the Third sector consortium. PA offered support in disseminating information to the Third Sector via the 43 neighbourhood networks and Equality networks. [ACTION: JC to liaise with PA.]</p>	<p>JC</p>
4.8	<p>DC stated that the UoP could provide a desk for the consultant but stipulated the need for an experienced consultant. Getting the system in place would be relatively straightforward but dealing with day to day issues would be the challenge. The procurement of the consultant could be undertaken by the UoP. The consultant would need a group (or this Board) to report to. DC offered to work alongside others to get to the recruitment stage. JC also offered his support. [ACTION: DC/AV to discuss.] [ACTION: SK and TG to consider their involvement and advise AV.]</p>	<p>DC/AV SK/TG</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reflection/Analysis/Evaluation of past experiences and events, to ensure improvement in the future. ▪ Voice for culture - advocacy ▪ Needs a place to go to get a joined-up coherent view of culture. ▪ This Board should not be about operationally 'doing' anything but it should be 'reassured' that things are progressing as they should be, or holding to account those who can take action. ▪ A watching brief on projects. ▪ The next level down within the PCB (the cultural sector groups and forums) should be the ones to take action. ▪ Redefining the remit and functions of the other Boards - other agendas are unclear, or unwilling, to get in line with Culture. ▪ Needs Executive Support to pull the culture agenda to the centre. This critically leads back to the discussions of Executive Director post. ▪ Embryonic agenda of the new structure could be circulated. [ACTION: AV to draft new agenda and cc to PCB for comment.] ▪ It was agreed that more senior colleagues should now be appointed to the PCB. These could be invited to join to help to shape the new phase of the PCB. [ACTION: AV to speak to Doug Fletcher, Phil Gibby, Laura Dyer and Richard Bayly.] 	<p style="text-align: center;">AV</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AV</p>
6.0	Date(s) of next meeting(s)	
	<p>Wednesday 27 July, 5pm, Theatre Royal Monday 5 September, 5pm-7pm (venue tbc) Monday 3 October Monday 7 November Monday 5 December</p>	