|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item:** | **10** |
| **Attachment:** | **E** |

**HRA BOARD COVER SHEET**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date of Meeting:** | 20th May 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Paper:** | Management response to staff survey |
| **Purpose of Paper:** | To outline to the board steps that have been taken in responding to a number of issues raised as a result of the 2015 Staff Survey |
| **Reason for Submission:** | For the board to note actions taken and to discuss any further interventions that may be helpful. |
| **Lead reviewer:** | Janet Wisely |
| **Details:** | See paper |
| **Suitable for wider circulation?** | Yes as will be Part 1 board item and therefore publically available  |
| **Time required for item:** | 10 mins |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation / Proposed Actions:** | **To Approve** | **Yes** |
| **To Note** |  |
| **For Discussion** | **Yes** |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** | Ian Cook |
| **Job Title:** | Director Corporate Services |
| **Date:** | 13th May 2016 |

**Management Response to 2015 Staff Survey**

**Introduction**

The survey was carried out during November 2015, initial results were produced in December 2015 and a full report completed in January 2016. The Board received a full presentation on the results on February.

Overall results were very encouraging and positive, with an improvement, from 2014, in the vast majority of areas. The HRA also outscored against benchmarks in the vast majority of areas were comparisons were available. However there were a small number of questions that resulted in responses that warranted further management investigation and in one case a requirement for a deeper understanding of the reasons which contributed to staff in one directorate in one office recording a generally much less positive response that the rest of the organisation (There will be a verbal update on this specific issue)

This short report outlines the actions that the HRA has taken since January 2016 to address these issues.

**Speaking up**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2015** | **2014** | **Diff to 2014** | **BMG Benchmark** | **Diff to benchmark 2015** |
| **I can speak my mind without fear of negative consequences** | **Sample Bases** | 149 | 86 |  | N/A | N/A |
| **Summary: Agree** | 58% | 57% | 1% |  |  |
| **Summary: Disagree** | 21% | 27% | -6% |  |  |

**HRA Response**

Although responses indicated an improvement from 2014, it was still considered an important area to address as 1 in 5 people had indicated that they had a reluctance to ‘speak their mind’. The following actions have been taken

1. **Raising** **concerns policy** - has been produced, agreed by the board and published. This includes the identification of a Board ‘Champion’ to whom matters can be escalated if it is felt that normal organisational channels have not been effective. This has been promoted across the organisation through the All Staff VC’s and through discussion within management teams
2. **Staff Forum** – efforts have been made to increase visibility and to reaffirm the offer that members of staff are able to approach staff reps about ‘any’ issues of concern. Terms of Reference have been revised to reflect this approach. Publicity regarding the forum has been increased, with posters in all offices, an updated web presence, a regular slot at staff induction and more recently a very well received presentation at the all staff day.

**Managing Poor Performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2015** | **2014** | **Diff to 2014** | **BMG Benchmark** | **Diff to benchmark 2015** |
| **My line manager effectively deals with poor performance**  | **Sample Bases** | 149 | 86 |  |  |  |
| **Summary: Agree** | 44% | 36% | 8% | 50% | -6% |
| **Summary: Disagree** | 17% | 26% | -9% |  |  |

Once again there was an improvement on last year, and 8% increase on those agreeing with the statement that ‘managers effectively deal with poor performance’ however this still left just over 1 in 5 who disagreed and a majority neutral. The Board reflected that this may be because there was not experience of managing performance, or because it is essentially confidential in nature. Nevertheless it was important area to address.

Further analysis of the data was commissioned to try and assess whether there were any common factors which contributed to ‘dissatisfaction’ levels. What appeared to be quite clear was that those people who were ‘looking for a job in the next year’, or didn’t agree with the statements about being ‘committed to the organisation’, or ‘going the extra mile’ or ‘motivated to do a good job’ were 2-3 times more likely to be concerned about the management of poor performance

**HRA Response**

1. **Training –** The EMT had a session in February on managing hearings in relation to employment relations issues. This covered process, procedures and legislation. For the wider management group it is proposed to run a number of training sessions in 2016/17
2. **NHS BSA** – Director Corporate Services has had discussions with Senior HR Advisers at BSA to discuss consistent approach to managing poor performance (at the formal stage) and stressed the importance of supporting management in handling cases to an effective and conclusion

**EMT, Communicating**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2015** | **2014** | **Diff to 2014** | **BMG Benchmark** | **Diff to benchmark 2015** |
| **Executive management team are good at explaining the reasons for why decisions are made** | **Sample Bases** | 147 | 84 |  |  |  |
| **Summary: Agree** | 46% | 46% | 0% | 36% | 10% |
| **Summary: Disagree** | 24% | 29% | -5% |  |  |

One in four disagreed with the statement (which was a similar level to 2014), however it remained 10% better than the national benchmark used by the research company. It should also be noted that overall 84% of staff still feel ‘informed’.

**HRA Response**

1. **All Staff VC –** All significant organisational wide decisions are shared at the monthly All Staff VC’s (which 76% of staff view to be effective)
2. **Managers –** It is a key responsibility for Directors to cascade information via their management teams. This message will be reinforced throughout the year
3. **Staff Forum –** Key proposals are also, where possible, discussed and considered by the Staff Forum as are the implications of the resulting decisions
4. **EMT Action and Decision Log –** these are made available on the Intranet and will be further promoted through HRA News

**Appraisal**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2015** | **2014** | **Diff to 2014** | **BMG Benchmark** | **Diff to benchmark 2015** |
| **The appraisal documentation is easy to use and is fit for purpose**  | **Sample Bases** | **117** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| **Summary: Agree** | **27%** |  |  |  |  |
| **Summary: Disagree** | **55%** |  |  |  |  |

55% disagreed with the statement that the ‘Appraisal Documentation was fit for purpose’

**HRA Response**

1. The documentation has been significantly simplified and is currently being piloted in action for this year’s appraisal round