







CCG Committee Members Effectiveness

Results from the committee members effectiveness at the Clinical Commissioning Group Committee.

Sample Size = 12





Comments

- Good start
- Opted out of Chairing questions!
- I thought that the Vice-Chair being the Chair of the Audit committee would act as a link between the board and the Audit committee
- We are only just getting through the transition so 13/14 will be the real test
- The diversity of the membership can be challenging for the Chair who deals with this effectively
- Discussion is allowed and encouraged which allows for the challenge to ensure assurance and the highlighting of any gaps
- The meetings are well constructed and prioritised, the road forward is clear and the processes seem to be well integrated
- The meeting time of 3 hours is more appropriate than 2 hours previously

Suggestions for Improvements

- Working well with strong partnership ethos
- Perhaps to establish a section in the "confidential" part of the meeting to deal specifically with soft intelligence and Patients' observations / comments or reports about the Quality and Standards of the various providers
- Need to continue with some joint sessions with SCE
- More involvement of patient issues would perhaps be useful, case presentations, patient stories, etc.
- The use of abbreviations is inevitable but usage needs to be controlled to make the papers and discussions understandable at all times
- Outside the meeting the chair could brief people who are in attendance (not members of the governing body) to clarify their roles at the meeting