

<b>Report to:</b>	<b>Council of Governors</b>	<b>Agenda item:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>5 September 2018</b>		

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Board Monitoring Group Update Report</b>
<b>Status:</b>	<b>For Approval</b>
<b>Board Sponsor:</b>	<b>Council of Governors</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Amanda Buss and James Colquhoun (Public Governors) Janet Adeyemi, Membership &amp; Governance Manager</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>None</b>

<b>1. Purpose</b>
To outline the recommended actions proposed by the Council of Governors Board Monitoring Group during the past 3 months.

<b>2. Recommendations (Note, Approve, Discuss etc)</b>
The Council of Governors is asked to discuss the recommendations.

<b>3. Legal / Regulatory Implications (NHSLA / Value for Money Conclusion etc)</b>
None

<b>4. Risk (Threats or opportunities link to risk on register etc)</b>
None

<b>5. Resources Implications (Financial / staffing)</b>
None

<b>6. Equality and Diversity</b>
None

<b>7. References to previous reports</b>
None

<b>8. Freedom of Information</b>
Public

## Board Monitoring Group Update Report

### Background

In June 2015, the Lead Governor expressed concern to the Council of Governors that they were not fulfilling their duties in full as RUH Governors. Whilst he suggested that the Governors were adequately representing the views and interests of the members, he felt that they were failing in the duty to hold the Non-Executive Board to account via the Non-Executives. He suggested that, as a start, some Governors should attend the Board of Directors meetings each month and see the NEDs at work. He asked for volunteers which resulted in the formation of the group.

### Reporting

The Board Monitoring Group provides an update report to the Council of Governors following each Board of Directors meeting to:

- Report to CoG on the main areas being addressed by RUH Board of Directors.
- Identify the areas that may cause concern from an attendee's perspective.
- Recommend actions that could be taken.

### Recommendations

The information below summarises the key recommendations from these reports. The Council of Governors is asked to discuss the recommendations and agree whether or not to implement them.

#### Board of Directors Meeting held on 27 June 2018

##### Quality/Performance recommendations

- A progress report on Falls could be included at the October meeting of the Quality Working Group.
- To seek assurance at the next CoG that the building of the Dyson Cancer Centre would not be compromised by RUH's record on Infection Control and that the on-going Director of Estates vacancy was not contributing to the situation.
- To seek clarification at CoG about the potential of increasing the budget for Innovation Panel by a minimum of 25%.
- To gain a report on the quality and quantity of feedback from "other means" at the next Quality meeting.

##### Finance recommendations

- To seek assurance at CoG that the Chair and new Director of Finance have a

plan that mitigates the risk of RUH losing its reputation for prudence in financial management.
<b>Other recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

## Board of Directors Meeting held on 25 July 2018

### Quality/Performance recommendations

- Governors note the difficulties in achieving sepsis targets before E Obs are implemented, but we would like to understand how the Non-Executive Directors are reassured that the delay in administering antibiotics for Sepsis in ED has not resulted in measurable harm to any patients.
- Discharge process - Governors note the Trust's commitment to improving the communication at discharge following the CQC In patient survey. QWG to receive a presentation covering progress against actions arising from the in-patient survey in 6 -9 months' time
- Governors would like to know how is the Board of Directors assured that the level of sickness absence is not affecting patient care?.

### Finance recommendations

- Governors would like clarification in relation to the one-off benefits which have allowed the trust to achieve the control total. Additionally, do Non-Executive Directors feel that there is sufficient reassurance in relation to the measures in place to achieve the financial plan for the year, and how are they assured that the reliance on 'one-off' measures will not be deployed in subsequent quarters?