

Summary: Brent CCG

Engagement and relationships: Overall, stakeholders tend to be satisfied with the way in which Brent CCG has engaged with them so far. The majority of those who do feel they have been engaged are also satisfied with the way in which that has been done, though this is slightly lower than the average for all Wave 2 aspiring CCGs. The majority agree that Brent CCG has listened to their views where they have provided them, though again the proportion doing so is lower than average. This pattern continues in relation to the extent to which respondents agree the CCG has acted on their suggestions, as less than half agree this is the case.

Perceptions of the working relationship and the leadership of the CCG are also slightly lower than for other Wave 2 CCGs, though the majority are still positive about these points.

Views are relatively consistent across different stakeholder groups. There appear to be specific individuals across different groups with more negative views, rather than a lower pattern of engagement or satisfaction in one particular group.

Domain 1: Perceptions of arrangements to ensure that the clinical perspective is represented within Brent CCG are mixed. Seven in ten member practices think the structures in place for them to be involved in decision-making are effective but only half feel they were involved in discussions about proposed configuration, structure and governance arrangements. These results are broadly in line with the Wave 2 average. Two of the three other clinical colleagues outside the CCG surveyed say there are arrangements in place to input to Brent CCG about local healthcare services, yet none of the three are satisfied with these arrangements. Opinions are divided amongst health and wellbeing board members regarding the leadership of Brent CCG. However, all three of these respondents do think the clinical leaders of the CCG are very active members of their health and wellbeing board. LINKs/HealthWatch/patient group stakeholders are mainly positive about the clinical leadership of the CCG but are divided on whether the clinical leaders of Brent CCG are engaging effectively.

Domain 2: Just two of the five local authority stakeholders responding say that they were involved in discussions about the geographic area of Brent CCG. However, three stakeholders say there had been no change in the boundaries and four in five are satisfied with them.

Domain 3: The vast majority of stakeholders are aware of Brent CCG's QIPP plans and priorities, and three quarters report them to be clear. Stakeholders are less likely though to have confidence that the QIPP plans will deliver continuous improvements in quality within the available resources. In addition, three of the five stakeholders from the NHS providers do not feel that the CCG is committed to helping them deliver their own QIPP plans.

Domain 5: Brent CCG's collaborative arrangements and shared plans seem to be relatively strong. Local authority stakeholders say that they are working well together on integrated commissioning. However, there appears to be limited awareness regarding the arrangements in place with the local authority to safeguard both children and adults, though two stakeholders have knowledge of these. Those who are aware do think the arrangements in place are appropriate though. There is also uncertainty about who will be accountable for these services.

Domain 6: Most member practices report a good understanding of the responsibilities of the practice, though understanding of the governing body's responsibilities is lower than the average for Wave 2. Around half of stakeholders say that there are arrangements in place for the delegation of functions, and fewer than half of these are satisfied with them, a result

which is slightly lower than seen in other CCGs. Seven in ten member practices are confident in the Designate Chair, but again this is slightly lower than the Wave 2 average.

Summary: In formal collaborative arrangements, Brent CCG seems to have the required arrangements in place and stakeholders are generally satisfied with these arrangements. However, engagement and relationships tend to be rated less well than may be expected comparing to the average for aspiring Wave 2 CCGs.

Technical note: *This summary is intended to be read in conjunction with the PowerPoint report, which provides a full breakdown of all of the results for the CCG. The findings are based on the results of a survey conducted with the CCG's stakeholders, as nominated by the CCG in line with a specification provided, between 16 July and 10 August 2012. Ipsos MORI sent all stakeholders an email invitation to an online survey, followed by reminder emails for those who did not respond and follow-up telephone interviews where these could be achieved.*

Please note that numbers of people completing the survey are extremely small for some questions. Differences between stakeholder groups will not be statistically significant. Comparisons to the Wave 2 average are only provided for questions asked of all stakeholders and member practices.