Ashford and St. Peter's Hospitals NHS
NHS Foundation Trust

TRUST BOARD
27th January 2011

TITLE	**Foundation Trust Application Post Project Evaluation report**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	On 1st December 2010, the trust was authorised as a Foundation Trust and the Foundation Trust application project came to an end. At the final meeting of the Foundation Trust Project Board on 8th December 2010, it was agreed that a post project evaluation would be undertaken, with the key findings and outstanding actions presented to the Trust Board for review and ongoing monitoring. The focus of this report is: • What worked well during the project. • What could have worked better. • What lessons learned will be applied to future projects.
BOARD ASSURANCE (Risk) / IMPLICATIONS	The assurance process is as follows: • Outstanding actions from the project and the final Project Board meeting will be monitored by the Board to ensure that they are fully addressed. • Risks identified in the project's Post Authorisation Risk Log are being reviewed and incorporated in the Trust's Corporate Risk Register and Board Assurance Framework. • Lessons learned in relation to project management and project support will be incorporated into future projects to ensure that they run as effectively as possible.
STAKEHOLDER / PATIENT IMPACT AND VIEWS	Stakeholder and Patient views were integral to the project. A patient panel representative was a member of the FT Project Board, 28 Governors have been appointed and over 9,400 members have been recruited.
EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES	All equality and diversity issues were addressed during the project – no outstanding issues have been identified as part of this Post Project Evaluation Report.
LEGAL ISSUES	All legal issues were addressed during the project – no outstanding issues have been identified as part of this Post Project Evaluation Report.
The Trust Board is asked to:	Note the Post Project Evaluation report and review progress against identified actions
Submitted by:	Raj Bhamber, Director of Workforce and Organisational Development (Foundation Trust Project Executive Lead)
Date:	20th January 2011
Decision:	For **Noting**

Ashford and St. Peter's Hospitals NHS
NHS Foundation Trust

Foundation Trust Application

January 2011

Post project evaluation report

1. Purpose of Document 3
2. Achievement of the Project's Objectives 3
3. Post Project Review and Lessons learned 4
3.1 What were the key lessons learned? 4
3.2 What worked well? 4
3.3 What could be improved? 5
3.4 How will these lessons be used to inform future projects? 5
4. Actions 6

1. Purpose of Document

This post project evaluation report has been collated by the Foundation Trust (FT) Project Manager and includes a review of the objectives, key lessons learned, what worked well and what could have been done differently, how to use the lessons to inform future projects and to agree a way forward for any outstanding issues.

2. Review and Achievement of the Project's Objectives

The Terms of Reference for the Foundation Trust Board set out the objectives for the Foundation Trust Application. These have been reviewed and progress is as follows: :

Actions	Progress
To develop a Project Plan to ensure that all elements of action necessary to achieve NHS Foundation Trust status are completed within the necessary timescales and to the required standards.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To monitor progress against the Project Plan ensuring that the Executive and Trust Boards are kept up to date.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To approve the terms of reference and work programmes of the Project Team Sub Groups.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To ensure the Executive and Trust Boards receive accurate and timely information to enable effective management of the programme towards NHS Foundation Trust status and to enable appropriate, well informed, decisions to be made as necessary.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To identify resources required to support the Project and ensure these are put in place.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To manage the project budget with delegated authority to appoint staff, purchase equipment and commission services where necessary.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.
To ensure effective partnership working with key stakeholders and proper communications throughout the process.	Achieved throughout the life of the project – no outstanding actions.

3. Post Project Review and Lessons learned

3.1 What were the key lessons learned?

- Formal project/programme management and techniques are invaluable:
  - The benefits of robust arrangements outweigh the cost.
  - Dedicated resources and budgets are required.
  - Established consultancy firms can be very expensive and do not always assist in the most appropriate way
- An external project manager brought a new perspective to the project and helped with the liaison with Monitor. Her background in financial accounting and strategic planning also helped with challenging assumptions and processes before and during the Monitor Phase.
- FT status is not an end in itself, but is part of being a good organisation.
- The application process is long and complicated; patience, persistence and adequate resources are important.
- Clarity around mission, strategy and objectives is imperative before starting to write the IBP.
- Basic systems and performance must be robust before commencing the application (CIPs, finances, staff satisfaction, quality, patient satisfaction)
- The right top team needs to be in place when the Monitor phase commences.
- Collating information for the SHA and Monitor was time consuming and repetitive.
- Staff and manager briefings were received positively.
- Establishing links with existing FTs was invaluable in terms of advice and sharing best practice.
- Complete engagement and commitment from the Board was essential in driving the project – this took a lot of time from the NEDs and there was a trade off with other activities at times.

3.2 What worked well?

- Robust Project Board with good leadership by the Project Director (particularly in the Monitor Phase).
- Informed, external advice and support (Programme/project office, independent consultants and organisations eg Foresight).
- Professional project management and support (particularly in the Monitor Phase).
- Dedicated resources:
  - Project Director with specific remit for the project
  - Project management and secretarial support for arranging Monitor, SHA and PWC meetings and co-ordinating Monitor and SHA submissions.
  - Key contact points for Monitor, PWC and SHA to liaise with.
  - Allocation of room for use by Monitor and PWC.
- Daily preparation and debrief meetings for Executive leads and interviewees during the intense, Monitor meeting phase.

- Collation of areas discussed and potential issues after every Monitor meeting – this was used as a briefing for subsequent meetings and the Board to Board meeting.
- A wide range of master classes on different subjects to inform and prepare the Board.
- A range of Board to Board preparatory sessions – the less formal, question and answer based sessions were more reassuring and useful than the staged formal sessions.
- Good working relationships between the project manager, Executive team and Membership team/Head of Corporate Affairs – ensuring a joined up approach.

3.3 What could be improved?

- Formal project management processes commencing at an earlier stage.
- Better forward planning and scheduling meetings at the commencement of the project.
- More investment in Public Relations/communications and marketing throughout the project.
- A more joined up approach in developing and writing the Integrated Business Plan (IBP).
- Clear Terms of Reference for the Project Board is essential; clarity is required for determining whether the purpose is information sharing, scrutiny, decision making etc.
- Basic project management skills are a huge advantage for executive directors and their direct reports:
  - Introducing a project management training and development event for senior staff would be a big advantage.
  - No programme/project should be started without a Programme Management Office (PMO), project/programme management lead.
  - A robust project/programme plan should be in place, including budget, timescales and communications strategy/plan.
  - A Project/programme Board should be established with an Executive sponsor.

3.4 How will these lessons be used to inform future projects?

1. Outstanding actions (set out in Section 4) will be monitored by the Trust Board.
2. Current Project/programme management processes will continue to be reviewed to ensure that they are robust and that they reflect the good practice established during this project.
3. Project and Board capacity and resources will be considered before commencement of future projects.
4. Robust governance arrangements will be in established for future projects.

4. Actions

Source	Actions	Responsibility	Group/Committee	Timescale
Post project evaluation questionnaire	Improve financial reporting and understanding of EBITDA and service lines	John Headley,	Finance Committee	Seminar before the April 2011 Trust Board
	Clarify and strengthen the role of governors and their relationship with Board	Aileen McLeish	Trust Board and Council of Governors	Induction (17 January 2011, another date to be agreed, development sessions towards the end of 2011)
	Develop (and procure where necessary) appropriate project/programme management skills in the organisation	Raj Bhamber	Programme Board (Programme 4 Leadership Development)	March 2011
	Review project management arrangements and requirements for existing and future projects	John Headley/Raj Bhamber	Executive Directors	Next ED Development session
Monitor Quality Governance Assessment	Implement actions identified in the Quality Governance Assessment action plans	Mike Baxter, Medical Director/ Suzanne Rankin, Chief Nurse	IGAC	March 2011
Governor's Induction session	Arrange a follow up induction session in February for governors unable to attend the January session	Raj Bhamber, Director of Workforce and Organisational Development/ Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs	Council of Governors	15 February 2011
	Review Governor's skills and development audit to address areas for further group or individual development	Raj Bhamber & Jules Arnould, Head of Organisational Development	Council of Governors	1 March 2011
	Request	Jane Gear, Head	Council of	Completed

Source	Actions	Responsibility	Group/Committee	Timescale
	permission to internally share Governor email addresses	of Corporate Affairs	Governors	
Final FT Project Board meeting	Support Governors to develop a member communications working group and provide examples of best practice from other Foundation Trusts	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs	Trust Board	27th January 2011
	Share Executive Directors' portfolios (including forward look) and Quality Accounts at February Council of Governor's meetings	Andrew Liles, Chief Executive/ Raj Bhamber, Director of Workforce and Organisational Development	Council of Governors	15th February 2011
	Finalise and share agenda for future Council of Governors meetings	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs	Trust Board	27th January
	Collate presentations for the Governor's inductions sessions	Vicki Hart-Dale, FT Project Manager	Complete	17th January 2011
	Offer choice of Governor induction and site tours dates	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs	Complete	17th January 2011
	Provide Governor briefings on media articles	Giselle Rothwell, Head of Communications	Council of Governors	Ongoing
	Transfer relevant risks from the FT post authorisation risk log to CRR/BAF	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs/ Suzanne Rankin, Chief Nurse	IGAC AND Trust Board	27th January 2011
	Clarify the process for submitting Q3 Monitor Compliance Framework submissions, including Board and sub	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs/ Valerie Howell. Deputy Chief Executive/ John Headley, Director of	Trust Board	27th January 2011

Source	Actions	Responsibility	Group/Committee	Timescale
	committee sign off	Finance and Information		
Final FT Project Board meeting	Identify responsible individuals for tracking areas of exception reporting	Executive leads	Trust Board	27th January 2011
	Notify Monitor of the recent NED resignation	Jane Gear, Head of Corporate Affairs	Trust Board	27th January 2011
	Collate comments into FT Project evaluation document	Vicki Hart-Dale, FT Project Manager	Trust Board	27th January 2011

5. Conclusion

Overall, the FT Project was a success, as evidenced by the 1st December 2010 authorisation and the positive feedback received from Monitor.

6. Recommendations

Key outstanding actions will be taken forward and monitored by the Executive Directors, Head of Corporate Affairs, Finance Committee and IGAC on behalf of the Trust Board.