

JSNA Owing Group Guidance

Outline of role & responsibilities:

Each JSNA topic is 'owned' by a group ideally with both strategic commissioning responsibilities and multi-agency membership. This group needs to be identified and agreed at the point of writing the Project Initiation Document (PID). It is the role of the author(s) to identify and seek agreement from the group that they are willing to act as the owning group for a chapter.

The role of the owning group is to:

1. Provide expert opinion regarding content and support to the author(s)
2. Endorse the chapter prior to final approval by the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB)
3. Consider how the chapter recommendations may be taken forward

The owning group will ideally be an existing established group that has responsibility for strategic oversight of the topic agenda for the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and / or Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC). For chapters where no owning group can be identified, a task and finish group with multi agency and expert membership can be established.

As well as providing oversight and support during the development of the chapter, the owning group will be responsible for considering the recommendations contained in the JSNA chapter.

This approach to owning groups is anticipated to improve quality through the following benefits: wider involvement; better integration into commissioning cycles, support for authors and enhanced commitment to support the JSNA.

1. Providing expert opinion and support

As a group of professionals with collective expertise around the specified JSNA topic the owning group's role is to support the author in writing the chapter. This can involve meeting to review progress and comment on the draft chapter. Feedback throughout the process is more effective for all involved in the development of the chapter and avoids substantial changes and delays towards the later part of the chapter's development. Support can be provided virtually if needed.

Supporting the author to identify other key stakeholders who could input information and comment on the draft is also important.

2. Endorsing JSNA chapters

The owning group needs to review the final version of the chapter and endorse it prior to being presented to the HWB for approval. At the point to which the JSNA chapter is being presented to the owning group for endorsement it should have gone through the quality review process. The JSNA chapter may have been amended in light of the feedback from the quality reviewer to the author(s). It may be useful for owning groups endorsing JSNA chapters to consider the same questions as those used in the review process. You can find these in the table below.

Quality Review forms part of the overall JSNA process which has a clear governance structure and defined roles and procedures. The role of the quality review is to be a constructive process whereby JSNA chapters are critically appraised against the criteria set out below, with feedback being provided to authors. This is to ensure JSNA chapters meet accepted quality standards before being published online and presented to the HWB, that there is consistency across chapters and to prevent the dissemination of unsuitable information. The quality review should be carried out in a supportive and constructive manner with suggestions and recommendations made for improvements. Therefore, it is hoped to be a positive and useful process for authors.

| Key Review Criteria | |
|--|---|
| 1. Is the topic clearly defined? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Does the executive summary provide a useful overview of the chapter?</i> ✓ <i>Is it clear who is at risk & why?</i> ✓ <i>Has the impact on health and wellbeing been explored?</i> |
| 2. Does the data tell a story about the local area? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Is there a clear narrative around the data giving it meaning and context?</i> ✓ <i>Can areas of need be determined?</i> ✓ <i>Is data presented from across the County?</i> ✓ <i>Is data presented accurate and appropriate for sharing i.e. nothing confidential?</i> |
| 3. Have the dimensions of local inequalities been fully explored (demographically, geographically etc)? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Have vulnerable groups been identified?</i> |
| 4. Is there a clear and concise summary of community assets? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Does it appear there has been a thorough exploration of assets?</i> ✓ <i>Does the chapter reference community assets beyond commissioned services?</i> |
| 5. Has the voice of the local population been incorporated and utilised to influence conclusions? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Is there evidence of meaningful engagement work?</i> ✓ <i>Has the voice of local people been used to inform conclusions around needs?</i> |

| |
|--|
| <p>6. Has evidence of effective interventions/approaches been presented? ✓ <i>Are these current and evidence based?</i></p> |
| <p>7. Are the impacts for the short and longer term future understood and evidenced? ✓ <i>Does this include both positive and negative impacts?</i></p> |
| <p>8. Is there a clear and reasonable rationale expressed in support of any conclusions drawn? ✓ <i>Have the unmet needs and service gaps been appropriately identified</i> ✓ <i>Are the recommendations supported by evidence provided within the chapter e.g. in the data, local insight, evidence of what works etc sections. Is there follow through?</i></p> |
| <p>9. Are recommendations made appropriate for informing wider strategic objectives and commissioning decisions? ✓ <i>Are the recommendations clear?</i> ✓ <i>Do they identify appropriate priorities based on what has been identified within the chapter?</i> ✓ <i>Are people appropriately identified to lead on recommendations?</i> ✓ <i>Is it possible to determine how this chapter might have a positive influence on outcomes?</i></p> |
| <p>10. Are statements/claims made throughout appropriately referenced to ensure credibility? ✓ <i>Are reputable sources used?</i> ✓ <i>Are up to date references used as much as possible?</i> ✓ <i>Is local insight of an acceptable quality and standard?</i></p> |
| <p>11. Are there any issues of accuracy that need checking?</p> |
| <p>12. Are there any other comments regarding content (style, language, formatting, length etc)?</p> |
| <p>13. From information provided does the level of engagement with relevant partners in producing the chapter appear to be appropriate and sufficient? ✓ <i>Has it been made clear who has been involved in the production of the chapter?</i></p> |

3. Considering recommendations for implementation

Ideally the owning group should be in a position to take some responsibility for driving forward relevant recommendations outlined in the chapter. This can help to ensure that recommendations are developed into actions and the JSNA effectively informs practice.