

## Regional workforce planning: quarterly report

Item	Detail
Region	Midland Region
Quarterly period report covers	1 October 2013 to 31 December 2013

Status (traffic light*)	Outcome	Activity	Notes
Green	Services understand best practice workforce development planning methodologies and the workforce data required in planning	Te Pou presented at regional meetings and Workforce Planning Lead (WFPL) continued to profile through regional priorities.	Te Pou presented at two regional meetings to introduce this work; profiling continued by WFPL at regional forums, summits and a recent workshop held at Te Papa - Wellington.
Green	High level of service cooperation and participation in the workforce stocktake	Regional Clinical Governance Network recommend review of language in survey; engagement from stakeholders of Organisation Survey through Survey Monkey with 13 organisations/services taking part.	Regional WFPL with workforce team, reviewed survey over two week period to develop a high standard survey monkey. Report total of 13 services completed survey monkey (12 services by 20 Dec and 1 service on 31 Dec 2013).
Yellow	Quality workforce data is available, accessible and used to inform regional and local workforce development planning	Te Pou and Matua Raki's communication plan supports data collection processes – Dec 2013	Work to be completed Jan/Feb 2014 in next report period.
Yellow	Services establish and use best practice workforce development planning methodologies	Identified in Phase two	
Yellow	Local workforce development planning processes identified	Identified in Phase two	
Yellow	Mental health and addiction workforce development planning is aligned to relevant activities of the regional training hubs	Regional activities align to national requirements and regional Mental Health & Addiction workforce development planning	
Green	Regional workforce development plan developed ( or incorporated into existing regional planning processes)	Midland Region Workforce Strategic Plan 2013-2016 is in place	

*\*see definitions below*

What new risks or issues have been identified (provide a description and the date the risk or issue was identified)	What is the likelihood of this occurring (G,A,R*)	Likely level of impact (G,A,R*)	Consequences	Mitigation
Timeframes to engage with services and disseminate organisational survey within this report period identified as unrealistic on 15/11/2013	Red	Yellow	Delayed deliverables and potential damage to reputation of this work.	Pathway identified and supported by Regional Clinical Governance Network Group. A creative process developed by regional workforce team

				through survey monkey moving forward.
It is not mandatory for services to complete survey identified on 15/11/2013			Some services will not complete survey.	Support to those services to complete the survey.

*\*see definitions below*

**Possible opportunities to innovate (i.e. better meet the needs of stakeholders)**

- A robust process to develop relationships with regional stakeholders (DHBs & NGOs) is key to the success of this work; it strengthens relationships, builds trust and is ongoing.
- A launch and media release may support the communication plan through increased profiling. Missed opportunity to profile this work on national Mental Health Awareness campaigns. Series of media releases through different mediums i.e. radio, television.

**Other information**

- The Survey Monkey upheld the professional high standard expected of stakeholders that ensured timeframes were met and framing questions delivered in a respectful way.

<b>Date</b>	10 January 2014
-------------	-----------------

## Traffic Light Explanations and Risk Ratings

### Traffic Lights

Traffic light	Meaning	What is required for the report
Red	Urgent intervention is necessary to avoid failure or very adverse consequences to performance, outcomes and reputations. Further follow up will be required to work on solutions and monitor outcomes with project or programme funders. Regular updates and additional reports will be required.	Provide full explanation of implications of action and failure to act. Present an acceptable mitigation strategy to manage the risk. Consider the likelihood and impact of an adverse result.  <b>Project Sponsors will subsequently present the risk mitigation strategy to SLT. Additional ad hoc reporting will almost certainly be required by SLT.</b>
Amber	Caution is required (issue that could have a negative impact or performance or outcomes if it becomes a risk) a brief explanation of proposed solutions is required. This issue will be on watch, further information may be required, and discussion will occur in the next face to face meeting	Provide a brief explanation of issue and proposed solution. Consider the likelihood of and impact of an adverse event.  <b>Project Sponsors will subsequently explain the main points of the risk mitigation strategy to SLT. SLT will expect to be notified promptly if the situation does not improve as planned.</b>
Green	Everything on track or completed, no additional narrative required.	Provide one sentence on progress or achievement and consult the Project Sponsor about preparing a 'spot light' story for significant achievements.  <b>Project Sponsors will be invited to identify a small number of projects to feature as examples of innovation or noteworthy workforce developments. SLT will decide which stories will feature in the Quarterly Report or be used for other promotional purposes.</b>

### Ratings of Risk

Likelihood of occurrence	Description	
Green (Low)	The risk is seen as <b>unlikely</b> to occur within the time horizon of the work.	
Amber (Medium)	The risk is seen as <b>likely</b> to occur within the time horizon of the work.	
Red (High)	The risk is <b>expected</b> to occur within the time horizon of the work.	
Level of Impact	Examples of impacts	Example
Green (Low)	Example of low or negligible impact	The risk will not substantively impede the achievement of the deliverable or project, causing minimal damage to the regional agency and/ or Te Pou's reputation.
Amber (Moderate)	Example of Moderate impact	The risk will cause some elements of the deliverable or project to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the regional agency and/or Te Pou's reputation.
Red (High)	Example of high impact	The risk will cause the deliverable or project objectives not to be achieved, thereby damaging the regional agency and/or Te Pou's reputation.