NHS Health Education England

Allied Health Professions Faculty Maturity Matrix

Contents

	age 2
Domain descriptions – Purpose pa	190 L
Domain descriptions – AHP Faculty membership pa	age 3
Domain descriptions – Members' engagement pa	age 3
Domain descriptions – Governance pa	age 4
Domain descriptions – Leadership pa	age 5
Domain descriptions – Quality improvement and management pa	age 6
Domain descriptions – Data dashboard pa	age 6
Domain descriptions – Identification of workforce priorities pa	age 7
Domain descriptions – Sustainability pa	age 7
Allied Health professions Faculty Maturity Matrix – self-assessment pa	age 9

Background

- The AHP Faculty maturity matrix has been developed to outline the core characteristics of AHP Faculties as they develop.
- The AHP Faculty evaluation (2020) recommended that a maturity matrix was needed to support the set up and development of the AHP Faculties. The evaluation team produced a prototype as a "proof of concept" based on the AHP Faculty Logic Models.
- The 24 AHP Faculties involved in the initial test bed project were consulted on the prototype and the final maturity matrix was then co-produced based on the feedback received.
- The matrix outlines the core capabilities expected of emerging AHP Faculties, developing AHP Faculties and maturing AHP Faculties.
- It uses a progression model which shows a journey rather than a series of binary checklists, recognising that AHP Faculties will not develop all domains at the same pace and will therefore have varying levels of maturity across each domain.
- By doing this, it seeks to support more nuanced and reflective discussions about Faculty maturity and enables insight into where the Faculty may need to develop, and the support it may need from regional and national colleagues.
- The maturity matrix has been designed to facilitate the self-assessment of AHP Faculties internally. However, it also has the capability to support further collective evaluation of the Faculties regionally and/or nationally and may also be used to facilitate peer-review between Faculties.

Domain descriptions – Purpose

Emerging

Faculty purpose, role and responsibilities are loosely defined. Ways of working are emerging. More time is required to agree shared priorities and plans for the local system. Short-term plans may exist, and are project based, but are not widely shared or interdependencies understood.

Developing

The Faculty has agreed terms of reference, clearly stating purpose, scope, and ways of working.

Most members have a good understanding of the purpose of the network and could articulate it to others.

There is an agreed plan for developing the Faculty for the next year and a clear programme of work.

There is some awareness of internal and external workforce drivers and how these can be supported by the Faculty.

Maturing

The Faculty continually reviews its strategic purpose, in partnership with the AHP Council, ICS People Board and Arms Length Bodies (ALBs).

External and internal workforce drivers, interdependencies and influences are fully understood. Cleary defined subsidiarity principles are understood and in place.

Deliverables are well known and plans to achieve them are underway. System partners fully buy into strategic plans and are committed to the Faculty for the future.

Domain descriptions – AHP Faculty membership

Emerging

The Faculty has limited stakeholder representation, with only some of the organisations directly relevant to the Faculty's workforce development drivers.

The current stakeholders do not represent the range of stakeholder organisations available to the Faculty.

Developing

There is broad stakeholder representation across many of the available organisations, with specific emphasis on stakeholders relevant to the chosen workforce development driver/drivers. The faculty are seeking out representation from each of the 14 AHP groups.

Discussions around the minimum commitments from stakeholders are either occurring at present or there is a view to discuss this.

Maturing

All relevant provider organisations and educational institutions are represented, including Local Government, Primary Care, and Private, Independent and Voluntary Organisations (PIVO). There is good representation from across the 14 AHP groups.

Strong links to the ICS are in place and the Faculty is well connected and aligned to regional workforce priorities.

Clear minimum commitments have been guaranteed by stakeholders in relation to the aims of the Faculty, with the Faculty providing support in achieving these and keeping momentum.

Domain descriptions – Members' engagement

Emerging

Meetings are planned but do not occur regularly and are not consistent.

The approach to meetings is not yet structured in a way that maximises the time spent in ensuring agility and momentum.

There is no system yet in place to hold members of the Faculty to account for work done, however all these things are viewed as an ambition.

Developing

Meetings occur regularly with members and some stakeholders in attendance.

The meetings have started to implement a structured approach to tackling key points, however this is not yet fully functioning.

Thought has been given to an effective and constructive way to hold members and relevant stakeholders to account however this is not currently tangible.

Maturing

Planned, structured meetings occur regularly, and relevant members and stakeholders are committed to attend.

In meetings, members of the Faculty and relevant stakeholders are held to account in a constructive way to monitor the progression of projects and allowing time for troubleshooting is accounted for.

A strong 2-way flow and feedback system is in place both in the meeting time and outside of it, enabling a quick response to managing issues as they arise.

Domain descriptions – Governance

Emerging

Lines of accountability and channels of communication are not fully clear, with no distinction between the role of the AHP Council and Faculty.

Members do not understand their governance responsibilities.

There is no system in place to hold members to account – the chair of the Council and the Faculty are likely be the same person in an emerging Faculty.

Separate Faculty meetings do not take place and instead Faculty business is discussed during AHP Council meetings.

There is a lack of visibility of the work of the Faculty and no transparency to stakeholders.

Limited opportunity for shared problem solving amongst stakeholders.

Developing

A model of governance has been established which distinguishes the Faculty from the AHP Council. The AHP Faculty is a separate entity for which the AHP Council are accountable.

Most members understand their governance responsibilities.

The Faculty has a dedicated chair, but there is no identified SRO from the AHP Council. The Faculty chair may well also be the Faculty project lead in a developing Faculty.

Clear channels of communications exist, and the Faculty's lines of authority are accessible.

Thought has been given to methods of ensuring visibility and accountability although at present there is not a system in place.

Maturing

A clear model of governance has been established and is functioning effectively, ensuring that the Faculty is fully held to account by the AHP Council.

There are clear lines of accountability to the AHP Council and the People Board.

The Faculty has a dedicated chair (separate to the Project Lead) who is a Chief/senior* AHP from the AHP Council.

Channels of communication and lines of accountability are fully understood by all members and stakeholders.

A system is in place to ensure visibility and accountability.

Each member understands their governance responsibility, and this is working effectively. There is clear accountability for external funding.

* A senior AHP refers to an experienced manager/leader practicing at least at AFC Band 8b.

Domain descriptions – Leadership

Emerging

There is no substantive Faculty chair in position. A temporary project lead is in post and they also have the role of Faculty chair.

The project lead takes responsibility for coordinating and leading the Faculty and associated sub-groups.

Faculty members take minimal responsibility for delivering on the action plan and do not fully understand their role.

Faculty meetings lack structure and outputs/outcomes are not visible or supported by the wider ICS.

Developing

An experienced project lead is in position but is not secure without additional funding. The Faculty are discussing the need for a separate, permanent Faculty chair in addition to a project lead.

Faculty members are contributing to the delivery of the action plan but most of the sub-groups are led by the project lead.

The Faculty reports in to the AHP Council but has limited visibility within the wider ICS.

Maturing

The Faculty is chaired by a chief/senior* AHP who is also a member of the AHP Council. The role of chair is reviewed at least bi-annually. Development opportunities for Faculty members are sought and supported to encourage succession planning.

The Faculty chair is supported by an experienced project lead who is responsible for the development and coordination of the faculties action plan, sub-groups and administration of meetings.

All Faculty members actively contribute towards the delivery of the action plan. Successes and achievements are broadcast across the ICS, region and nationally to gain continued support and visibility and to sustain motivation and momentum.

* A senior AHP refers to an experienced manager/leader practicing at least at AFC Band 8b.

Domain descriptions – Quality improvement and management

Emerging

Quality improvement (QI) tools and techniques are not in use by the Faculty team but the value of these are understood and it is an aspiration.

Project initiation, implementation and management plans are not in place.

Relevant training or support is not yet in place and with no immediate plans to do so.

Developing

Basic QI tools and techniques are in use by the Faculty, and further priorities have been identified with associated recruitment, training and/or support is being planned.

Faculty projects have clear aims, improvement plans, milestones, governance and evaluation.

The HEE star model is used as a tool to support workforce transformation priorities and actions.

Maturing

A range of QI and project management approaches are actively used by the Faculty team to plan, deliver and evaluate projects and reach the measurable outcomes.

Data and intelligence is used to support continuous learning.

There are ongoing plans and activities to support sustainability and wider spread/adoption.

Domain descriptions – Data dashboard

Emerging

A base set of AHP workforce data requirements have not yet been established by the Faculty. There is no plan to set up a data dashboard and consideration has not been given to data analyst time.

Developing

A base set of AHP workforce data requirements have been established by the Faculty and thought has been given to setting up a data dashboard, but one does not yet exist.

Consideration into additional relevant data requirement as well as data analyst time is likely to have happened, however there is not currently access to data analyst time.

The Faculty is aware of regional, national HEE data collection and the need to align with this.

Maturing

A base level of AHP workforce data requirements have been established by the Faculty as well as additional relevant data requirements.

Faculty workforce data collection is consistent and aligned to HEE regional and national data collection.

A data dashboard has been set up, is understood, is reviewed regularly and is acted upon by the Faculty. Data analyst time is available and is supporting the Faculty with further progression.

Domain descriptions – Identification of workforce priorities

Emerging

Identification of workforce issues in the Faculty has occurred with 1 or 2 workforce projects chosen to target these.

No tangible work has been done to assess how these projects will impact the workforce or what the intended outcomes will be.

Developing

The Faculty has identified 1 or 2 workforce development priorities which reflect the needs of the workforce.

The Faculty understands the priorities and how the workstreams can respond to these.

Maturing

The Faculty has used data to identify priority workforce issues and has a range of targeted workforce development projects in place to tackle these.

The impact has been understood and objectives set to ensure these development projects achieve the intended outcomes and meet the needs of the Faculty.

Faculties actively horizon scan to identify future priorities.

Domain descriptions – Sustainability

Emerging

The Faculty runs on the premise that it can only function with dedicated HEE funding, with no plans for sustainability should funding stop.

The Faculty is in the very early stages of development and is unable to evidence its impact to the AHP Council and the wider ICS.

The focus of the Faculty is limited to one or two areas, which are driven by HEE funding streams.

Members are unable to see how the AHP Faculty can be sustained beyond the end of any dedicated HEE funding.

Developing

Some additional funding has been secured, and tangible plans are being developed to sustain the Faculty.

There is a growing desire to sustain the AHP Faculty irrespective of any dedicated funding – this is driven by emerging data evidencing the impact of the Faculty.

The Faculty is becoming embedded in wider ICS structures, supporting its sustainability utilising ICS funding.

The Faculty begins to focus on delivering additional projects, these may come from a variety of funding sources.

The Faculty model is strong and functional enough to secure further funding should the opportunity arise.

Maturing

The Faculty has shown itself to be a strong and functioning model, delivering outcomes which are demonstrated through clear evidence and data.

The Faculty is fully embedded with system architecture – both with the AHP Council and the wider ICS and can understand funding streams beyond the financial year.

Data drives support for the Faculty with the ICS and unlocks the possibility of securing alternative funding sources.

The Faculty has a range of work streams within it that are inextricably linked to system priorities. The ICS utilises the Faculty to its fullest extent and supports its ongoing maintenance.

Allied Health professions Faculty Maturity Matrix – self-assesment

Please use this template to self asses your AHP Faculty.

Insert your ICS name here:

Insert date and name of person completing the matrix:

	Emerging	Developing	Maturing
Purpose			
AHP Faculty membership			
Members engagement			
Governance			
Leadership			
QI and project management			
Data dashboard			
Identification of workforce priorities			
Sustainability			