

# **NHS Harrow: Impact assessment tool for service change proposals Harrow Mencap**

## Appendix 5: Voluntary Sector Commissioning Review Impact Assessment

### **NHS Harrow: impact assessment tool for service change proposals**

#### **1. Completing the impact assessment tool**

This framework is intended for use for individual proposals for changes to services. It is anticipated that a range of stakeholders and specialists will need to work together to complete this assessment while developing individual service proposals. This framework does not replace requirements to undertake an equality impact assessment or regulatory impact assessment where necessary.

#### **2. Using the results of the assessment**

Impact assessments on all current projects should be reviewed by the relevant Transformation Programme Management Board:

- a. If a proposal receives a 'Red' flag indicating that a high risk of harm exists the proposal should be reviewed urgently by the Transformation Programme Board and either ceased or redesigned appropriately.
- b. If a proposal receives one or more 'Red' flags in any other criteria then the relevant Transformation Board should review the proposal. One red flag is not necessarily a cause of concern; for example a service redesign project on a low prevalence condition may still be worthwhile if other benefits are anticipated. Each case will need to be considered individually to ensure that enough significant benefits (e.g. 'green flags') are predicted to accrue from the project.

Dr Andrew Howe  
Director of Public Health NHS Harrow

## NHS Harrow: Impact assessment tool for service change proposals Harrow Mencap

Criteria	Red Flag	Amber Flag	Green Flag
<b>SAFETY</b>			
Harm	High risk of harm <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Medium risk of harm <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	Low risk of harm <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
Quality improvement	No quality improvement <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Moderate quality improvement <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	High quality improvement <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>			
Strength of evidence for stated clinical objectives	Limited evidence <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Modest evidence <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	Good evidence <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
<b>COST</b>			
Value for money	Limited evidence of vfm or evidence of poor vfm <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Evidence of modest vfm <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	Evidence of good vfm <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
Impact on current resource utilisation / PCT financial balance	Low impact) <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Moderate impact <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	Significant impact <span style="color: green;">■</span>
<b>BENEFITS</b>			
To individual (health improvement, patient outcome & life expectancy)	No benefits <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Modest benefits <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	High benefits <span style="color: green;">■</span>
To community (health inequalities)	No benefits <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Modest benefits <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	High benefits <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
<b>NEED</b>			
Prevalence	<0.1% prevalence <span style="color: red;">■</span>	0.1-10% prevalence <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	>10% prevalence <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
<b>PATIENT ACCESS AND EXPERIENCE</b>			
Patient & public access	Reduces access (including compromising national access targets <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Maintains access <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	Improves access <span style="color: green;">■</span>
Patient experience	Reduces patient experience <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Maintains patient experience <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	Improves patient experience <span style="color: green;">■</span>
Carer experience	Reduces carer experience <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Maintains carer experience <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	Improves carer experience <span style="color: green;">■</span>
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>			
Impact on partners' sustainability	Has high impact on partners' sustainability <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Has modest impact on partners' sustainability <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	Has no, or beneficial impact, on partners' sustainability <span style="color: green;">■</span>
Partners' acceptability	Low acceptability <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Moderate acceptability <span style="color: yellow;">☒</span>	High acceptability <span style="color: green;">■</span>
Treatment or service options	Other options with better outcomes <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Other options with same outcomes <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	No other options <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
Feasibility	Unsustainable or significant risk of failure <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Probably sustainable, implementation feasible <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	Sustainable, easily integrated. Clear implementation plan <span style="color: green;">☒</span>
<b>POLICY ALIGNMENT</b>			
National policy, target or other statutory requirement – (PCT Commissioning Strategic Plan)	Not related to national policy or target <span style="color: red;">■</span>	Weak relationship to national policy or target <span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	Direct relationship to national policy or target <span style="color: green;">☒</span>