

Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group 360° Stakeholder Survey summary report

1. Introduction to stakeholder relations for Cannock Chase CCG

Cannock Chase has a large number of relationships it has to manage including its relationship with its member practices. Relationships include those that:

- **form part of the CCG** – member practices and their staff
- **monitor the performance and/delivery of the CCG** – NHS England, HealthWatch, elected officials, media
- **monitor the performance of healthcare providers we commission services from**– Monitor, Care Quality Commission, NHS Trust Development Authority
- **we work in partnership with** – local authorities (county and district), voluntary sector, patient reference groups and other healthcare commissioners such as CCGs and NHS England
- **we represent** – patients, carers, families using healthcare every day and who we are accountable to as a statutory organisation.

2. Overview to 2016 Ipsos MORI Stakeholder Survey

This is the third consecutive year that we have undertaken a survey of our stakeholders. The feedback will be used to help inform the way we manage our relationships and undertake our business.

2.1 Background and objectives

Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) need to have strong relationships with a range of health and care partners in order to be successful commissioners within the local system. These relationships provide CCGs with ongoing information, advice and knowledge to help them make the best possible commissioning decisions.

The CCG 360° stakeholder survey is a key part of ensuring these strong relationships are in place. The survey allows stakeholders to provide feedback on working relationships with CCGs. The results from the survey will serve two purposes:

- To provide a wealth of data for CCGs to help with their ongoing organisational development, enabling them to continue to build strong and productive relationships with stakeholders. The findings can provide a valuable tool for all CCGs to be able to evaluate their progress and inform their organisational decisions.

- To feed into assurance conversations between NHS England sub-regions and CCGs. The survey will form part of the evidence used to assess whether the stakeholder relationships, forged during the transition through authorisation, continue to be central to the effective commissioning of services by CCGs, and in doing so, improve quality and outcomes for patients.

2.2 Methodology and technical details

- It was the responsibility of each CCG to provide the list of stakeholders to invite to take part in the CCG 360° stakeholder survey.
- CCGs were provided with a core list of stakeholder organisations (outlined in the table in 2.3) to be included in their stakeholder list. Beyond this however, CCGs had the flexibility to determine which individual within each organisation was the most appropriate to nominate.
- They were also given the opportunity to add up to ten additional stakeholders they wanted to include locally (they are referred to in this report as 'Wider stakeholders'). These included: Commissioning Support Units, Health Education England, lower tier local authorities, MPs, private providers, Public Health England, social care / community organisations, Voluntary Sector Council/Leader, voluntary / third sector organisations, local care homes, GP out-of-hours providers and other stakeholders and clinicians.
- The survey was conducted primarily online via email invitations. Stakeholders who did not respond to the email invitation, and stakeholders for whom an email address was not provided, were telephoned by an Ipsos MORI interviewer who encouraged response and offered the opportunity to complete the survey by telephone.

2.3 Core stakeholder framework

GP member practices	One from every member practice
Health and Wellbeing Boards (HWB)	Up to two per HWB
Local HealthWatch	Up to three per local HealthWatch
Other patient groups	Up to five
NHS providers – Acute	Up to two from each provider
NHS providers – Mental health trusts	Up to two from each provider
NHS providers – Community health trusts	Up to two from each provider
Other CCGs	Up to five
Upper tier or unitary local authorities	Up to five per LA

Note that the allocation for HealthWatch and other patient groups was increased for 2016 compared to previous years.

2.4 Survey response rates for Cannock Chase CCG

Fieldwork was conducted between 1 March 2016 and 4 April 2016. 35 of the CCG's stakeholders completed the survey. The overall response rate was 58% which varied across the stakeholder groups shown in the table below.

Stakeholder	Number invited to take part	Completed survey	Response rate
GP member practices	26	13	50%
Health and Wellbeing Boards	2	1	50%
Local HealthWatch / patient groups	4	3	75%
NHS providers	10	6	60%
Other CCGs	5	5	100%
Upper tier or unitary local authorities	4	2	50%
Wider stakeholders	9	5	56%

2.5 Interpreting the results

Within the survey, stakeholders were asked a series of questions about their working relationship with the CCG. In addition, to reflect each core stakeholder group's different area of expertise and knowledge, they were presented with a short section of questions specific to the stakeholder group they represent.

For each question, the responses to each answer are presented as a percentage of stakeholders giving a certain answer. The number of stakeholders answering (the base size) is stated at the top of each column.

2.6 Using the results

The overall summary shows the results for all questions in the survey including any local questions where CCGs included them. The results for each question are provided at CCG level with a breakdown also shown for each of the core stakeholder groups where relevant.

Where the information is available, the results for the CCG are compared with:

- the CCG result in 2014
- the CCG result in 2015
- the 2016 average across all CCGs in the CCG's cluster
- the 2016 average across all CCGs in the CCG's regional (DCO) teams
- the national CCG average in 2016

3. 2016 Cannock Chase CCG Survey Summary

3.1 Overall engagement and relationships

The following chart presents the summary findings across the CCG for the questions asked of all stakeholders. This provides the percentage of stakeholders responding positively to the key questions, including year-on-year comparisons where the question was also asked in 2015 and 2014.

Year	2014	2015	2016
Number of responses unless otherwise stated	(44)	(39)	(35)
Overall engagement and relationship summary – last 12 months			
To what extent do you feel you have been engaged by the CCG overall?	<p>% a great deal/ a fair amount</p>		
	75%	85%	74%
How satisfied are you with the way in which the CCG has engaged with you?	<p>% very/ fairly satisfied</p>		
	78% (41 responses)	73% (37 responses)	64% (33 responses)
To what extent has the CCG listened to your views where you have provided them?	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	66%	64%	57%
To what extent has the CCG has taken on board your suggestions?	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	-	62%	54%
How would you rate your working relationship with the CCG overall?	<p>% very/ fairly good</p>		
	80%	74%	80%
Would you say your working relationship with the CCG has got better, got worse or stayed about the same?	<p>% got much/ a little better</p>		
	68% (40 responses)	34% (38 responses)	44% (34 responses)

Year	2014	2015	2016
Number of responses	(44)	(39)	(35)
Commissioning services			
The CCG involves and engages with the right individuals and organisations when making commissioning decisions	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	66%	62%	60%
I have confidence in the CCG to commission high quality services for the local	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	68%	59%	63%

population				
I understand the reasons for the decisions that the CCG makes when commissioning services		68%	59%	63%
The CCG effectively communicates its commissioning decisions with me		68%	51%	57%
The CCG's plans will deliver continuous improvement in quality within the available resources		59%	51%	57%

Year	2014	2015	2016	
Number of responses	(44)	(39)	(35)	
Overall leadership of the CCG				
The leadership of the CCG has the necessary blend of skills and experience		82%	69%	69%
There is clear and visible leadership of the CCG		89%	79%	71%
I have confidence in the leadership of the CCG to deliver its plans and priorities		82%	64%	66%
The leadership of the CCG is delivering continued quality improvements		61%	51%	49%
I have confidence in the leadership of the CCG to deliver improved outcomes for patients		68%	59%	54%

Year	2014	2015	2016	
Number of responses	(44)	(39)	(35)	
Clinical leadership of the CCG				
There is clear and visible clinical leadership of the CCG		84%	69%	57%
I have confidence in the clinical leadership of the CCG to deliver its plans and priorities		80%	64%	43%
The clinical leadership of the CCG is delivering continued quality improvements		57%	54%	43%

Year	2014	2015	2016
Number of responses	(44)	(39)	(35)
Monitoring and reviewing services			
I have confidence that the CCG effectively monitors the quality of the services it commissions	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	68%	59%	63%
If I had concerns about the quality of local services I would feel able to raise my concerns with the CCG	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	84%	69%	74%
I have confidence in the CCG to act on feedback it receives about the quality of services	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	75%	59%	66%

Year	2014	2015	2016
Number of responses	(44)	(39)	(35)
Plans and priorities			
How much would you say you know about the CCG's plans and priorities?	<p>% a great deal/fair amount</p>		
	66%	77%	60%
I have been given the opportunity to influence the CCG's plans and priorities	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	57%	54%	51%
When I have commented on the CCG's plans and priorities I feel that my comments have been taken on board	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	45%	49%	57%
The CCG has effectively communicated its plans and priorities to me	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	-	59%	49%
The CCG's plans and priorities are the right ones	<p>% strongly/ tend to agree</p>		
	54%	54%	37%

4. Recommendations and action plan

Component	Emerging themes	Proposed action
1: Well-led	•	•
2: Performance	•	•
3: Finance	•	•
4: Planning	•	•
5: Delegated Functions	•	•

Reported overview produced by Amy Egan, Communications and Engagement Specialist, Midlands and Lancashire CSU. (June 2016)