

Governors observing the Board of Directors and Board Committees for QPS for COG 06.06.19

Prompt	What to look for	Notes
<p>Was the committee chaired effectively?</p>	<p>Did the meeting run to time?</p> <p>Did the committee devote the right amount of time to the items listed? (ie. More time for the more significant issues)</p> <p>Was the Chair well prepared for the meeting?</p> <p>Did everybody who wanted to participate get a chance to do so? Note in particular if any member or attendee appears to have been ignored or sidelined.</p> <p>At the conclusion of every item, was there appropriate summing up and was it clear what the outcome of the discussion was?</p> <p>Was there appropriate intervention? For example, if members strayed away from the topic or were prolonging a discussion unnecessarily?</p>	<p>23/04 – Agenda items 1.1-1.8 took until 1045, Chair recognised the run over and made conscious effort to get the agenda timings back on track. (The presentation on NEESPS rightly had taken a proportion of this time)</p> <p>Chair appeared to be well prepared</p> <p>Contributions from all.</p> <p>Intervention was appropriate and on topic.</p> <p>Focussed. 23/04 – Hussein Khatib’s first meeting.</p>
<p>Did the non-executive directors participate effectively?</p>	<p>Were the non-executive directors well prepared for the meeting? How familiar did they appear to be with the detail in the papers or did they come across as not having read the papers?</p> <p>Did they ask insightful questions about the items under discussion?</p> <p>Was there any non-participation/apparent disinterest from a non-executive?</p> <p>Were the NED inputs to discussions balanced across all agenda items? [Some NEDs have a comfort zone</p>	<p>21/05 – Only two NEDs in attendance, Hussein had sent apologies.</p> <p>21/05 - Good discussion on the Radiation Protection Advisors Annual Report.</p> <p>Broad involvement.</p>

Governors observing the Board of Directors and Board Committees for QPS for COG 06.06.19

Prompt	What to look for	Notes
	<p>and they will spend more time discussing favourite topics at the expense of issues that interest them less, even if they are a bigger issue for the organisation)</p> <p>Did any of the non-executive directors not challenge?</p>	
<p>Was there effective challenge by the non-executives?</p>	<p>Did the non-executives challenge appropriately? In other words, did they challenge on suitably material and significant issues or were they overly concerned about trivial matters (eg. Spelling mistakes, immaterial issues)</p> <p>Were there any items discussed where you consider that there could have been more challenge by the non-executives?</p> <p>Was the nature of the challenge constructive, supportive, non-confrontational and respectful or did it come across negatively (adversarial, argumentative)?</p>	<p>Challenge appropriate.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Very constructive comments made in an appropriate manner.</p>
<p>In general, was it a good meeting</p>	<p>Was the debate constructive, positive and respectful?</p> <p>Was there a general atmosphere of mutual trust and candour?</p> <p>Was there any evidence of “group think”? This is a risky situation when groups become so collegiate and complacent that all members start behaving in the same way?</p>	<p>23/04 – Some report detail missing.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>23/04 – At the end of the meeting the Chair asked if the group thought the meeting had gone well, were there things that could have been done differently?</p>