

Data Working Group notes – 25 January 2024

In attendance:

Cllr Patrick Canavan (Lead Member), Cllr Joe Salmon, Cllr Stephen Bartlett, Jillian Kay (JK), Sam Crowe (SC), Roger Jones (RJ), Nicky Mitchell (NM), Lindsay Marshall (LM) and Louise Smith (LS)

Notes and actions detailed as follows:

- SC shared the slide which had been previously circulated to advise the group of the level of data available and the levels that would be appropriate to be considered by the group. Links in the presentation can be accessed to consider data. **ACTION by working group members.**
- LM advised that considering the key lines of enquiry and understanding b) would be a useful exercise at this meeting.
- The group discussed the Dorset intelligence and insight Service (DiiS) dashboard and who could have access to that data. SC to take away to see if Committee members could gain access. **ACTION (SC)**
- It was noted that that ASC had provided some data to DiiS who had formulated a dashboard for BCP to pilot.
- NM shared a powerpoint presentation (copy attached)
- Following the presentation the group discussed how data was collected differently by authorities and agencies which made it hard to draw comparisons.
- Cllr Salmon advised he would expect the following to be provided with reports to scrutiny:
 1. historical trends
 2. regional and national comparisons
 3. costings and budget implications
 4. Limitations of any data provided (added by Jillian)
 5. Demographic comparisons
- The need for context and comparators was highlighted to enable effective scrutiny and recommendations and the challenges were detailed.
- It was highlighted as an aspiration of the Performance Executive Board which was chaired by the Chief Executive, to align finances to performance data and the benefits of this were detailed. How it worked at the moment was by identifying the questions that were key and then working across the finance and performance teams to try and give us the best picture to work with.
- It was noted that there were still variations within BCP regarding systems used due to the joining of the three authorities which also presented difficulties.
- The group was advised the best way to scrutinise data effectively would be to have a strong framework and focused questions to work from.

- In response to an aspiration from the Chair about forward thinking regarding items coming on the forward plan and how to ensure the relevant information was supplied to the Committee, LM advised of the gift of the Committee to consider items coming forward and to think about what key lines of enquiry it wanted to focus on when at Committee and ensuring Officers were clear about what was being asked of them to be included in the report. LM advised this could be explored further. **ACTION.**
- JK highlighted JS providing questions to officers regarding reports prior to meetings to enable an opportunity for them to ensure they had the information to hand was good practice.
- The group discussed the performance and quality improvement board, its purpose and how it considered operational data and the challenge would be what would be considered by O&S so that it wasn't swamped with data and could focus scrutiny
- The patient journey and feedback through qualitative data was highlighted as a very important source of data information as the quantitative data could show that the service was going in the right direction in a certain area but the patient journey could tell a different story.
- The Director of Public Health advised that at the next meeting of the group he could share some of the dashboards which are monitored in his service.
ACTION – SC.
- It was highlighted that asking good focused questions such as why did BCP have higher levels of older people falling and fracturing their hips compared to Dorset and what type of questions and data could be considered when scrutinising that
- The difference between horizon scanning and deep diving into a specific issue was discussed
- The working group was advised of the work BCP had been undertaking with DiiS regarding dashboards which would provide indicators and the next piece of work bringing their data scientists together with ours to start using a programming language called Python to look at predictive analytics to that, which would show patterns and trends within the data.
- The working group discussed formulating a proforma which would be provided to officers regarding what the Committee would like to see as part of any scrutiny item report. **ACTION for dem services.**
- LM highlighted the key lines of enquiry and what data was available, what scrutiny needed to fulfil its role and was there a gap between the two and suggested that the members of the working group look through the data from the links provided and consider what might be useful for the Committee to consider. **ACTION for members of the Working Group.**
- LM highlighted that whilst the Committee could have access to the data all year round, it could be considered once a year as part of a forward planning session to consider some focused items to scrutinise
- SC highlighted the importance of national reports provided by organisations like the Health Foundation which provided good benchmarked data on the performance of health and care systems.

- Another example given was a Care Quality Commission report called Beyond Barriers which showed more nurses were being employed within acute services as opposed to community care however all local plans and strategies were focusing on providing care closer to home.
- SC advised he would pull together some information on organisations which provided national reports and provide it to the working group. **ACTION (SC)**