# SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:**      Slough Wellbeing Board

**DATE:**             **15<sup>th</sup> May 2013**

**CONTACT OFFICER:**      Helen Clark, Policy Manager (Health and Social Care)

                         01753 875847

**WARD(S):**           All

## PART I

## FOR DECISION

## PROPOSAL FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MEETINGS

1. **Purpose of Report**

   To present a proposed approach for evaluating the effectiveness of SWB meetings.

2. **Recommendation**

   The Slough Wellbeing Board is requested to resolve that:

   a) The proposed approach of evaluating the effectiveness of SWB meetings by seeking ongoing feedback from members should be implemented.
   b) Further work should be undertaken to consider how feedback can be obtained from any members of the public who attend the meetings as part of the development of the Board's communication strategy.

3. **The Slough Wellbeing Strategy, the JSNA and the Corporate Plan**

3a. **Slough Wellbeing Strategy Priorities**

   The Slough Wellbeing Board will play a key role in the delivery of the Joint Slough Wellbeing Strategy which is developed to reflect the JSNA and forms part of the SBC Corporate Plan. The approach proposed aims to ensure that the meetings of the SWB are productive and enable appropriate decisions to be made in order to meet the objectives set out in the Strategy.

   Seeking input from members of the public who attend the meetings links to the underpinning strategy theme of civic responsibility and in particular to the aim of enabling people to influence the future development of the strategy.

4. **Other Implications**

   (a) <u>Financial</u>
   There are no financial implications of the proposed action.

*(b)* <u>Risk Management</u>
No risks identified.

*(c)* <u>Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications</u>
None identified

*(d)* <u>*Equalities Impact*</u>
Feedback subsequently obtained from the public would be analysed according to SBC equalities monitoring categories, thereby enabling any differential impact on particular groups to be identified.


5.  **<u>Supporting Information</u>**

The Board undertook two development sessions facilitated by the Local Government Association (LGA) in February 2013. The notes of the first of these sessions state that it was agreed that the Board should:

*Develop a simple system for evaluating the effectiveness of each meeting and agreeing any changes required.*

This system will focus on how meetings are running and as such will be distinct from a broader process of measuring the performance and impact of the Board which will be brought to a future meeting for consideration. It will need to be simple to operate and proportionate, given the wide range of issues which the Board will have to consider at each meeting.

It is suggested that the meeting evaluation system should reflect the criteria for successful Health and Wellbeing Boards set out in the LGA's *New Development Tool for Health and Wellbeing Boards.* These describe what Boards should look like now and how they should look to develop over the coming three years. The criteria from this Tool which may relate to meetings are as follows:

*Section 1: Leadership, values, relationships and ways of working*

*Criteria 1*
- *Now: Board members understand the concept of shared leadership and communicate effectively and respectfully*
- *In one year: Trust has been established, constructive challenge is the norm, a conflict resolution process is in place*
- *In three years: Continuous learning (from own experiences and others is well established)*

*Criteria 2*
- *Now: The Board has a code of conduct which is explicit about expectations of behaviour and which describes the values aspired to. The Board models appropriate behaviours and has an agreement about minimum attendance at meetings.*
- *In one year: The Board uses both internal and external reviews to test that its code of conduct is effective. Board members attend regularly and make a positive contribution to meetings.*

- *In three years: The Board's annual self-assessment incorporates agreed outcome measures against its code of conduct. Stakeholders agree that the Board operates on a win-win basis.*

### Criteria 3:
- *Now: Members have effective working relationships and are beginning to influence each other's organisations.*
- *In one year: Board members look for win-win solutions focussed on beneficial health outcomes for the community. Relationships enable members to influence beyond their own organisations.*
- *In three years: Local organisations seek to contribute to the work of the Board.*

### Section 2: Roles and contributions
- *Now: The Board knows what each member brings in the way of skills, experience, knowledge and potential contribution.*
- *In one year: Each Board member has a clear role description and acts in accordance with this. An annual board development plan has been agreed.*
- *In three years: The Board regularly reviews its own effectiveness and development.*

The Board may choose to conduct a broader review of how it is operating against the remaining criteria later in the year.

In addition, the evaluation system should reflect the views expressed at the first workshop regarding what constitutes an effective meeting. These were as follows:

- Not overly bureaucratic (but recognising requirements of operating as Committee)
- Pace and buy-in from members to go away and work on issues
- Papers provide sufficient background information for members to enable members to feel confident in raising questions / challenges
- Challenging discussions which give opportunity to question rather than just being updated.
- Set programme for year
- Reports from PDGs should focus on areas where Board can have input rather than just updating.
- Performance information should be limited to key points or outlying areas – Board should not be a data monitoring group.

A draft one-page questionnaire incorporating these points is attached at Appendix 1. It is suggested that the policy team contacts two Board members after each meeting to seek telephone feedback based on these questions. Due to the small number of people involved and the close working relationships already in place the questionnaire will look to collect qualitative information. The conversation would normally take 15 minutes or less. Findings would be collated into a report on meeting effectiveness to be brought to the Board for consideration after six months initially and annually from then on. This report would also incorporate any informal feedback received by the support officers, including from those presenting reports who are not Board members.

In addition it is proposed that the Board should consider what feedback might be sought from members of the public who attend meetings. This will be covered as part of the Board's communication strategy, an outline of which is to be brought to the July

Board meeting.  This strategy will also consider the most appropriate ways of engaging with the public during meetings.

Finally feedback should be sought from members of other Priority Delivery Groups who may attend Board meetings.  Again this will be part of a broader programme of communications with PDGs to be considered at a future meeting.


6.  **Comments of Other Committees / Priority Delivery Groups (PDGs)**

   Not applicable

7.  **Conclusion**

   The Board is asked to approve or make comments on the proposed meeting evaluation process and to agree that further work is required on obtaining public feedback.

8.  **Appendices Attached**

   'A'       -       Proposed meeting evaluation questionnaire


9.  **Background Papers**

   None

**Appendix A**

**Slough Wellbeing Board**
**Meeting effectiveness questionnaire**

**Board member:**

**Date of meeting:**

1. How do you rate the overall effectiveness of the meeting?

2. Did the papers provide sufficient background information for you to be able contribute to the discussion?  Please identify any where this was not the case.

3. Do you consider that all items were appropriate to the Board?

4. Where an update from a PDG was received, did this provide the appropriate level of information and highlight appropriate issues for Board consideration?

5. Where data was presented was this clear and proportionate?

6. Do you feel that the Board was able to influence the matters on which it was asked for a decision?  Please identify any items where this was not the case.

7. Was the discussion sufficiently robust?  Please identify any items where this was not the case.

8. Did you feel able to challenge those presenting the papers?

9. Do you feel that members behaved appropriately in the meeting?

10. Did you feel that your role was understood and your contribution was valued?

11. Are you able to identify ways in which partners agreed to work together to address issues presented?

12. Are you able to identify clear outcomes from the meeting?

13. Are you clear on what the key issues to be discussed at the next meeting will be?