

APPROVED

Board Meeting
01.04.21
Open Session
Item 10.1.1

NHS GRAMPIAN
Minute of the Staff Governance Committee
held on Friday 11 December 2020 at 12.15pm
via Microsoft Teams

Present:

Mrs Joyce Duncan, Non-Executive Board Member (Chair)
Mrs Rhona Atkinson, Non-Executive Board Member
Ms Rachael Little, Employee Director
Mr Bert Donald, Whistleblowing Champion
Mr Sandy Riddell, Non-Executive Board Member

In Attendance:

Mr Tom Power, Director of People and Culture
Mrs Susan Coull, Head of HR
Ms Gerry Lawrie, Head of Workforce and Development
Mrs Anne Inglis, Head of Organisational Development
Ms Carolyn Venters, Health and Safety Partnership Representative
Mr Steven Lindsay, Full Time Partnership Representative
Mr Nigel Firth, Equality and Diversity Manager (for item 17/20)

Minute Taker: Mrs Diane Annand, Staff Governance Manager and
Catriona Downie, Secretary

Item	Subject	Action
12/20	Apologies Apologies were received from Professor Lynda Lynch, Chair; Professor Caroline Hiscox, Chief Executive; Dr June Brown, Interim Executive Nurse Director; Ms Liz Hancock, RGU representative; Mrs Cheryl Rodriguez, Head of Occupational Health and Safety; and Professor Mohamed S. Abel-Fattah, Aberdeen University representative.	
13/20	Minute of the meeting held on 13 August 2020 The Minute was approved as an accurate record.	
14/20	Minute of meeting held on 25 February 2020 The Minute was approved as an accurate record.	
15/20	Matters Arising a. Action Log Mrs Annand advised that due to the passage of time the outstanding actions on the log from the 25 February 2020 meeting required to be reviewed to ensure continued relevancy. It was agreed that this would be done at an agenda setting meeting. Homeworking/Safer Workplaces - Mr Power reported that there is a policy review being undertaken by the Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee	DA/TP/RL/ JD

APPROVED

	<p>(STAC). Homeworking was a strand included within the Health and Wellbeing Programme, and Operation Snowdrop, which will ensure staff are supported in the interim.</p> <p>Sturrock Report update – it was noted that an update was provided within the Culture and Staff Experience Oversight Group papers (agenda item 19/20b). Mr Power confirmed that this action could be closed as the Oversight Group will receive regular updates. Agreement that an update on the wider item which includes Whistleblowing and the Sturrock Report will be presented at the March 2021 meeting, to record the work done.</p> <p>Constitution – a number of the noted actions referred to amending the constitution. Agreement that an overhaul was required, written clearly and concisely with the length no more than two pages.</p> <p>It was agreed that an action log addition should include workforce information. The Committee noted the importance of management and workforce information to its remit, in providing assurance to the Board. It was agreed to schedule an item on the key metrics the Committee wish to see. These will include updates on any whistleblowing cases raised under the national standards being introduced in April 2021.</p> <p>This prompted discussion how receiving the relevant data can provide the assurance required that wellbeing is being discussed at Staff Governance Committee meetings. It was agreed that discussion should take place at the March 2021 meeting, regarding what data would be of relevance.</p> <p>Update on regional working in relation to Doctors and Dentists in training and recruitment – agreed to close this action.</p>	
	<p>Sector Focus – Staff Governance Survey Outcomes</p>	
<p>16/20</p>	<p>Staff Governance Survey outcomes and feedback from GAPF</p> <p>Further to the agreement at the August 2020 Staff Governance Committee meeting to gather data that will inform how the Committee will operate in the future and also to gather views on its remit in relation to the Board’s strategic intent, 52 individuals were invited to participate in the Staff Governance Survey during October 2020. As there is a joint responsibility to build a Staff Governance agenda between the Committee and GAPF and given their future involvement, the target audience for the survey was:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff Governance Committee members and advisors (18 individuals) 2. GAPF members and Sector Partnership Forum Co-Chairs (48 individuals) <p>Fourteen individuals were both a Staff Governance Committee member or advisor and GAPF members or SPF co-chair.</p> <p>The survey had four sections as described below. Staff Governance Committee members or advisors were asked to complete the whole survey. GAPF members or Sector Partnership Forum Co-Chairs were asked to complete Parts 2 and 4. At a November 2020 GAPF workshop the survey outcomes from Part 2 and 4 were discussed to inform the discussion at this</p>	

APPROVED

	<p>meeting.</p> <p>Overall 13 respondents completed the survey, 9 Staff Governance Committee members or advisors and 8 GAPF members or SPF co-chair. Four individuals were both a Staff Governance Committee member or advisor and GAPF members or SPF co-chair.</p> <p>Mr Power gave a presentation to the Committee of the high level survey outcomes for each part of the survey (as noted below), referring members to the detailed outcomes in the distributed report.</p> <p>Part 1 – Is the Staff Governance Committee meeting its Constitution?</p> <p>Purpose and authority (from the 8 related questions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An average of 7.5 of the 9 respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the Committee was meeting its purpose and authority• An average of 1.4 of the 9 respondents disagreed that the Committee was meeting its purpose and authority <p>Committee responsibilities (from the 14 related questions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An average of 6.6 of the 9 respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the Committee was meeting its responsibilities• An average of 2.1 of the 9 respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed that the Committee was meeting its responsibilities <p>From the 14 related questions on Committee responsibilities, the 4 where there was least consensus was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports the implementation of the strategic direction of NHS Grampian• Consider the wider workforce issues of strategic importance to the Board and monitor performance of the Board against the Standard including oversight of strategic and corporate risks• Oversee the commissioning of structures and processes which ensure that deliver against the Standard is being achieved• Encourage the further development of mechanisms for engaging effectively with all members of staff within NHS Grampian <p>Part 2 – Providing the Committee with Assurance</p> <p>Areas of strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 78% felt that Sectors meeting the Committee annually to look at the whole Standard was effective• 75% of Sector Partnership Forum members said the Standard was discussed at their meetings• 100% of those Reps responding reported finding discussion with the Committee helpful <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Standard may not be a standing agenda item for all of the Sector Partnership Forums• Difficulty in operating an Sector Partnership Forum for corporate services across very separate directorates	
--	---	--

APPROVED

	<p>Areas for improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Committee could be more objective focussing on challenges and issues• Focus on planning and reshaping of workforce to meet future service requirements – direction and assurance• Provides assurance on the present, but doesn't look to the future needs <p>75% of Sector Partnership Forum members said the Standard was discussed at their meetings.</p> <p>100% of those Reps responding reported finding discussion with the Committee helpful.</p> <p>Part 3 – Format of meetings</p> <p>Format pre Covid-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 89% of respondents felt the format contributed to achieving the constitution <p>Format Covid-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 100% of respondents felt the format contributed to achieving the constitution <p>Format pre Covid-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ranking in terms of (1) the greatest benefit to retain to (5) the least benefit to retain. Average rank of:• 1.8 – a Sector attending to provide assurance of the compliance of the Standard• 2 – Specialist attending to present e.g. Communications Teams for Well Informed• 2.8 – Focus on individual element of the Standard each meeting• 3.8 – Quarterly frequency• 4.6 – 3 hour length of meeting <p>Format Covid-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ranking in terms of (1) the greatest benefit to retain to (5) the least benefit to retain. Average rank of:• 2.4 – Topic based providing assurance across the Standard e.g. PPE, Staff Testing• 2.8 – Specialist attending to present reports• 3.0 – Submission of concise exception reporting• 3.0 – Monthly frequency• 3.8 – One hour length of meeting <p>Part 4 - Role of the Committee relative to Strategic Intent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 83% Respondents felt that the Committee has a leadership role around work on culture that supports the other aspects of strategic intent• If not in a leadership role the Committee would give the greatest contribution, to	
--	---	--

APPROVED

- developing the culture (Average rank = 1.3/5)
- digital opportunities (2.8/5)
- people powered health and care (3.0/5)
- The potential contribution that participants ranked lowest was enhancing north east collaborative leadership
- Current connection between the Committee and IJBs was not felt likely to enhance the delivery of strategic intent

The Committee discussed each part in turn.

Part 4 The outcomes from the Short Life Working Group – Renewal to form a response for the Board on the following questions:

The Committee was asked to discuss:

- Update on the strategic intent
- Form a response for the Board on the following questions:
 - How do the recommended actions fit with existing work?
 - How will we take forward discussing joint working on Staff Governance issues with the IJB's?

The Committee discussed the challenges for the Committee Chairs in taking forward the short life working group recommendations. The requirement to refocus was accepted and supported however as the recommendations was not new work for the organisation the need to avoid duplication was essential. As active governance was the subject of the January 2021 Board seminar there was a wish not to pre-empt that discussion.

The Committee discussed the fundamental need to work with partners as part of a North-East collaborative, with the Community Planning Partnership given as an example. The Committee commented on the lack of capacity at all levels to take forward priorities, highlighting those at Executive Director level and the Non-Executive Board member role.

Mr Power outlined the SLT approach to the renewal work of planning, prioritising and focusing on the strategic intent, being led by the Director of Strategy/Deputy Chief Executive.

The Committee noted the legislative framework under which it must operate and the mandatory requirement to report to the Scottish Government on Staff Governance Standard compliance.

Agreed outcomes at the Committee were:

- The Committee had a leadership role around work on culture that supports the other aspects of strategic intent. This had also been the feedback from GAPF.
- Decision around role in this respect deferred until after the January 2021 Board seminar on active governance.

***Part 1 Is the Staff Governance Committee meeting its Constitution?
Part 3 The pre Covid-19 and the Covid-19 format of the meeting***

APPROVED

	<p>The Committee was asked to discuss implications for the Constitution and ways of working:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the implications of the survey results for the Committee Constitution and ways of working?• For example:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do any areas of purpose/authority need improvement?• Which of the committee’s responsibilities would benefit from more attention?• Is there anything missing that it is important to incorporate?• Is anything included that is no longer relevant? <p>The Committee discussed whether this section of the survey outcomes should be considered given the intention to re-write the constitution. It was acknowledged however that it had been appropriate to seek the views of Committee members.</p> <p>Mr Power raised the need to decide the forums to which workforce data would be provided, of which the constitution was an influencing factor. Ms Lawrie highlighted that previously the same workforce data was provided to more than one committee. The Committee discussed that this may be appropriate however it was necessary for the Chairs to be clear on the responsibilities of their committee, and the management information most relevant to that.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the format of future meetings, noting that for both previously used formats the frequency and meeting lengths were ranked lowest. It was noted that by the use of Microsoft Teams more frequent meetings were possible. The Committee debated influencing factors which included the capacity of the officers advising the Committee, use of comfort breaks and the range of possible topics to discuss when incorporating both business as usual and Covid-19 matters. Mr Power summarised that it was important to have clarity on function before deciding on format.</p> <p>Sectors attending to give assurance on compliance with the Staff Governance Standard was agreed as preferable to lengthy reports.</p> <p>Agreed outcomes at the Committee were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A revamp of the constitution to make it more focussed on the Staff Governance Standard, the legislative framework under which the Committee must operate. This will ensure the Committee is clear on function and responsibilities.• Bi-monthly frequency with a focus on a separate domain of the Staff Governance Standard each meeting, of up to 2 hour’s length, including a comfort break, to give sufficient time to on workforce challenges. <p><i>Part 2 How does the Committee provide assurance of attainment and maintenance of the Staff Governance Standard</i></p> <p>The Committee was asked to discuss:</p>	<p>DA/TP/RL/ JD</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

APPROVED

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimum content/Format of meeting (hybrid to April 2021 and beyond) • What is the right balance of content/format of meeting? (note: bi-monthly to April 2021) • What are the expectations of a Sector attending a meeting? • What is the role of GAPF in that respect, and in terms of Staff Governance? • What feedback should be provided to GAPF including acknowledging examples of good practice that support the Committee? <p>The Committee discussed that a programme of Sectors attending a meeting would require to be devised to give as much as one year’s notice of attendance. A Sector would be informed of the Committee’s expectations (presentation of achievements, challenges and issues) to enable a focussed discussion, which met the constitution in terms of assurance. This would also meet the principles of staff speaking up in a safe environment to express views. The Committee would challenge a Sector if expectations were not delivered.</p> <p>It was noted that not all Sector Partnership Forum co-chairs were members of GAPF therefore it was important to ensure that the right individuals attended.</p> <p>Ms Venters highlighted that currently the Committee was not receiving assurance with regard to health and safety therefore there was the need to strength the relationship between committees – the Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee being the fora through which this should flow.</p> <p>The Committee noted the recent changes of Chair and Executive Lead for Staff Governance, which gave an opportunity to re-focus and build for the future. The Staff Governance Standard was acknowledged as a good framework, with the domains and concept of reciprocal rights and responsibilities remaining relevant.</p> <p>Ms Lawrie raised the provision of workforce data which added value, highlighting that the analysis of the data would be the most meaningful to the Committee for assurance purposes. The Committee agreed that the ability to challenge the assurance given was important along with the awareness that the data behind the analysis was available.</p> <p>Agreed outcomes at the Committee were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Governance Standard monitoring and receiving assurance will be achieved by developing a programme of Sector attendance. A focused dialogue on achievements, challenges and issues between a Sector and the Committee was deemed an effective method to ensure the constitution is met. • Time in the agenda for topical matters. • To provide information on the alignment and structure of committees in relation to the Board. 	<p style="text-align: center;">DA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">RL</p>
	<p>Statutory Information, Reports and Returns</p>	

APPROVED

<p>17/20</p>	<p>NHS Grampian Equality and Diversity Workforce Monitoring Report 2019/20 – for approval</p> <p>Mr Firth outlined that the distributed report was produced on an annual basis as required under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012, covering all nine of the protected characteristics. Mr Firth presented the report, taking the Committee through each of the protected characteristics of race; disability; sex (male or female); religion or belief; sexual orientation; gender reassignment; age; pregnancy and maternity; and marriage and civil partnership. For each the number of staff and their relevant protected characteristics and information on the recruitment, development and retention of these employees was included.</p> <p>The Committee was assured that a process existed to undertake more detailed analysis of the statistics to fully understand if any unconscious bias existed.</p> <p>The Report was noted for onward approval by the Board.</p>	
<p>18/20</p>	<p>Staff Governance Committee Board and Performance Governance reports content</p> <p>The Report would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a summary of the agreed outcomes further to the Staff Governance Survey outcomes and feedback from GAPF • Outline that the NHS Grampian Equality and Diversity Workforce Monitoring Report 2019/20 had been presented to the Committee for onward approval by the Board. 	
	<p>For Information</p>	
<p>19/20</p>	<p>a. BMA Joint Negotiating Committee Minutes – 24 January and 18 August 2020 - noted</p> <p>b. Culture and Staff Experience Oversight Group Discussion paper and first meeting minutes - noted</p>	
<p>20/20</p>	<p>AOCB – none raised</p>	
<p>21/20</p>	<p>Date of next Meeting</p> <p>10.30am to 12.30am on Wednesday 3 March 2021. Due to NHS Grampian moving to civil contingency level 4 from 5 January 2021, an additional meeting was arranged for Friday 15 January 2021 at 10am to 11am.</p>	