

Item 6.1b Board Assurance Framework 2015/16

- Each area of the BAF is aligned to the delivery of the strategic goals set by the Board (i.e. achievement of 2015/16 milestones and in-year work to build capacity / capability for future milestones) and regulatory compliance (corporate governance statement)
- Board Evaluation :

An assessment of the likelihood and impact of each strategic risk will generate a RAG rating which the Board will assign to each BAF entry

5x5 matrix

X	LIKELIHOOD					
IMPACT / CONSEQUENCE		1 Rare	2 Unlikely	3 Possible	4 Likely	5 Almost Certain
	5 Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25
	4 Major	4	8	12	16	20
	3 Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
	2 Minor	2	4	6	8	10
	1 Negligable	1	2	3	4	5

- Refer to BAF Policy for operating guidance, roles and responsibilities and reporting template

		Delivering the highest quality, safest and best experience for patients and their families by providing reliable care by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing friends and family test recommendation from 99.0% to 99.3% (top 5) by March 2016 Remain within top 10% of all trusts for overall quality of care (National Patient Survey) Reducing avoidable harm as measured by KPIs set out in Quality Improvement Strategy by March 2016 Achieving milestones of 'sign up to safety' by March 2016 					
	Principal Risks preventing the Trust achieving strategic goals	Key controls	Board Assurance		Gaps in Control / Assurance	Action Who?/When?	Board Evaluation (impact x likelihood)
			Internal	External			
1 SP	Inability to achieve target Friend and Family test score due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> insufficient staffing levels; inconsistent application of values and behaviours by all staff blockages in patient flow resulting in cancellations, delays in treatment, unnecessary bed moves, late discharge noise and disruption during site development work This could impact on the Trust's reputation as a provider of high quality care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trust values and vision Code of Conduct Staff performance appraisals Recruitment and Selection Policy Staff training programme Staff communications Quality impact assessments ECS process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance dashboard Patient stories Nurse staffing levels Board walk rounds ECS assessments Quality Committee papers and minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Friends and Family score Complaints and compliments PLACE Healthwatch reviews Culture survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refresh Values following cultural survey Hot Boards for staff communications Completion of bed modelling and patient flow work 	DH – July 2015 LL- June 2015 (Wards) then rollout to depts. TW – May 2015	2 x 3 = 6
2 SP/ GNR (RAP)	Unable to reduce harm – sepsis, medication errors, reliable care, infection from multi-resistant organisms, organisational learning mortality, due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increases in patient acuity; non-compliance by staff with Trust policies & procedures; and/or lack of or ineffective staff training; non-compliance with care bundles; lack of clear roles and responsibilities for staff leading to a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual performance review process Revalidation Staff training programme Mortality reviews Risk management strategy Quality strategy Quality improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance dashboard Integrated Performance committee papers & minutes Quality Committee papers and minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GMC reports Deanery reports Internal Audit CQC Intelligent Monitoring Report CQC assessments Advancing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement plan for sepsis compliance Medium / long term strategy for infection prevention (multi resistant organisms) Organisational 	GNR (RAP) – July 2015 (Quality Committee) GNR (RAP) – July 2015 (Quality Committee) MJ – July	3 x 3 = 9

	<p>lack of accountability</p> <p>This could lead to avoidable patient harm, financial penalties and reputational issues. In a worst case scenario, this could result in the Trust being subject to enforcement action from Monitor and/or the Care Quality Commission.</p>	<p>policies and procedures (e.g. falls policy;)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incident reporting & root cause analysis Quality impact assessments Clinical audit Speak Out Safely campaign Daily Safety Huddles Ward boards ECS assessment process Audit programme RCA process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IG toolkit Complaints and compliments report staff survey Safety culture survey Board walk rounds Quality report Clinical audit reports ECS compliance reports Weekly harms report (Exec team) 	<p>Quality Alliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr Foster benchmarking ICNARC External Pharmacy review National staff survey Monitor risk rating No. and value of clinical negligence claims 	<p>Learning Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeframe for Facilities Board to be implemented. Embedding of medication safety thermometer and development of improvement plan for safer medicines 	<p>2015 (Quality Committee)</p> <p>DJ (June 2015)</p> <p>GNR (/RAP) – July 2015 (Quality Committee)</p>	
3 LL	<p>Inability to declare full compliance against Monitor's corporate governance statements as a result of gaps or weaknesses in the Trust's governance arrangements.</p> <p>This could lead to the Trust being subject to enforcement action by Monitor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitution Organisational structure Board committee Structure BAF Policy Risk management strategy Operational Plan Commissioner contracts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate governance statements evidence pack Annual Governance Statement Provider Licence checklist RTT Action Plan Operational Board papers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal audit review of evidence to support corporate Governance statements Internal Audit – BAF review External audit opinion Monitor risk rating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTT breach - Establish performance management system for RTT to monitor trajectory and impact of actions Complete action plan following external review of risk 	<p>TW 2015 (IPC)</p> <p>MJ – July 2015 (Audit Committee)</p>	<p>3 x 5 = 15</p>

			<p>and minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrated Performance committee papers and minutes ▪ Quality Committee papers and minutes ▪ Self assessment against Monitor's Quality Governance Framework ▪ Fit and Proper Persons requirements reviewed for directors 		<p>management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete and embed Data Quality Strategy ▪ Undertake self-assessment against Well Led Framework ▪ Complete audit and identify / address gaps in FPP requirements 	<p>MJ – July 2015 (IPC)</p> <p>NL/JT/LL – June 2015 (BoD)</p> <p>NL/LL April 15</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>To develop our service portfolio and business by expanding our current models of service and by developing innovative models of care underpinned by enhanced business systems by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extending 7 day service – ACS transfers on Saturdays by X and radiology working at weekends by X ▪ Knowsley COPD service expansion (tender process Q1) ▪ Implementing planned service developments in aortics, EP, ICC and ACHD by March 2016 ▪ Expanding critical care and surgical bed capacity to meet activity plan and improve flow (Q1) 						
	Principal Risks preventing the Trust achieving strategic goals	Key controls	Board Assurance		Gaps in Control / Assurance	Action Who? /When?	Board Evaluation (impact x likelihood)
			Internal	External			
4 TW	<p>Unable to grow services in line with plans :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ become the primary provider of Adult Congenital Heart Disease services in the North West; ▪ successfully transfer Upper Gastrointestinal service to RLBUHT ▪ retain and expand Knowsley COPD service ▪ Extend 7 day service <p>The Trust may not achieve the above due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inability to influence commissioning intentions; ▪ Lack of bed capacity; ▪ Lack of staffing; ▪ Lack of or ineffective marketing strategy; ▪ Inability to swiftly respond to national and local policy; ▪ Ineffective partnership arrangements leading to loss of management control; ▪ Inability to develop strategic alliances with other NHS providers; ▪ Inability to position itself ahead of the competition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investment policy ▪ Business case appraisal ▪ Regular meetings with key stakeholders ▪ Partnership governance arrangements ▪ Contract management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrated Performance committee papers & minutes ▪ BoD papers & minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholder feedback (Corporate Culture work) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clinical Strategies for surgery and respiratory services ▪ Completion of tender process for COPD ▪ Finalisation of plans for Upper GI transfer to RLBUHT 	<p>DH – Summer 2015</p> <p>TW – Q1</p> <p>TW – By 31.8.15</p>	<p>3 x 3 = 9</p>

	If the Trust is unable to develop its service portfolio, the Trust may lose strategic opportunities that help the Trust to remain financially viable.						
5 MJ	There is a risk to the full delivery of the research and innovation strategy caused by insufficient research management support, failure to engage research inactive services of the Trust, lack of success in attracting external funding and reductions in Clinical Research Network (CRN) budgets leading to research and innovation not contributing to the Trust's overall vision of LHCH being recognised as the best cardiothoracic integrated healthcare organisation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research & Innovation Clinical Lead • Maintenance and enhancement of ICMS • Academic appointments • Quality assurance on grant applications 	Reports on delivery of CRN targets		Need to secure backfill for Head of Research	MJ – Q1	2 x 3 = 6

<p>To maintain financial viability, enhance service delivery and develop new models of care to improve the health of our patients and safely reduce costs through our programme of transactional and transformational change by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning bed base to optimal pathways of care and achieving 85% bed occupancy levels Improve LoS for first time CABG and first time isolated valve to that expected for casemix by March 2016 Achieve CIP of 4.0% Implement LSS in theatres (Q1) Demonstrate EPR benefits for community services (Q3) 							
	Principal Risks preventing the Trust achieving strategic goals	Key controls	Board Assurance		Gaps in Control / Assurance	Action Who? / When?	Board Evaluation (impact x likelihood)
			Internal	External			
7 DJ/ TW	<p>Failure to improve the Trust's efficiency through the safe reduction of costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-delivery of the cost improvement target; Competing quality and resource priority may lead to additional cost pressures; Inability to improve patient flow; Inability to improve theatre utilisation; Decommissioning and/or loss of services to competitors; and/or Inability to realise benefits from Electronic Patient Records system Commissioner contracts below forecast demand levels. <p>If the Trust is becomes financially unstable this could lead to enforcement action from Monitor. It may also have an impact on the quality of care provided due to inability to invest in service improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Plan PMO - CIP project management / governance Budgetary control Local counter fraud Core financial controls (e.g. payroll, cash, capital, credit control, etc) Business case appraisals Service line reporting Disaster recovery plan Standing Financial Instructions, Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation Robust contract 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance dashboard Integrated Performance papers & minutes Internal staff survey IPC papers & minutes Operational Board papers and minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Audit – Combined Financial Systems Internal Audit – IM&T Business Continuity Internal Audit – workforce reviews External Audit opinion External review of EPR NCBC benchmarking Monitor risk ratings Monitor review of Annual Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions arising from EPR review Improving patient flow project Leadership for and embedding of PMO No signed NHSE contract for 2015/16 	<p>DJ – Q1</p> <p>TW – Q1</p> <p>DH – Q1</p> <p>DJ – Q1</p>	<p>4 x 4 =16</p>

		negotiation and monitoring process					
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

		To be the best NHS Employer by 2019 with a demonstrable track record of motivating our high performing workforce by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving staff engagement score by 10% by March 2016 Improve recommendation as a place to work score by 10% by March 2016 Reduce expenditure on bank and agency staff to a maximum 3.6% of total pay bill Reduce staff sickness to 3.60% by March 2016 					
	Principal Risks preventing the Trust achieving strategic goals	Key controls	Board Assurance		Gaps in Control / Assurance	Action Who?/ When?	Board Evaluation (impact x likelihood)
			Internal	External			
8 DH	Inability to attract and retain the best staff due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor staff engagement; Lack of clear roles and responsibilities leading to lack of accountability; Lack of or ineffective leadership development and talent management; Lack of effective education and training opportunities for junior doctors Staff feeling unable to speak out openly and honestly about issues; and/or Lack of or ineffective performance appraisal No sustainable staffing model in relation to planned reduction in F2 doctors (Surgery) Development needs of new leadership teams arising from transition to new divisional structure Poor training experience for junior doctors and reduced numbers from August 15 Pockets of poor staff survey, culture survey and staff FFT scores may indicate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trust values & vision Code of Conduct HR policies and procedures Speak Out Safely campaign Staff performance appraisals Staff training Staff communications Staff induction programme Health & Safety arrangements Listening into Action Response plans to manage industrial action Speak out Safely campaign 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated Performance Committee dashboard Staff FFT Board walk rounds Performance dashboard Cultural survey Quality Committee dashboard LiA pulse checks Culture survey action plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CQC reports Independent governance review National staff survey ISAE 3402 report from payroll provider Intelligent Monitoring Tool MIAA audits and reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership development / talent management programme Improve workforce planning Robust education strategy to support medical education 	DH – Q1 (for new directorate leadership team) DH – People Strategy Q1 RAP – Q1	4 X 3 =12

	that the Trust does not have a high performing workforce. In turn, this may inhibit the Trust's ability to provide excellent patient care.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>To develop productive relationships and alliances with key stakeholders as effective and responsive partners in order to enhance the Trust's profile and reputation and thus secure LHCH clinical sustainability by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishing LHCH as network leader for cardiology by March 2016 ▪ Delivering the first year of the Cardiology strategy by March 2016 ▪ Implementing Year 1 of fundraising strategy 						
	Principal Risks preventing the Trust achieving strategic goals	Key controls	Board Assurance		Gaps in Control / Assurance	Action Who?/When?	Board Evaluation (impact x likelihood)
			Internal	External			
9 RAP	<p>Inability to influence commissioners and engage key stakeholders due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of engagement strategy; ▪ Lack of feedback or not seen to respond to feedback; ▪ Impact of Healthy Liverpool Programme <p>There is also a risk that relating to the sustainability of the system wide cardiology service if the Trust is unable to recruit sufficient clinical expertise to support management of wider network.</p> <p>As a result, the Trust is unable to maintain and enhance its reputation as high quality provider of cardiothoracic healthcare services which in turn leads to a loss of market share.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular meetings with stakeholders, including commissioners ▪ Robust governance arrangements to support transfer of Upper GI service, ensuring patient safety and mitigating reputational risk ▪ Annual plan ▪ Strategy for Cardiology ▪ Engagement at CEO level in Healthy Liverpool Programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Output from board strategy days ▪ CEO report on partnership updates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholder survey ▪ Commissioner feedback ▪ Independent advice on Engagement Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Output from Stakeholder research (Corporate Culture) ▪ Final plans and timeframe to manage safe handover of of Upper GI service ▪ Recruitment of clinical expertise to support system wide cardiology service ▪ Clarity around wider system and Healthy Liverpool outcomes 	<p>DH – Report Quarter 1</p> <p>RAP By 1st September 2015</p> <p>RAP – ongoing</p> <p>Board review Oct 15</p>	3 x 3 = 9

