



## Referrals from the Priorities Panel

The Group is asked to consider recommendations from the LINK's Priorities Panel in respect of issues which have been brought to the attention of the LINK.

Also attached to this report is an extract from the LINK's Governance Framework, which was updated at the LINK's Annual Meeting in May 2009, together with an explanation of the decision making model used by the Panel in helping it to arrive at its decisions on whether the LINK should take action. The Panel is currently discussing whether this scoring system can be used to advise Governors on the relative priorities between the ever increasing numbers of issues being brought to the LINK for action.

### **ID 026      Inadequate mental health provision to support rough sleepers and homeless people**

**Scores:** 27, 15, 28, 29, 20 Average score =: 24(36\*) \* Denotes maximum score possible

#### **Recommendation to Governors' Group:**

That the Governors' Group draw this concern to the attention of the commissioners of NHS and social care services for people suffering mental ill health.

### **ID 031      West Kent NHS Transforming Community Services proposal**

**Scores:** 25, 29, 35, 12, 36 Average score = 28(36\*)

#### **Recommendation to Governors' Group:**

Although the Panel thought this proposal had great merit the Panel recommends that the LINK declines the request that it carries out this piece of work on behalf of NHS West Kent in view of the limited amount of time available. However, it is recommended that the LINK promote the consultation, provide representation at the various workshops / events via the LINK's bulletin and encourage LINK participants to get involved in the consultation.

### **ID 032      A User's Perspective of Day Centres in East Kent**

**Scores:** 26, 25, 35, 22, 21 Average score = 26(36)\*

#### **Recommendation to Governors' Group:**

That this proposal be taken forward as a LINK project subject to the Governors' Group finding suitable resources.

## **Extract from LINK Governance Framework**

“The Priorities Panel has a duty to report to the LINK Governors’ Group, where:

- 1.1. An issue is considered to have implications for the governance of the LINK.
- 1.2. Where LINK resources are to be used on a proposed project.
- 1.3. Where a referral is to be made to convey LINK participants’ views to :
  - a. NHS Trusts (including Primary Care Trusts)
  - b. Kent County Council
  - c. Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the Kent County Council or other such scrutiny or regulatory bodies.
2. In deciding on a proposal from the Priorities Panel where resources are required (such as funding for a LINK project), the Governors’ Group can refuse such a request with regard to the availability of LINK funds or where the Governors’ Group believe that the proposal may bring the LINK into disrepute or where a governance issue is involved. The Governors cannot usually refuse a proposal in respect of the merits or demerits of that proposal.
3. The Priorities Panel members could be invited to take part in the Governors’ discussion on their proposal. The Priorities Panel members would not be entitled to vote.
4. Once a proposal / LINK project is approved by the Governors then the Governors’ Group would be responsible for ensuring that a process for project management is put in place, to monitor its operation and to intervene if it is felt that it is not proceeding to their satisfaction or where the LINK’s integrity is threatened. The Priorities Panel would have no further role in the matter.
5. In relation to a LINK project the Governors’ Group could commission an external organisation, including supporting a local community and voluntary sector group, to carry out such a project on the LINK’s behalf or, after discussing with the Host, arrange for it to be carried out in-house.....”

## **Note on Priorities Panel decision making model**

It may assist the Group to be aware of the process which the Priorities Panel is required to use when considering an issue which has been brought to the LINK. This decision making framework is set out in the LINK's Governance Framework. This decision making model has also been the subject of consultation with LINK participants.

The following elements are considered when making decisions:

- a. Structured evidence – information that has some research base, can be verifiable and as far as possible is free from bias - **Weighting 3**
- b. Unstructured evidence – softer information, some of which may be anecdotal but may also be from a range of sources - **Weighting 2**
- c. Can the LINK make an impact in the time available - **Weighting 1**
- d. Is the issue being dealt with by somebody else - **Weighting 1**
- e. To what extent will the community be affected by the issue - **Weighting 2**
- f. Can the LINK make a difference to the current situation - **Weighting 1**
- g. What is the impact on inequalities in health and social care - **Weighting 2**

Each Panel member can award an initial score of nought to three against each of the above elements. For example, an issue that is presented to the LINK which has been well researched may attract an initial score of, say, 2 (the second highest possible) – the weighting for structured evidence is 3, so,  $2 \times 3 = 6$ . The only converse score is that which relates to whether the issue is being dealt with by somebody else. In this case a low score would indicate that some other organisation was already doing something on the issue. The maximum score for any one issue under the above system would be 36 points.

It has to be remembered that this is only a tool to assist with decision making and to assist in determining relative priorities between issues when resource are finite.

Graham Hills  
Operational Director, the Kent LINK

February 2010