

<b>Report Title</b>	Strategic Board Assurance Framework: 2018-20		
<b>Sponsoring Executive</b>	Kam Dhami, Director of Governance		
<b>Report Author</b>	Susan Rudd, Associate Director of Corporate Governance		
<b>Meeting</b>	Trust Board (Public)	<b>Date</b>	9th June 2021

### 1. Suggested discussion points *[two or three issues you consider the Committee should focus on]*

The Trust Board reviews the SBAF on a regular basis as part of the assurance required regarding the system of internal control.

The Board is asked to review the SBAF and note updates.

### 1. Alignment to 2020 Vision *[indicate with an 'X' which Plan this paper supports]*

Safety Plan	X	Public Health Plan	X	People Plan & Education Plan	X
Quality Plan	X	Research and Development	X	Estates Plan	x
Financial Plan	X	Digital Plan	X	Other <i>[specify in the paper]</i>	X

### 2. Previous consideration *[where has this paper been previously discussed?]*

--

### 3. Recommendation(s)

The Trust Board is asked to:

<b>a.</b>	<b>CONSIDER</b> and confirm the updated SBAF.
<b>b.</b>	
<b>c.</b>	

### 4. Impact *[indicate with an 'X' which governance initiatives this matter relates to and where shown elaborate]*

Trust Risk Register	x	Risk Number(s):				
Board Assurance Framework	x	Risk Number(s): SBAF 1 - 19				
Equality Impact Assessment	Is this required?	Y		N	x	If 'Y' date completed
Quality Impact Assessment	Is this required?	Y		N	x	If 'Y' date completed

# SANDWELL AND WEST BIRMINGHAM HOSPITALS NHS TRUST

Report to Trust Board: 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021

## 2018/21 Strategic Board Assurance Framework:

### 1. INTRODUCTION


- 1.1** The current Trust Strategic Board Assurance Framework is aligned to the 2020 Vision and has been updated with Executive leads.
- 1.2** SBAF risks are assigned to Board committees, led by a Non-Executive Chair and reported in the summary overview given by that chair to the full Board. The Board has previously undertaken a review of the controls for each risks and assessment of the assurance level for each risk.
- 1.3** As a reminder the definitions for each level of assurance are set out below; the highest level of assurance is “substantial” meaning the Board are substantially assured that “they really know what they think they know”<sup>1</sup>.

Assurance level	Definition
Zero	Indicates poor effectiveness – there is no assurance that the controls are working either way
Limited	Some assurances in place or controls are still maturing so effectiveness cannot be fully assessed but should improve
Adequate	Some issues identified that if not addressed, could increase the likelihood of the risk materialising.
Substantial	Controls are suitably designed, being consistently applied and are effective in practice.


- 1.4** The table below provides the assurance level and risk rating against each of the SBAF risks.


### 2. SBAF DOCUMENT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


- 2.1** Risk scoring is undertaken on a 5x5 matrix (Likelihood x Impact). Risks rated 15 or over are rated high (Red), 10 -12 are medium (Amber), 4 – 8 are moderate (Yellow) and 1-3 are low (Green). The “Initial Risk” score sets out the scoring for each risk before the application of any controls. The “Current Risk” score sets out the scoring for the current month after all controls for that risk has been applied. Each risk is mapped to any underlying high level risk.
- 2.2** A summary of the up to date position for each risk is provided below and the Board should refer to **Appendix 1** for more detail.

<b>SBAF 1 – Management bandwidth</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12 (3 X 4)	12	8		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Group reviews are embedded with additional capacity and support being provided by the Improvement Team. The PDR process is complete for all senior leaders. A 'release time' analysis was also completed by the CEO and Chief Nurse. The impact of the covid pandemic on management resilience is supported by the range of wellbeing offers the Trust has in place however the number of current vacancies and new appointments in place within the Trusts senior and middle management teams is acknowledged.				

<b>SBAF 2 – Collapse of local care home market</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
15	9	6		
Risk Closed				

<b>SBAF 3 – GP retention/recruitment</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
9 (3 X 3)	9	6		<b>LIMITED</b>
Proposal to Close Risk to be submitted to next meeting of Quality & Safety Committee as this is now less of an organisation risk than a system risk.				

<b>SBAF 4 – Failure of vulnerable services</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12 (3 x 4)	12	8		<b>LIMITED</b>
Updates are provided through the Quality & Safety Committee and the risk score and assurance level is unchanged				

<b>SBAF 5 – welearn implementation</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12 (4 x 3)	9	12		<b>LIMITED</b>
Updated to reflect QI training, clinical audit reporting and governance scorecard developed with Group engagement				

<b>SBAF 6 – Midland Met Final Contractor</b>				
<b>Risk Closed</b>				
A Contractor in place and managed under an NEC4 contract.				

SBAF 7 – Partners signing to ICP vision				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12(3x4)	12	8		<b>LIMITED</b>
Proposal to close risk. The ICP/Place Based Boards are formed with all partners attending				


SBAF 8 – Digital Plan gap				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
16(4 x 4)	12	9		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Risk Closed				


SBAF 9 – Cost reduction/income plans				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score (L X I)	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
20 (5x4)	12	8		<b>LIMITED</b>
<p>The risk score has reduced (May 2021) as the Trust is likely to achieve a cash backed break even position for H1 of 2122. Maintaining limited assurance relates to the fact that this risk looks beyond the current known outlook and there is much uncertainty about the future financial framework of the NHS after the end of September 21. It is possible that the block income may continue, equally it is possible that allocations will reduce back to pre-Covid levels, which would likely expose an underlying deficit. The extent to which this can be mitigated in year (as it was in 1920) will have to be determined. The BVQC cost reduction programme in the Trust is making good progress, but there is still significant work to do to close the gap which sits at around 50% of the full year target of £13m.</p>				


SBAF 10 – NHS payment methods preventing ICS working				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score (L X I)	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
20 (5 x 4)	12	8		<b>LIMITED</b>
<p>Work on establishing ICP shadow budgets continues and progress is reported to the ICP Boards. An ICS risk share is in place and worked effectively in 2021, albeit an effective governance process in relation to recurrent investments in the ICS needs to be developed and implemented. The block arrangements plus risk share are effectively mitigating this risk at the moment, reflecting the risk level. Risk is proposed to remain at limited assurance, due to the uncertainty and work still to do.</p>				


SBAF 11 – Labour supply				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
20 (5 x 3)	12	9		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
The pandemic has had an impact on planned actions however the HR team carried out a series of focus groups with our own staff and reviewed the analytical data available				


through ESR, Model Hospital and NHS jobs to ascertain our retention risks, conversion rates from interest to offer, to new joiners and obtaining feedback through the recruitment process, Trust induction and local orientation surveys. The result was a new Retention strategy and Hard to Fill plans presented at Trust Board and Group Reviews. Changed resourcing approach to focus on localised recruitment which helped to reduce the number of Trust vacancies by half. 90% of those appointed being from this process came from outside of the Trust compared with 55% previously indicating a significant positive shift in market positioning and our external recruiter reputation.

<b>SBAF 12 – Staff development time</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
6 (2 x 3)	6	4		<b>LIMITED</b>

<b>SBAF 13 – Workforce Wellbeing inc. Mental Health</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
16 (4 x 4)	12	6		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Actions relating to identifying mental health related absences from ESR data points continue and are discussed at the Public Health Committee alongside other staff wellbeing initiatives. POD continues to review the psychological well-being scorecard and actions being taken.				

<b>SBAF 14 – Mortality reduction</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
16 (4 x 4)	16	12		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Updates continue through Quality & Safety Committee and Board, risk score and assurance level unchanged				

<b>SBAF 15 – Improve research goals</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
9 (3 x 3)	9	6		<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Updates continue through Quality & Safety Committee, risk score and assurance level unchanged				

<b>SBAF 16 – Unreliable Informatics structure</b>				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12 (4 x 3)	12	6		<b>LIMITED</b>

Risk Closed
-------------

SBAF 17 – Unity				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
16 (4 x 4)	6	8	↓	<b>ADEQUATE</b>
Risk score downgraded to 6 (2x3) following successful implementation of Unity				

SBAF 18 – Commissioning changes				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
20 (5 x 4)	9	6	↓	<b>LIMITED</b>

SBAF 19 – Sustainability of services on 2 sites				
Initial risk score (L X I)	Current risk score	Target score	Overall movement	Current assurance level
12 (3 x 4)	12	8	↔	<b>ADEQUATE</b>
This is a risk that has been present on the SBAF since April 2017 and was adequately assured with availability of 7 day service data to monitor service sustainability last year.				

**3. SUMMARY**

3.1 The current SBAF risks will inform the proposed new risks for 2021/22, aligned to revised strategic objectives.

**4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Trust Board is asked to:

- a) **CONSIDER** and confirm SBAF.

Susan Rudd  
 Associate Director of Corporate Governance  
 3rd June 2021

