Board Effectiveness Evaluation 2013-14

Results:

Questions	Column 1 NEDs average score	Column 2 Eds/Dirs average score	Column 3 Difference	Column 4 Overall average score
1 Leadership All Board members support the HSCIC's strategy, standards and fully comply with the organisations values and codes of conduct enabling them to set the tone from the top	4.0	3.7	0.3	3.8
2 Accountability Board members understand their statutory duties and functions and the governance and accountability framework under which the HSCIC operates	3.6	4.0	0.4	3.8
3 Strategy Board members have a clear understanding of the financial resources that are required to meet the HSCIC's objectives, and have had the opportunity to ensure the HSCIC Business Plan is in line with the HSCIC's strategic objectives	3.4	3.4	0.0	3.4
4 Strategy Board members have a clear understanding of the organisational structure, and the overall capability and capacity required to meet the HSCIC's objectives	2.8	3.1	0.3	3.0
5 Strategy Board members have a clear understanding of the inter-organisational relationships that are required to meet the HSCIC's objectives	2.6	3.0	0.4	2.8
6 Board Composition The Board has an appropriate mix of skills, with no significant shortfalls in areas of expertise	3.6	3.1	0.5	3.3
7 Board Performance The Board regularly reviews the HSCIC KPIs and where necessary intervenes to question performance levels against business targets	3.6	4.3	0.7	4.0
8 Balance of Activities There is an appropriate balance between the activities of the Board and those of the Executive Management Team	3.2	3.6	0.4	3.4
9 Committee Structure There is an appropriate committee structure reporting to the Board and an operational governance structure, which assists with the Board's overall effectiveness	3.2	4.3	1.1	3.8
10 Succession Planning There is appropriate succession planning for Board members and the Executive Management Team	2.5	1.7	0.8	2.0
11 Performance Evaluation Board members are individually subject to an annual performance evaluation that measures their contribution and commitment	2.2	4.3	2.1	3.4

Questions	Column 1 NEDs average score	Column 2 Eds/Dirs average score	Column 3 Difference	Column 4 Overall average score
12 Risk and Assurance Framework				
The Board takes corporate responsibility for effective overview of strategic risks and assurance. It sets the risk appetite for the organisation and encourages a constructive approach to managing risk in an open and transparent way	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0
13 Chair and CEO Relationship				
The Chair and the Chief Executive work well together and their different skills and experience complement each other	3.2	4.3	1.1	3.8
14 Managing Board Meetings and Discussions				
Meetings are structured to encourage high quality of debate on the appropriate issues with robust and probing discussions	3.2	4.0	0.8	3.7
15 Chair				
The Chair's leadership style and tone promotes effective decision-making, constructive debate and ensures that the Board works as a team	3.6	4.3	0.7	4.0
16 Attendance and contribution at meetings				
All members feel fully empowered to actively contribute at meetings, and understand the benefits of open and constructive debate	4.0	4.1	0.1	4.1
17 Executive Director				
The contribution of the Executive Directors/Directors, as members of the Board, is effective	4.0	4.1	0.1	4.1
18 Non-Executive Directors				
The non-executive Directors contribute effectively to the development of strategy and the monitoring of the performance of management, providing the right level of support and challenge	3.6	3.3	0.3	3.4
19 Meetings and Administration				
The Board meets sufficiently often, and with information of appropriate quality and detail, such that agenda items can be properly covered in the time allocated	4.3	4.1	0.1	4.2
20 Administrative support for the Board				
Board members receive the right level of administrative support including good provision of information, timely dissemination of papers and appropriate quality of minutes	4.4	4.7	0.3	4.6

Board Effectiveness Evaluation 2013-14

Text Comments:

1. **Leadership** - *All Board members support the HSCIC's strategy, standards and fully comply with the organisations values and codes of conduct enabling them to set the tone from the top.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Difficult to be clear as the strategy is still developing
- This is difficult to measure during transition with an interim Chair and CEO, and developing a new strategy while creating a new organisation and delivering on all commitments.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Constraint: these were emergent from April – November 2013
- Becoming clearer and therefore easier to support.
- I think as the year has progress the board has become more cohesive, focussed and provided stronger leadership compared to the start of the year.

2. **Accountability** - *Board members understand their statutory duties and functions and the governance and accountability framework under which the HSCIC operates.*

Non-Executive Directors
- There is still work to be done to understand the full range of duties and functions derived from the HSCIC Act and ensure appropriate governance oversight.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Both execs and non-execs could do with a better understanding of our specific statutory duties
- The NEDS, led by Chair and particularly Chief Exec are strong in this area
- I think the tension is when we are an independent organisation and when we are doing the DH's bidding.

3. **Strategy** - *Board members have a clear understanding of the financial resources that are required to meet the HSCIC's objectives, and have had the opportunity to ensure the HSCIC Business Plan is in line with the HSCIC's strategic objectives.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Not clear about financial resources, as the discussions on the shortfall on expenditure shows. Greater clarity now emerging on the business plan for next year.
- It's still year one! The strategy was developed very rapidly but still left little time to ensure robustly aligned business planning and budgeting.

Executive Directors and Directors
- I think the board members have clear visibility of the financial resources, but not how they map specifically to HSCIC objectives. FY14/15 business plan alignment with strategy has not yet happened but is planned
- This will become clearer once we have a budget and business plan agreed for next year
- Clarity about future budget at an earlier stage would be helpful.

- We don't have a system that allows adequate financial planning and MI. The bids from the start of the year were inaccurate and poorly forecast. This means the ability to cost effort against delivery is low

4. **Strategy** - *Board members have a clear understanding of the organisational structure, and the overall capability and capacity required to meet the HSCIC's objectives.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Still work in progress. The appointment of the CEO and the new CEO NEDs, provides an opportunity for the whole Board to review and fully understand the new organisation, post-transition.
- Once again, difficult to be clear about this when both the structure and the personnel are in the middle of change

Executive Directors and Directors
- Need to Improve our capacity planning. Room for efficiency.
- Board should have done some 'time out' to have an extended session on the Strategy (and business plan), and should factor that into next year
- Structure is clear and evolving. Knowledge of what is required, without necessarily being in place.
- NEDs have not spent enough time in the new organisation to understand the business.

5. **Strategy** - *Board members have a clear understanding of the inter-organisational relationships that are required to meet the HSCIC's objectives.*

Non-Executive Directors
- We may know what we want to happen, but difficult to be confident that proposed relationships, especially that with NHSE, will emerge in reality
- Both internal and external relationships need careful development as the new environment beds down.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Role of all key players in system is only becoming clear. Often it is the subtle relationships that determine the importance / role of an org and this is still fairly fluid.
- I think the board understand this (hence the score) but the relationships are ill defined and broken across significant areas
- Further work to do with a number of partners, particularly NHS England.

6. **Board Composition** - *The Board has an appropriate mix of skills, with no significant shortfalls in areas of expertise.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Not enough non-exec experience to confidently oversee the former CfH business
- This is a Board in transition with new NED and EDs having arrived and about to arrive. The Board is managing this well.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Social care under-represented

- Need more technology and more social care expertise amongst NEDs
- I think there are areas that could be strengthened. That said with the inherited board and some new additions, there seems a better balance of skills.
- Range of experience and skill that could be brought by a diverse set of NEDs is absent – will be rectified by new appointments.
- New appointments will hopefully address deficits.

7. **Board Performance** - *The Board regularly reviews the HSCIC KPIs and where necessary intervenes to question performance levels against business targets.*

Non-Executive Directors
- There is clear and significant development of KPIs and performance reporting.
- It is taking a long time to get agreed KPIs. While we appear to be now close to finalising something, for the year as a whole it has been too changeable, so that the Board has spent more time on trying to agree, rather than analysing the results

Executive Directors and Directors
- Constraint: Performance pack only mobilised circa November 2013
- Yes and improving.
- I can say from personal; experience! Much more focussed than previous sending organisations.
- Definitely improving.
- KPI information much better but still need more focussed and helpful conversations

8. **Balance of Activities** - *There is an appropriate balance between the activities of the Board and those of the Executive Management Team.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Much of the board agenda is tactical, and not enough is strategic. The Board should spend more time considering future business options and investments

Executive Directors and Directors
- There is delineation but the EMT need a greater focus on the tactical direction of the organisations delivery and related areas (e.g. risk management) which is more evolve than its current focus
- Again – an improving area. The proposed Board operating structure will help.
- Currently the Chair acts too much like an exec (e.g. attendance at ISCG)
- Very little overlap; shows a strong Chief Exec.
- There is too much duplication of roles.

9. **Committee Structure** - *There is an appropriate committee structure reporting to the Board and an operational governance structure, which assists with the Board's overall effectiveness.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors

- I think one or two areas such as finance and commercials have been weak. I think finance especially is starting to improve but we still seem light commercially

10. **Succession Planning** - *There is appropriate succession planning for Board members and the Executive Management Team.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Not aware of any succession planning
- This is an off-the-shelf evaluation, isn't it?

Executive Directors and Directors
- I don't think we have succession planning across a number of areas.
- New appointees to all jobs with effect of 01 April bar the Chair.
- No visibility of an informal or formal approach
- No – needs talent management strategy.

11. **Performance Evaluation** - *Board members are individually subject to an annual performance evaluation that measures their contribution and commitment.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Nothing!

Executive Directors and Directors
- I can only comment on the Execs, however I have an annual and on-going evaluation from the Chief Exec
- Have been historically and anticipate this continuing.
- Visibility of that for EMT members. No visibility of it for NEDs
- Only have knowledge of Execs

12. **Risk and Assurance Framework** - *The Board takes corporate responsibility for effective overview of strategic risks and assurance. It sets the risk appetite for the organisation and encourages a constructive approach to managing risk in an open*. and transparent way

Non-Executive Directors
- No significant discussion to date on this

Executive Directors and Directors
- Area for significant improvement for main Board do this is a systemic way, although Audit and Risk Committee appears to function well
- Risk management is undertaken and we have a separate Audit and Risk Committee however I don't believe we know the appetite for reputational, financial and technical risk acceptance.
- Yes and improving with the new risk framework and policy.
- More work to do but making progress
- Work in progress

13. **Chair and CEO Relationship** - *The Chair and the Chief Executive work well together and their different skills and experience complement each other.*

Non-Executive Directors
- During a difficult transition year, and with a more exec than non-exec chair, the balance seems to have worked reasonably well
- For both interim and new Chair.

Executive Directors and Directors
- I think there can be some overlap but overall better than many previously encountered.
- Relationship appears good and have complementary skills

14. **Managing Board Meetings and Discussions** - *Meetings are structured to encourage high quality of debate on the appropriate issues with robust and probing discussions.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Board and Assurance and Risk Committee meetings need to be given more time.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Discussions a bit imbalanced still. More time being spent on technology and programmes but still further to go given their importance to our overall strategy

15. **Chair** - *The Chair's leadership style and tone promotes effective decision-making, constructive debate and ensures that the Board works as a team.*

Non-Executive Directors
- For both interim and substantive Chair.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Polite, inclusive, but firm
- Dismissive of some NED contributions.
- Particularly good – feels much more team working than being held to account.
- All parties can contribute and no 1 person is given more significant voice in the board

16. **Attendance and contribution at meetings** - *All members feel fully empowered to actively contribute at meetings, and understand the benefits of open and constructive debate.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors
- Developing
- All parties can contribute and no 1 person is given more significant voice in the board

17. **Executive Directors** - *The contribution of the Executive Directors/Directors, as members of the Board, is effective.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors
- I think this has improved over the year.
- Execs still mainly focus on their own areas of expertise, but improving over time
- Developing.

18. **<u>Non-Executive Directors</u>** - *The non-executive Directors contribute effectively to the development of strategy and the monitoring of the performance of management, providing the right level of support and challenge.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors
- I think this has improved over the year
- NEDs still mainly focus on their own areas of expertise, but improving over time
- Improving
- Typically do not understand enough of the business – often either too high level/generic or too detailed.

19. **<u>Meetings and Administration</u>** - *The Board meets sufficiently often, and with information of appropriate quality and detail, such that agenda items can be properly covered in the time allocated.*

Non-Executive Directors
- Board and Assurance and Risk Committee meetings need to be given more time.

Executive Directors and Directors
- May just have been transitional but feels a bit like 'buses' – none then a few close together.

20. **<u>Administrative support for the Board</u>** - *Board members receive the right level of administrative support including good provision of information, timely dissemination of papers and appropriate quality of minutes.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors
- Administration is good and papers are issued timeously.
- Well supported and organised.

21. *Please describe anything you believe significantly contributed to the effectiveness of the Board during the past year.*

Non-Executive Directors
- The chair was willing to draw out the executive members of the board to get a better balance between exec and non-exec views at the Board than I have seen in some organisations

- The board has made a good start but like all new organisations there is still some way to go.
- The new members (both executive and non-executive) from April will require good management. New blood is always good but there is the risk of the loss of corporate memory and the risk that continuing transformation slows development down in the interim.
- This has been a difficult first year because, with the exception of the Chair since May, none of the Board members is a permanent appointee and the inevitable lack of clarity about roles, responsibilities and accountabilities across the whole post-April 2013 health and social care landscape. Nonetheless, I believe that the Board – and the Agency – have functioned as effectively as they could in these circumstances. Executive and Non-Executive members have worked well together and the Board agenda has been well managed. Draft strategies, business plans and risk registers have been prepared and circulated on a timely basis and in a way that informed and enabled thorough consideration and debate. The balance between material for Public and Private meetings has been managed very effectively and the support to the Non-Executives has been second to none.
- The identification of issues around Informatics accountability across the H&SC landscape and the strategic risks posed by information assurance and cyber security to the reputation of the Agency, once identified, were both followed up expeditiously. The IGAR review has hopefully gone a long way to resolving the former and the executive responded promptly to the latter, bringing advice and a clear action plan to the Board.

Executive Directors and Directors
- I think some personnel changes have added significant value and brought wider context to the Board. I do think all members share a common goal of supporting delivery whilst ensuring the organisation meets its legislative obligations. I think the Exec directors always support the Chair and Chief Exec and pull together as a team. They are supportive of each other and have a good knowledge of the end to end business.
- New 'team' approach.
- Flexibility of Chair/CEO to fill roles as necessary.
- Relationship between CEO and Chair, and constructively critical NEDs.
- Rigorous administration of secretariat.
- Agenda planning
- Pre-meets with Board Sec, CEO and Chair
- Quality of papers and Exec contributions

22. Please describe anything you believe significantly detracted from the effectiveness of the Board during the past year.

Non-Executive Directors
- Rather too much time devoted to tactical business, and less to strategic objectives and investment
- Changing executive team
- Lack of clarity about our relationships and role with our partners, particularly the ISCG
- Uncertainties following the merger re strategies for the two components and the changing personnel have made it difficult to assess the overall direction and have

total confidence that we really are in control. The slow emergence of any clarity as to the relative roles of NHSE, DH etc. has complicated this

- It follows from the above that the fact that there has been a lack of certainty over the membership of the Board beyond April 2014 (in the worst case, all but the Chair will leave on 31 March!) has been unwelcome. Given the criticality of IA and cyber security to the reputation and effective operation of the Agency, the departure of the SIRO at the end of December was not helpful, nor was the change of FD mid-year. In these circumstances, the Non-Executive Chair has had to take a more hands-on approach than is perhaps appropriate but should be able to stand back once the permanent CE is in post. The same applies to other roles.

Executive Directors and Directors

- As a board in its first year of operation, with a Chair that was appointed in circa June 2013 and a resulting emergent strategy, in a new system, I feel the Board has done well given the constraints, and provides a platform for performance during FY14/15
- Too many 'formalities' to sort out that are necessary for a new org (e.g. Delegated Authorities, etc.) but detracted from key issues
- See comments regarding the NEDs
- Sometimes the timing has felt a bit tight but think this is being addressed.
- Insufficient knowledge by NEDs of large areas of org business
- There are some areas that stagnated and added organisational risk that were known at EMT but never probed at the board.
- Uncertainty about future membership of board.
- New organisation, new mandate/scope, moving landscape with other ALBs.

23. Please describe any changes you would like to see introduced to improve operation of the Board in future.

Non-Executive Directors

- I would like to see more time and attention given by the board to finance – control, risk, project review and interpretation of the financial outcomes
- More time considering alternative strategic options, investments, with ordinary business being dealt with more by recommendation from the Executive Team
- I would like to see more time and attention given by the board to finance – control, risk, project review and the interpretation and effects of the financial outcomes, both for the year in question and looking forward.
- I would like to see more whole board oversight of all matters including areas we manage on behalf of DH.
- I would like to see the whole board involvement in the strategic direction of the organisation – both the technological developments and the development of better information being made available to all our client groups. Whilst we see the corporate plan, in many ways that is really about bringing into effect decisions already made.
- I believe that the board should find more time to review and consider its strategic performance- one way is to have 2 away days – one looking back at the previous year's performance and one looking forward to the following year and allowing for some blue sky thinking. This clearly involves our reviewing relationships with our partners and their asks.

- I would like to feel that, particularly for the non-execs, the principle of 'no surprises' was well established.
- I think the HSCIC needs to ensure a continuing strong influence over the information governance agenda and ensure it is seen as a trusted source of data and its use– this risks being damaged by the public concerns over care.data
- The confirmation of permanent appointments will be very welcome! Thereafter, I would hope that the Board will invest in effective team building to ensure that relationships are established and understandings of the future direction of, and challenges to, the Agency are shared and a common narrative for use with both internal and external staff and stakeholders is agreed.
- Once the recommendations of the Cyber Security Programme are received, the Board will need to consider whether the nature of the risk is such that the Executive Committee which coordinates activity in this area should be upgraded to a formal sub-committee of the Board, in accordance with best practice in other organisations responsible for large data holdings.

Executive Directors and Directors
- Social care represented in NEDs, minority group representation improved, location for meetings rotated e.g. Southport/Exeter.
- Could the public session of the board be live streamed, to further demonstrate our commitment to transparency?
- New and better NEDs – implementation of agreed model and Board activity.
- I think some wider NED and ED input will strengthen the board, especially if they are from a wider non health background. I want to learn and be mentored by NED's and look up to them. Certainly I have found that with some.
- Annual 'time outs' to discuss strategy and link to business plan.
- We should try and ensure the board performance pack has more up to date data. It is too out of date.
- More working with Non-Execs outside the Board meetings so that the sense of team-'ness' is increased.
- New NEDS and Execs should have a structured and intensive induction programme.

24. *Please include any additional comments you may have in relation to the effectiveness of the Board below.*

Non-Executive Directors
- No comments

Executive Directors and Directors
- Think the proposed approach to structuring the agenda will be good.
- Need to recognise when the honeymoon is over in terms of historic failings and responsibility is ours.