

# Trafford CCG

## CCG authorisation 360° stakeholder survey report

---

Version 18 | Internal Use Only

# Background and objectives

- In April 2012 the NHS Commissioning Board Authority (NHSCBA) published *Clinical commissioning group authorisation: a draft guide for applicants* which sets out the thresholds for authorisation that CCGs must meet.
- The vision for CCGs is rooted in three principles: giving patients more power; focusing on healthcare outcomes, quality and reducing inequalities; and giving frontline professionals greater freedoms and a strong leadership role. For CCGs to fulfill these principles successfully, they will need to form strong relationships with a range of stakeholders, including patients, clinical colleagues both within and outside their CCG, colleagues in local authorities and health and wellbeing board(s), providers, other commissioners and those who will provide commissioning support for the CCG (where appropriate). The potential of CCGs will only be realised if these relationships are in place.
- Therefore, a key part of the authorisation process is the CCG authorisation 360° stakeholder survey, which has been conducted with a broad range of stakeholders connected to each CCG. In a system where much will be achieved through relationships that harness the expertise of different stakeholders, the survey is an essential part of understanding how those relationships are developing and therefore the CCG's readiness for authorisation. The survey allows the NHSCB to learn more about the aspiring CCG's relationships with its stakeholders and therefore to assess whether the relationships forged during transition are likely to provide sufficient basis for effective commissioning by CCGs.

# Methodology and technical details

- The applicant CCG provided the list of stakeholders for the CCG authorisation 360° stakeholder survey as specified by the stakeholder framework which was provided to them. The following stakeholder groups were included in the survey:

GP member practices	CCGs with whom the applicant has collaborative commissioning arrangements	(Shadow) Health and wellbeing boards
Upper tier or unitary local authorities	Lower tier local authorities (where applicable)	LINKs or (shadow) local HealthWatch and patient groups
NHS Providers	Other health professionals	Commissioning support services

- The survey was conducted primarily online. Nominated stakeholders were initially invited to participate via email. Those stakeholders who did not respond to the email invitation were telephoned by an Ipsos MORI interviewer who encouraged response and offered the opportunity to complete the survey by telephone.
- Within the survey, stakeholders were asked a series of questions about their working relationships with the CCG. In addition, as each stakeholder group has different areas of experience and knowledge, they were presented with a short, personalised section of questions that was specific to the stakeholder group they represent. Each question is linked to one of the six domains of authorisation set out in *Clinical commissioning group authorisation: a draft guide for applicants*.

# Methodology and technical details

- Fieldwork was conducted between 10 September and 5 October 2012.
- 52 of Trafford CCG's stakeholders completed the survey. The overall response rate was 83% which varied across the stakeholder groups as follows:

Stakeholder type	Invited to take part in survey	Completed survey	Response rate
GP member practices	35	30	86%
CCGs	4	4	100%
(Shadow) Health and wellbeing boards	3	3	100%
Local authorities (total)	5	4	80%
Upper tier/unitary local authorities	5	4	80%
Lower tier local authorities	N/A	N/A	N/A
LINKs/(shadow) HealthWatch/patient groups	3	2	67%
NHS Providers	8	5	63%
Other health professionals	4	3	75%
CSSs	1	1	100%

# Interpreting the results

- Results for each question are shown in percentages (%) and the number of stakeholders giving a certain answer (n).
- In the tables, the number of stakeholders giving a certain answer are included in brackets.
- **For questions with fewer than 30 stakeholders answering, we strongly recommend that you look at the number of stakeholders giving each answer rather than the percentage, as the percentage can be misleading when based on so few stakeholders.**
- The number of stakeholders answering (the base size) is stated for each question in this report.
- The base size is shown at the bottom of each chart and in every table.
- In some cases, percentages have been rounded up or down to ensure that the figures in a pie chart sum to 100%.
- Where the results for net scores (e.g. strongly/tend to agree) do not match the results you obtain from adding percentages in the chart, this is due to rounding.

This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for market research, ISO 20252:2006 and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found [here](#)

# Engagement and relationships

# Engagement and relationships: Summary

		<b>Base</b>
Overall, to what extent, if at all, do you feel you have been <u>engaged</u> by Trafford CCG?	81% (42) a great deal/a fair amount	<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
And how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way in which Trafford CCG has <u>engaged</u> with you so far?	83% (39) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All stakeholders who have been engaged (47)</i>
To what extent do you agree or disagree that Trafford CCG has <u>listened</u> to your views where you have provided them?	75% (39) strongly/tend to agree	<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
To what extent do you agree or disagree that Trafford CCG has <u>acted</u> on your suggestions?	54% (28) strongly/tend to agree	<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
Overall, how would you rate your <u>working relationship</u> with Trafford CCG?	75% (39) very/fairly good	<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the <u>leadership</u> of Trafford CCG...?		<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
A. The <u>leadership</u> of Trafford CCG has the necessary blend of skills and experience	73% (38) strongly/tend to agree	
B. There is clear and visible <u>leadership</u> of Trafford CCG	81% (42) strongly/tend to agree	
C. I have confidence in the <u>leadership</u> of Trafford CCG to deliver its plans and priorities	73% (38) strongly/tend to agree	
D. The <u>leadership</u> of Trafford CCG will be able to deliver continued quality improvements	69% (36) strongly/tend to agree	

# Engagement and relationships: Summary

- Stakeholders are generally very positive about the engagement that has taken place with Trafford CCG so far.
- The majority feel they have been engaged by the CCG, with around four in five saying they have been engaged at least a fair amount.
- Among those who have been engaged to some extent, more than four in five are satisfied with the way in which this has been done so far.
- Three in four stakeholders describe their working relationship with the CCG as good, with just two member practices saying it is poor and one that it does not have a working relationship with the CCG.
- Perceptions of engagement and working relationships are broadly in line with the average for aspiring Wave 4 CCGs, if not a little better for satisfaction among those who feel they have been engaged.
- In addition, most stakeholders are positive about the leadership of Trafford CCG, in particular with four in five agreeing that there is clear and visible leadership within the CCG. The CCG tends to perform slightly better than the average in this regard.
- Views of engagement, relationships and leadership are broadly consistent across the stakeholder groups, although there are some individuals who feel less engaged; for example, stakeholders from NHS providers.

# Domain 1: A strong clinical and multi-professional focus which brings real added value

Version 18 | Internal Use Only

# Domain 1: Summary

Criteria 1.1.D CCG members recognise local quality priority areas identified in CCG plans.		Base
How much, if anything, would you say you know about Trafford CCG's priority areas for <u>quality improvement</u> ?	80% (24) a great deal/a fair amount/just a little	All member practices (30)
Which areas for quality improvement, if any, do you understand to be <u>identified as a priority</u> for Trafford CCG?		All member practices who have heard of CCG's priority areas (25)
1. Mothers and newborns	8% (2)	
2. People with need for support with mental health	28% (7)	
3. People with learning disabilities	24% (6)	
4. People who need emergency and urgent care	68% (17)	
5. People who need routine operations	24% (6)	
6. People with long-term conditions	64% (16)	
7. People at the end of life	40% (10)	
8. People with continuing healthcare needs	36% (9)	
To what extent do you agree or disagree that these are the <u>right priority areas</u> for Trafford CCG?	64% (16) strongly/tend to agree	All member practices who have heard of CCG's priority areas (25)
Criteria 1.2.D Member practices are involved in decision-making processes and, where appropriate, there are clear arrangements for delegation of functions.		Base
How involved, if at all, do you feel you have been in <u>decisions</u> about the proposed configuration, structure and governance arrangements for Trafford CCG?	50% (15) very/fairly involved	All member practices (30)

# Domain 1: Summary

<b>Criteria 1.2.F Examples of member practice involvement in decision-making.</b>		<b>Base</b>
How effective, if at all, would you say the arrangements are for <u>member participation and decision-making</u> in Trafford CCG?	87% (26) very/fairly effective	<i>All member practices (30)</i>
<b>Criteria 1.3.A Arrangements in place for CCG to involve and seek advice from healthcare professionals from secondary, community, mental health, learning disabilities and social care.</b>		<b>Base</b>
Does Trafford CCG have arrangements in place to involve you in <u>discussions</u> about local healthcare services and seek your advice, or not?	67% (2) yes, it does	<i>All other health professionals (3)</i>
To what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with these <u>arrangements</u> ?	-% (-) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All other health professionals (3)</i>
How well, if at all, do you think Trafford CCG <u>understands</u> what you/your group does?	-% (-) very/fairly well	<i>All other health professionals (3)</i>
<b>Criteria 1.3.C Arrangements in place between LA and CCG specifying how public health advice to CCGs will be delivered.</b>		<b>Base</b>
Do you have arrangements in place with Trafford CCG that specify how your local authority will <u>deliver public health advice</u> to the CCG, or not?	100% (4) yes, we do have arrangements in place	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i>
How confident are you, if at all, that these arrangements will <u>enable</u> your local authority to deliver public health advice to Trafford CCG?	100% (4) very/fairly confident	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities who have arrangements in place (4)</i>

# Domain 1: Summary

Criteria 1.4.1A: CCG can demonstrate that it has taken steps to communicate its vision and priorities to partners, via its clinical leadership, through the local health and wellbeing board.	<b>Base</b>	
<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG...?</p> <p>A. There is clear and visible <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG</p> <p>B. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to deliver its plans and priorities</p> <p>C. The <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG will be able to deliver continued quality improvements</p> <p>D. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to involve other clinical colleagues providing health services locally.</p>	<p>100% (3) strongly/tend to agree</p>	<p><i>All health and wellbeing board members (3)</i></p>
<p>How active, if at all, would you say the <u>clinical</u> leaders of Trafford CCG are as members of your health and wellbeing board?</p>	<p>100% (3) very/fairly active</p>	<p><i>All health and wellbeing board members (3)</i></p>
<p>How well, if at all, would you say the <u>clinical</u> leaders of Trafford CCG have communicated its vision and priorities to the health and wellbeing board.</p>	<p>100% (3) very/fairly well</p>	<p><i>All health and wellbeing board members (3)</i></p>
<p>How consistent, if at all, is the vision that Trafford CCG's <u>clinical</u> leaders have communicated with the health and wellbeing board's priorities?</p>	<p>100% (3) very/fairly consistent</p>	<p><i>All health and wellbeing board members (3)</i></p>

# Domain 1: Summary

Criteria 1.4.1B: CCG can demonstrate it has taken steps to communicate its vision and priorities to stakeholders, patients and the public.	<i>Base</i>	
Which of the following steps, if any, has Trafford CCG taken to <u>communicate</u> its vision and priorities to you? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CCG has held events, workshops or meetings</li> <li>2. The CCG has sent out bulletins or other documents</li> <li>3. The CCG has published information on its website</li> <li>4. Representatives from the CCG have attended board meetings</li> <li>5. Representatives from the CCG have attended other meetings</li> <li>6. The CCG has not taken any steps to communicate its vision and priorities to me</li> </ol>		<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the steps that Trafford CCG has taken to <u>communicate</u> its vision and priorities to you?	65% (34) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All stakeholders (52)</i>

# Domain 1: Summary

Criteria 1.4.2A: Clinicians have taken steps to engage with LINKs/local HealthWatch and patient groups.	Base	
<p>Which of the following steps, if any, have <u>clinicians</u> from Trafford CCG taken to communicate its plans and priorities to your organisation?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clinicians from the CCG have been involved in/present at events, workshops or meetings</li> <li>2. Clinicians from the CCG have been involved in the publication of bulletins or other documents</li> <li>3. Clinicians from the CCG have been involved in the publication of information on its website</li> <li>4. Clinicians from the CCG have attended board meetings</li> <li>5. Clinicians from the CCG have attended other meetings</li> <li>6. Clinicians from the CCG have not taken any steps to communicate its plans and priorities to me</li> </ol>		<p><i>All LINKs/ HealthWatch and patient groups (2)</i></p>
<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree that <u>clinicians</u> from Trafford CCG have actively engaged with your organisation?</p>	<p>100% (2) strongly/tend to agree</p>	<p><i>All LINKs/ HealthWatch and patient groups (2)</i></p>
<p>How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the steps taken by <u>clinicians</u> from Trafford CCG to <u>engage</u> with your organisation?</p>	<p>100% (2) very/fairly satisfied</p>	<p><i>All LINKs/ HealthWatch and patient groups (2)</i></p>

# Domain 1: Summary

Criteria 1.4.2B: Positive feedback from LINKs/local HealthWatch and patient groups.	Base
<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG...?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is clear and visible <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG</li> <li>2. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to deliver its plans and priorities</li> <li>3. The <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG will be able to deliver continued quality improvements</li> <li>4. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to involve other clinical colleagues providing health service locally.</li> </ol>	<p><i>All LINKs/HealthWatch and patient groups (2)</i></p> <p>100% (2) strongly/tend to agree            100% (2) strongly/tend to agree            50% (1) strongly/tend to agree            100% (2) strongly/tend to agree</p>

# Domain 1: Summary

- Views on the arrangements to ensure that the clinical perspective is represented within Trafford CCG are mostly positive.
- Among member practices, all but four state that the arrangements in place for member participation are effective (better than the average), despite only half of practices feeling they were involved in decisions about the proposed configuration, structure and governance arrangements.
- Two of the three other health professionals are aware of arrangements for them to input to the CCG, but none are satisfied with these arrangements; one is dissatisfied and two are neutral.
- Health and wellbeing board members and representatives of LINKs/HealthWatch/patient groups are mostly positive about the clinical leadership of the CCG and how actively they have engaged with their respective organisations.

## Domain 2: Meaningful engagement with patients, carers and their communities

# Domain 2: Summary

Criteria 2.1.2A: CCG has engaged local authority/ties in establishing its geographic area.	<b>Base</b>	
How involved were you, if at all, in discussions about the <u>geographic area</u> that Trafford CCG would cover?	50% (2) very/fairly involved 50% (2) very/fairly involved -% (-) very/fairly involved	<i>All local authorities (4)</i> <i>Upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i> <i>Lower tier local authorities (-)</i>
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with Trafford CCG's <u>boundaries</u> ?	100% (4) very/fairly satisfied 100% (4) very/fairly satisfied -% (-) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All local authorities (4)</i> <i>Upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i> <i>Lower tier local authorities (-)</i>

## Domain 2: Summary

- Despite only two of the four local authority stakeholders saying they were involved in discussions about the geographic area the CCG would cover, there does not seem to have been any change from the PCT boundaries and all are satisfied with them.

**Domain 3: Clear and credible plans which continue to deliver the QIPP (quality, innovation, productivity and prevention) challenge within financial resources, in line with national requirements (including excellent outcomes) and local joint health and wellbeing strategies.**

Version 18 | Internal Use Only

# Domain 3: Summary

Criteria 3.1.2A: CCG can demonstrate that the process for developing its plans and priorities was inclusive and transparent.	Base
Have you been <u>involved</u> in the development of any of the following activities, or not? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Service or pathway design</li> <li>2. Priority setting</li> <li>3. Resource allocation</li> <li>4. Developing commissioning intentions</li> <li>5. Developing joint commissioning arrangements with local authorities or other CCGs</li> <li>6. None of these</li> </ol>	<div style="text-align: right;"> <p><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p> <p>31% (16)</p> <p>25% (13)</p> <p>15% (8)</p> <p>35% (18)</p> <p>21% (11)</p> <p>46% (24)</p> </div>
Overall, how inclusive, if at all, do you feel the <u>process</u> has been for developing Trafford CCG's plans and priorities?	<div style="text-align: right;"> <p><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p> <p>79% (41) very/fairly inclusive</p> </div>
Overall, how transparent, if at all, do you feel the <u>process</u> has been for developing Trafford CCG's plans and priorities	<div style="text-align: right;"> <p><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p> <p>75% (39) very/fairly transparent</p> </div>
Overall, how involved, if at all, do you feel you have been <u>in developing</u> Trafford CCG's plans and priorities?	<div style="text-align: right;"> <p><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p> <p>52% (27) very/fairly involved</p> </div>

# Domain 3: Summary

Criteria 3.1.2B: CCG can demonstrate where and how the CCG is working with other CCGs to meet QIPP, and can demonstrate that stakeholders are aware of and understand CCG priorities	Base												
<p>Are you <u>aware of</u> any of the following activities, or not?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Service decommissioning</li> <li>2. Management of prescribing spend</li> <li>3. Management of clinical variation</li> <li>4. Risk stratification</li> <li>5. Pathway redesign</li> <li>6. None of these</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right;">35% (18)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">67% (35)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">44% (23)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">27% (14)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">69% (36)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">6% (3)</td> </tr> </table>		35% (18)		67% (35)		44% (23)		27% (14)		69% (36)		6% (3)
	35% (18)												
	67% (35)												
	44% (23)												
	27% (14)												
	69% (36)												
	6% (3)												
<p>Have you been <u>involved in</u> any of the following activities or not?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Service decommissioning</li> <li>2. Management of prescribing spend</li> <li>3. Management of clinical variation</li> <li>4. Risk stratification</li> <li>5. Pathway redesign</li> <li>6. None of these</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>All who have been aware of activities (45)</i></p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right;">13% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">24% (11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">13% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">11% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">40% (18)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">40% (18)</td> </tr> </table>		13% (6)		24% (11)		13% (6)		11% (5)		40% (18)		40% (18)
	13% (6)												
	24% (11)												
	13% (6)												
	11% (5)												
	40% (18)												
	40% (18)												
<p>To what extent, if at all, are you aware of Trafford CCG's <u>QIPP plans and priorities</u>?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">85% (44) fully aware of them/aware of them but not in detail</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>All stakeholders (52)</i></p>												
<p>Overall, how clear, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG's <u>QIPP plans and priorities</u> are?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84% (37) very/fairly clear</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>All stakeholders who are aware of QIPP plans and priorities (44)</i></p>												

# Domain 3: Summary

<p>How confident, are you, if at all, that Trafford CCG's QIPP plans will <u>deliver continuous improvement</u> in quality within the available resources?</p>	<p>68% (30) very/fairly confident</p>	<p><i>All stakeholders who are aware of QIPP plans and priorities (44)</i></p>
<p><b>Criteria 3.1.2C: Member practices understand at least at a high level their local plan and priorities.</b></p>		<p><b>Base</b></p>
<p>How well, if at all, would you say that you <u>understand</u>...</p> <p>A. The financial implications of Trafford CCG's plan?</p> <p>B. The implications of Trafford CCG's plan for service improvement?</p> <p>C. The referral and activity implications of Trafford CCG's plan?</p>	<p>60% (18) very/fairly well</p> <p>57% (17) very/fairly well</p> <p>60% (18) very/fairly well</p>	<p><i>All member practices (30)</i></p>
<p><b>Criteria 3.1.2D: Member practices receive timely information to inform their involvement in CCG planning and monitoring delivery of those plans.</b></p>		<p><b>Base</b></p>
<p>How well, if at all, do you understand what is <u>required</u> of your practice in order to implement Trafford CCG's plans?</p>	<p>67% (20) very/fairly well</p>	<p><i>All member practices (30)</i></p>
<p>How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the <u>timeliness of information</u> you receive from Trafford CCG to inform your planning and implementation?</p>	<p>57% (17) very/fairly satisfied</p>	<p><i>All member practices (30)</i></p>

# Domain 3: Summary

Criteria 3.3H. On-going discussion between CCG and provider organisations about long-term strategy and plans.	Base	
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG and your organisation are <u>working together</u> to develop long-term provider strategy and plans?	40% (2) very/fairly well	All providers (5)
How involved, if at all, has Trafford CCG been in <u>contract or performance negotiations</u> ?	60% (3) very/fairly involved	All providers (5)
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG <u>understands</u> the challenges facing your provider organisation?	20% (1) very/fairly well	All providers (5)
How committed, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG has been in <u>helping you</u> as a provider to deliver your QIPP plans?	40% (2) very/fairly committed	All providers (5)
<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG...?</p> <p>A. There is clear and visible <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG</p> <p>B. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to deliver its plans and priorities</p> <p>C. The <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG will be able to deliver continued quality improvements</p> <p>D. I have confidence in the <u>clinical</u> leadership of Trafford CCG to involve other clinical colleagues providing health services locally</p>	<p>40% (2) strongly/tend to agree</p> <p>40% (2) strongly/tend to agree</p> <p>20% (1) strongly/tend to agree</p> <p>40% (2) strongly/tend to agree</p>	All providers (5)

## Domain 3: Summary

- Awareness and understanding of Trafford CCG's QIPP plans and priorities is good.
- More than four in five stakeholders are at least aware of the QIPP plans and priorities and report them to be clear, a little higher than the Wave 4 average for clarity.
- More typically, around two in three have confidence that these QIPP plans will deliver continuous improvements in quality within the available resources.
- Views are less positive among NHS provider stakeholders, however; only two of the five believe the CCG is committed to helping them deliver their own QIPP plans.

# **Domain 5: Collaborative arrangements for commissioning with other CCGs, local authorities and the NHSCB as well as the appropriate commissioning support**

Version 18 | Internal Use Only

# Domain 5: Summary

Criteria 5.3A. Where the need for integrated commissioning has been identified by the health and wellbeing board and in the JHWS, CCGs are collaborating with the local authority(ies) to develop shared plans.	Base	
Has a need for <u>integrated commissioning</u> between Trafford CCG and the local authority been identified by your health and wellbeing board and in the JHWS, or not?	100% (3) yes	<i>All health and wellbeing board members(3)</i>
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG and the local authority are working together to <u>develop shared plans</u> for integrated commissioning?	67% (2) very/fairly well	<i>All health and wellbeing board members where a need for integrated commissioning has been identified (3)</i>
Has a need for <u>integrated commissioning</u> between Trafford CCG and your local authority been identified by the health and wellbeing board and in the JHWS, or not?	100% (4) yes 100% (4) yes  -% (-) yes	<i>All local authorities (4) All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4) All lower tier local authorities (-)</i>
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG and your local authority are working together to <u>develop shared plans</u> for integrated commissioning?	100% (4) very/fairly well  100% (4) very/fairly well -% (-) very/fairly well	<i>All local authorities where a need for integrated commissioning has been identified (4) All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4) All lower tier local authorities (-)</i>

# Domain 5: Summary

<b>Criteria 5.3B. Clear line of accountability for safeguarding is reflected in CCG governance arrangements, and CCG has arrangements in place to co-operate with the local authority in the operation of the Local Safeguarding Children Board and the Safeguarding Adults Board.</b>	<b>Base</b>	
Does Trafford CCG have arrangements in place with your local authority to <u>co-operate in the operation</u> of the Local Safeguarding Children Board, or not?	75% (3) yes	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i>
How appropriate, if at all, would you say the arrangements are for Trafford CCG and your local authority to <u>co-operate in the operation</u> of the Local Safeguarding Children Board?	100% (3) very/fairly appropriate	<i>All upper tier/unitary that have arrangements in place (3)</i>
Do you know who will be <u>accountable</u> for safeguarding children within Trafford CCG, or not?	75% (3) yes (know name, role, or how to contact)	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i>
Does Trafford CCG have arrangements in place with your local authority to <u>co-operate in the operation</u> of the Safeguarding Adults Board, or not?	75% (3) yes	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i>
How appropriate, if at all, would you say the arrangements are for Trafford CCG and your local authority to <u>co-operate in the operation</u> of the Safeguarding Adults Board?	100% (3) very/fairly appropriate	<i>All upper tier/unitary that have arrangements in place (3)</i>
Do you know who will be <u>accountable</u> for safeguarding adults within Trafford CCG, or not?	75% (3) yes (know name, role, or how to contact)	<i>All upper tier/unitary local authorities (4)</i>

# Domain 5: Summary

Criteria 5.4A. CCG can demonstrate how they have identified their commissioning support intentions.	Base	
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG has <u>communicated</u> its support needs to you?	100% (1) very/fairly well	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>
How well, if at all, would you say Trafford CCG and your organisation are <u>working together</u> to develop commissioning support arrangements?	100% (1) very/fairly well	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>
To what extent, if at all, do you feel Trafford CCG has <u>engaged</u> with you in agreeing the <u>Service Level Agreement</u> (SLA) or <u>contract</u> ?	100% (1) a great deal/fair amount	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way in which Trafford CCG has <u>worked</u> with you to develop the <u>Service Level Agreement</u> (SLA) or <u>contract</u> ?	100% (1) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>
<p>How confident are you, if at all, that Trafford CCG has the following in place to be able to <u>fulfil its part</u> of the SLA or contract?</p> <p>A. Skills and experience within the leadership team</p> <p>B. Capacity to oversee the relationship between the CCG and your CSS</p> <p>C. Seniority and experience to oversee the relationship between the CCG and your CSS</p> <p>D. Systems and processes within the CCG to articulate its commissioning support requirements</p>	<p>100% (1) very/fairly confident</p> <p>100% (1) very/fairly confident</p> <p>100% (1) very/fairly confident</p> <p>100% (1) very/fairly confident</p>	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>
Which of the following best describes the SLA or contract between Trafford CCG and your CSS?	-% (-) the SLA is fit for purpose for the longer term	<i>All commissioning support services (1)</i>

# Domain 5: Summary

- Stakeholders are satisfied that collaborative arrangements are in place and working well within Trafford CCG.
- Local authority stakeholders feel that they are working well with the CCG to develop shared plans where a need for integrated commissioning has been identified.
- There do seem to be arrangements in place with the local authority to safeguard both children and adults. In both these cases, the arrangements in place to support co-operation are said to be appropriate, and most know the name or role of the person accountable within the CCG.
- The relationship with the CSS also appears to be working well and the stakeholder is fairly confident in the CCG's ability to fulfil its part of the SLA or contract.

# Domain 6: Great leaders who individually and collectively can make a real difference

Version 18 | Internal Use Only

# Domain 6: Summary

Criteria 6.2A. Systems in place to sustain two-way accountability between members.	<b>Base</b>	
How well, if at all, do you understand <u>your responsibilities as a member practice</u> , as set out in Trafford CCG's constitution?	70% (21) very/fairly well	<i>All member practices (30)</i>
How well, if at all, do you understand the <u>responsibilities of Trafford CCG's governing body</u> towards you as a member practice, as set out in Trafford CCG's constitution?	63% (19) very/fairly well	<i>All member practices (30)</i>
How, confident are you, if at all, in the systems to sustain <u>two-way accountability</u> between the CCG and its member practices in Trafford CCG?	63% (19) very/fairly confident	<i>All member practices (30)</i>
Are there <u>clear arrangements</u> in place for the delegation of functions within Trafford CCG, at the point of authorisation, or not?	43% (13) there are arrangements	<i>All member practices (30)</i>
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the <u>arrangements</u> in place for the delegation of functions within Trafford CCG?	54% (7) very/fairly satisfied	<i>All member practices where arrangements are in place (13)</i>
Criteria 6.4C. Documented support of members for Chair of governing body.	<b>Base</b>	
How confident are you, if at all, in the <u>leadership</u> provided by the Designate Chair of Trafford CCG's governing body?	93% (28) very/fairly confident	<i>All member practices (30)</i>

# Domain 6: Summary

- Around two in three member practices report some understanding of the respective responsibilities of the practice towards the governing body and vice versa, and also have confidence in the systems in place to sustain two-way accountability.
- However, only two in five member practices report that there are clear arrangements for delegation of functions within the CCG, with just over half of these being satisfied with the arrangements.
- Almost all member practices say they are confident in the leadership provided by the Designate Chair. Trafford CCG performs broadly in line with the Wave 4 average in terms of its governance arrangements, although satisfaction with the arrangements in place for the delegation of functions is lower.

This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for market research, ISO 20252:2006 and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found [here](#)