

REPORT TO THE TRUST BOARD MARCH 2014

Paper Ref: 8.2 TB (14) 4

Paper Title: Communications Plan 2014-15	Communications Plan 2014-15
Sponsoring Director:	Peter Jenkinson, Director of Corporate Affairs
Authors:	Louise Halfpenny, Paul Sheringham (comms) and David Hensley (external consultant)
Purpose:	To appraise the Board of progress against strategic objectives
Action required by the board:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the communications plan for 2014-15 • Agree the proposals for brand positioning • Agree a new name for the trust post FT OR agree a process for this decision.
Document previously considered by:	
<p>Executive summary <i>Key points in the report and recommendation to the board</i></p> <p>1. Key messages</p> <p>The attached plan sets out progress made in delivering the five year communications strategy approved by the Board in 2013. As can be seen from the plan, the team is making good overall progress on delivering the strategy, particularly in raising the profile of the trust externally. This has been the focus of efforts in the last six months. In the next 12 months the priority will be to improve staff engagement as well as maintaining the improvements made in external profile.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: The board is asked to approve the communications plan for 2014/15</p> <p>The trust has a great opportunity with foundation trust status to renew its branding and re-emphasise its vision, values and strategy. The trust has undertaken an exercise over the past three months to understand our stakeholders' view of the trust and to use this feedback to develop a draft brand positioning statement – the key message upon which our communications will be based on. The trust has also reviewed options for names for when the trust is authorised as a foundation trust, planned for later in 2014.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The Board is asked to agree the proposed position statement and to agree the name of the trust once authorised as a foundation trust.</p>	
<p>Key risks identified:</p> <p>Designing and producing a new brand logo for all our communications materials (signage, letters, vehicle livery, websites, etc) is a complex exercise. Ideally, these materials would be ready in time for the trust becoming an FT. There is a risk this will not happen if the decision regarding a new name is not made in the very near future.</p>	
Related Corporate Objective:	As set out in the communications strategy
Related CQC Standard:	
<p>Equality Impact Assessment (EIA): Has an EIA been carried out? (No) If no, please explain you reasons for not undertaking and EIA. Not required.</p>	

Appendix A:

1. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM – INITIAL SCREENING

Headline outcomes for the Equality Delivery System (EDS)

- Better health outcomes for all
- Improved patient access and experience
- Empowered, engaged and well-supported staff
- Inclusive leadership at all levels

Service/Function/Policy	Directorate / Department	Assessor(s)	New or Existing Service or Policy?	Date of Assessment
				15 Oct 2010
1.1 Who is responsible for this service / function / policy?				
1.2 Describe the purpose of the service / function / policy? <i>Who is it intended to benefit? What are the intended outcomes?</i>				
1.3 Are there any associated objectives? <i>E.g. National Service Frameworks, National Targets, Legislation , Trust strategic objectives</i>				
1.4 What factors contribute or detract from achieving intended outcomes?				
1.5 Does the service / policy / function / have a positive or negative impact in terms of the protected groups under the Equality Act 2010. These are Age, Disability (physical and mental), Gender-reassignment, Marriage and Civil partnership, Pregnancy and maternity, Sex /Gender, Race (inc nationality and ethnicity), Sexual orientation, Region or belief and Human Rights				
1.6 If yes, please describe current or planned activities to address the impact.				
1.7 Is there any scope for new measures which would promote equality?				
1.8 What are your monitoring arrangements for this policy/ service				
1.9 Equality Impact Rating [low, medium, high]				
2.0. Please give you reasons for this rating				