

**REPORT TO THE TRUST BOARD March 2014**

**Paper Ref: 9.5 TB (14) 11**

<b>Paper Title:</b>	<b>Monitor's Quality Governance Framework: Trust Self-Assessment</b>
<b>Sponsoring Director:</b>	<b>Peter Jenkinson</b> Director of Corporate Affairs
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Suzanne Marsello</b> Foundation Trust Programme Director
<b>Purpose:</b> <i>The purpose of bringing the report to the board</i>	All aspirant FTs are required by Monitor to have undertaken a self-assessment against the Quality Governance Framework, which is reviewed and approved by the Trust Board.
<b>Action required by the board:</b> <i>What is required of the board – e.g. to note, to approve...?</i>	The Board is asked to review the revised score for each domain, and approve this subject to any revisions that may be required.
<b>Document previously considered by:</b> <i>Name of the committee which has previously considered this paper / proposals</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<p><b>Executive summary</b> <i>Key points in the report and recommendation to the board</i></p> <p>As part of Monitor's Guide for Applicants (July 2010), aspirant Foundation Trusts (FTs) are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Board certification that quality governance arrangements are satisfactory, accompanied by a Board memorandum</li> <li>• Have a quality governance score of 3.5 or below with an overriding rule that none of the four categories of the Quality Governance Framework (QGF) be entirely amber/red rated</li> <li>• Demonstrate attainment of a quality performance threshold</li> </ul> <p>The QGF assessment is based on four domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy</li> <li>• Capabilities and Culture</li> <li>• Processes and Structures</li> <li>• Measurement</li> </ul> <p>The Trust originally undertook a self-assessment against the QGF which was approved by the Trust Board in October 2012, with a score of 3.5. Part of the FT process requires an independent external assessment of the QGF, which was undertaken by Deloitte in December 2012. At this time Deloitte scored the Trust at 5.0, which was above the level of 3.5 required for Monitor to consider an application. The Trust put in place an action plan to address the issues identified, and Deloitte repeated their assessment in April 2013, when the Trust was assessed as having a score of 3.5 (the level required by Monitor). Monitoring of progress against the action plan has been overseen by the FT Programme Board on a monthly basis.</p> <p>The QGF external assessment is considered by Monitor and the NTDA to be valid for a 1 year period, which the Trust was within when it made its final submissions to the NTDA in December 2013. It is good practice that the Trust refreshes this assessment after one year, and on this basis a reassessment has been completed, which gives the Trust a score of 3.0 against the recommendations identified by Deloitte in April 2013. The reassessment is presented to the Board for review.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Trust will be required to submit an updated and detailed Board Quality Memorandum to Monitor which will require a detailed assessment and the provision of evidence in relation to the QGF, which will be presented to the May Trust Board meeting for approval.</p>	

<p><b>Actions for the Trust Board:</b></p> <p>The Board is asked to review the revised score for each domain, and approve the self-assessment subject to any revisions that may be required.</p>	
<p><b>Key risks identified:</b>  <i>Are there any risks identified in the paper (impact on achieving corporate objectives) – e.g. quality, financial performance, compliance with legislation or regulatory requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Key Programme Risks</b>  None identified</p>	
<p><b>Related Corporate Objective:</b>  <i>Reference to corporate objective that this paper refers to.</i></p>	<p>Strategic Aim 5: Deliver robust operational and financial performance  Objective 14; To take necessary steps to position the organisation for FT status by Winter 2012</p>
<p><b>Related CQC Standard:</b>  <i>Reference to CQC standard that this paper refers to.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment (EIA): Has an EIA been carried out? NO</b>  <b>If yes, please provide a summary of the key findings</b></p> <p><b>If no, please explain you reasons for not undertaking and EIA.</b>  There is no direct impact on patients or the public and therefore an EIA has not been completed.</p>	

