

Review of the  
**Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards**  
Steering Group Governance Processes

*March 2011*

<b>DH INFORMATION READER BOX</b>	
Policy HR / Workforce Management <b>Planning /</b> Clinical	Estates Commissioning IM & T Finance Social Care / Partnership Working
<b>Document Purpose</b>	For Information
<b>Gateway Reference</b>	15636
<b>Title</b>	Review of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group Governance Processes
<b>Author</b>	DH/Professional Leadership Team/CNO Directorate
<b>Publication Date</b>	1st March 2011
<b>Target Audience</b>	Mary Seacole Steering Group Members - RCN, RCM, Unite/CPHVA, Unison, NHS Employers, CNO BME Advisory Group, Mary Seacole Award Holders
<b>Circulation List</b>	Communications Leads, RCN, RCM, Unite/CPHVA, UNISON, NHS Employers
<b>Description</b>	This Review analyses the governance processes, systems and structures used by the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group members. The Review has highlighted areas to improve and need to streamline structures and systems, with recommendations set to ensure the steering Group remains robust.
<b>Cross Ref</b>	Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards (DH February 2010)
<b>Superseded Docs</b>	N/A
<b>Action Required</b>	N/A
<b>Timing</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Contact Details</b>	Joan Myers Professional Leadership Team/CNO Directorate 452c Skipton House 80 London Road SE1 6LH 020 7972 5841
<b>For Recipient's Use</b>	

**Review of the**  
**Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards**  
**Steering Group Governance Processes**

*March 2011*



# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. The Background of the Second Phase of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. The Context</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3. The Purpose of the Second Review</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4. Methodology</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Analysis of Mary Seacole Scholarship Award documents	14
<b>5. The Views of the Focus Group</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group	15
5.2 Systems and processes of the Steering Group	15
5.3 What the updated SLA should consist of	15
5.4 The impact of the changes on the workload of Steering Group	15
<b>6. The Views of the Steering Group Members Interviewed</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group	17
6.2 The systems and processes of the Steering Group	17
6.3 What should the SLA look like?	17
6.4 The impact of changes on the workload of Steering Group members	18
<b>7. The Views of the Managers from the Professional Organisations</b>	<b>19</b>
7.1 Workload balance	19
7.2 Governance processes of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards	19
7.3 Funding for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards	19

<b>8. Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>21</b>
8.1 Conclusions	21
8.2 Recommendations	22
<b>9. Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holders, 1994–2009</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>10. Acknowledgements</b>	<b>28</b>
10.1 Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group members	28

# Foreword



The Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards are a well-established way of recognising talent and leadership. Their importance has grown over time, but it is timely to keep their purpose and the way they are managed under review.

This review analyses the governance processes, systems and structures used by the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group members. There have been incremental changes in the workings of the Steering Group since the commencement of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards in 1994. Originally, one winner received the Mary Seacole Scholarship Award annually. However, in 2004, this was increased to include leadership awards and development awards. These changes have had an impact on the

way the Steering Group works. Therefore, it is proper in these times of sweeping changes in the whole of the health economy that the Steering Group also reviews its governance processes and structures to enable the members to work more effectively and efficiently.

The review has highlighted areas to improve and the need to streamline structures and systems. The Steering Group is already working on these areas, and I am grateful to the commitment and enthusiasm of the Steering Group. In these uncertain times of economic austerity and change, it is hoped that the recommendations set in place as a result of this review will ensure that the Steering Group remains robust for years to come.

The Steering Group has worked commendably in partnership to support, develop and sustain the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards and award holders. I would like to thank the professional and staff organisations and independent members of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group for their continued dedication and commitment to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Award processes and for the invaluable support they have given to the award holders.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "C Beasley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

**Dame Christine Beasley**  
**Chief Nursing Officer for England**

# Executive Summary



In February 2010, the first review of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards<sup>1</sup> demonstrated that the scheme remains fit for purpose. The first review made recommendations for a follow-up review to look at the Mary Seacole Steering Group processes.

This second review analyses the governance processes, systems and structures used by the Steering Group to establish its effectiveness to support the award holders. A focus group discussion was conducted with Steering Group members, including semi-structured interviews with three Steering Group members and five managers from the professional organisations. The documents used by the Steering Group were also analysed.

The review found that since 2004 the workload of the Steering Group has increased. Despite this, the Steering Group works well and manages this pressure to provide effective support to award holders.

## Summary of main findings

### **The Steering Group members are fully committed to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards**

Members of the Steering Group are committed to upholding the memory of Mary Seacole and her contribution to nursing by supporting the Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holders to develop their leadership skills and improve patient care.

However, they believe that the significant change to the level and numbers of award holders over the years has had an impact on the workload of Steering Group members and has contributed to tensions within the existing systems and processes.

### **The Steering Group members provide effective support to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards**

They use their expertise to:

- mentor and support award holders
- manage workshops
- market the awards
- contribute to the administration of the awards
- provide shadowing opportunities for award holders with other professionals.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Health (2010) *Review of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards* [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_112377](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_112377)

Some members of the Steering Group would prefer the line managers of the award holders to take on the responsibility of mentoring so that they can concentrate more on the governance processes.

### Documents used by the Steering Group

The review found that of the many documents analysed, three framed the management of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards:

- the protocol for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Award is the main strategic document, which forms the service level agreement (SLA) between the Department of Health and the professional organisations. It represents the SLAs made from 2004 to November 2010.
- the application form and criteria for the leadership and development awards for nurses, midwives and health visitors
- the Mary Seacole leadership and development awards appeals procedure.

Other documents include the application form for independent members. However, there were no documents that describe the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group members.

### The need to strengthen the governance systems

The impact of increasing the number of award holders from one to six in 2004 has created a gap in the existing governance and this is being addressed.

Members of the Steering Group felt that the management of budgets by award holders needs strengthening as the organisations use different governance processes to monitor spending.

Managers from the professional organisations expressed the desire to be more involved when changes to the structure of the awards are required.

The existing SLA is due for renewal and it is hoped a more robust and detailed agreement will be implemented.

### Marketing the outcomes of past Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards

The Steering Group agreed it is important to market the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards in order to verify value for money and demonstrate the benefits of the awards to the wider health economy, and also to influence practice development. Most of the Steering Group members believed that it was their responsibility to measure and market the effectiveness of the awards.

## Recommendations

The Steering Group members made several recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the awards including:

- separating the management of awards from the mentoring of award holders. The responsibility for mentoring award holders could be transferred to the line manager or another appropriate person within the award holder's organisation. This change will strengthen the working relationship between the Steering Group and the award holder's organisation. The time gained from this change could be utilised to refine the governance processes.
- recommending that records and documents should be stored electronically to standardise the filing system of the award documents.
- increasing the length of time given for the SLA. The current SLA expired in November 2010. The review recommends that the SLA is signed for up to five years at a time. The SLA supports the working arrangements of the Steering Group. It provides the overarching governance arrangements for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards.
- strengthening the governance systems. The Steering Group has guidance on the management of the award funds and monitoring the progress of the award holders, as well as managing complaints. It is recommended that these are enhanced to include a more robust communication system for award holders and their employers, and the Steering Group and the professional organisations.
- developing a forum network for past award holders and implementing a system to gather information on the progress of projects to help keep track of past award holders. It would:
  - provide information on the professional development of the award holders
  - assess how their projects have continued to influence their organisations and communities
  - give insight into continuous professional development after they have completed their projects
  - provide a tracking system that gathers and stores information for use in establishing the effectiveness of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards
  - provide opportunities for holders to share information on new practices and explore ways to measure their successes
  - facilitate the development of a database of completed projects providing useful information for the Steering Group to measure the outcomes of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards
  - produce a tracking system to identify key projects that could be used to influence policy development and to cascade learning to a wider audience.

- reviewing the funding arrangements for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. The present funding arrangements create a sense of uncertainty for the Steering Group. The planning process is delayed as the Steering Group members await confirmation of funding each year before continuing plans for the following year. The general opinion is that the funding for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards should be agreed for a period of five years at a time. This arrangement will reduce the tension experienced by Steering Group members and enable them to plan over a longer period.

I have had the privilege of being a Mary Seacole Steering Group member for many years and, more recently, have been the chair for the past two years. I would like to voice my appreciation to all past and present Steering Group members who are dedicated to working in partnership to maintain the awards. We endeavour to continue to honour the name of Mary Seacole and are committed to increasing the family of Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holders who will continue to lead by example as role models.



**Obi Amadi**

**Outgoing Chair of Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group**

# 1. The Background of the Second Phase of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Review

The first review of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards,<sup>2</sup> commissioned by the Chief Nursing Officer, found that the awards continue to be fit for purpose in the light of the current health care reforms and changes within the equalities legislation. The first review provided a historical perspective of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards from 2004 to 2008. It reflected on the changes in funding made in 2004 from two leadership awards funded by the Department of Health to four development awards (funded by the Department of Health) and two leadership awards, with the additional funding provided by NHS Employers.

One of the recommendations of the first review was to conduct a follow-up review to look at the governance processes and structures necessary to maintain the awards. This second review analyses the governance processes, systems and structures used by the Steering Group.

The Steering Group consists of a representative from:

- Department of Health (DH)
- Royal College of Midwives (RCM)
- Unite/Community Practitioners' and Health Visitors' Association (CPHVA)
- Unison
- NHS Employers
- two independent members (one of whom is a past Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holder)
- two representatives from Royal College of Nursing (RCN) (one of whom is an administrator funded by the RCN who administers the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards on behalf of DH).

The Mary Seacole Steering Group members have a corporate responsibility for the individual award holder and an organisational responsibility if the award holder is a member of their organisation.

Their responsibilities include:

- monitoring the work of the award holder to ensure that the project and the final report are completed in line with the project proposal
- alerting the Steering Group to any untoward matters or performance issues that may cause embarrassment to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards programme
- attending quarterly meetings
- liaising with the manager of the award holder
- supporting the award holder to complete their project within the agreed timeframe

<sup>2</sup> Department of Health (2010) Review of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_112377](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_112377)

- liaising as necessary with the funding departments and professional organisations
- ensuring that the award holder uses the funding for the purpose intended.

There have been incremental changes in the Steering Group processes since the commencement of the awards. This has led to an increased demand on the Steering Group's time. While several changes were made to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards, few were made to the structure and processes of the Steering Group. Consequently, some members have experienced difficulties balancing work commitments with the increased workload required to sustain the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards.

Therefore it is timely that the governance process of the Awards are reviewed. The Mary Seacole Steering Group and their organisations has demonstrated they are committed to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. I would like to commend them for the time and dedication spent participating to the Steering Group processes whilst supervising and supporting the Award holders to complete their projects.



**Joan Myers**  
**Professional Officer for Diversity**  
**Department of Health**

## 2. The Context

The Department of Health's protocol, which consists of the service level agreements (SLAs) made with partner organisations dated from 2004 to November 2010, established the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group as the formal structure to support the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. The Steering Group is accountable to the Chief Nursing Officer with a representative from the Department of Health on the Steering Group. The administration of the awards is the responsibility of the Royal College of Nursing and communications are made through the Department of Health.

The SLA explains the working arrangements and responsibilities of the Steering Group and the process for the management of the awards.

The terms of reference included in the SLA are due to be updated. Historically, they state that each representative from the professional organisations selects a black or minority ethnic (BME) nurse, midwife or health visitor with at least three years' experience, who is working directly with patients, clients and the community at field level, to undertake a project or research that focuses on improving the health and health care of BME communities. The opportunity objective of the award is to assist in the advancement of the award holder's professional career development.

In 2007, the awards became available to any nurse, midwife or health visitor regardless of their ethnicity.

The SLA requires the selection of a representative for membership of the Steering Group from each professional organisation who will ensure that the intentions set out in the award winner's proposal are carried out and delivered within the agreed timeframe. The representative will have delegated responsibility and accountability for ensuring interim and final reports are presented to the Steering Group in accordance with the project proposal.

# 3. The Purpose of the Second Review

The second review examined and analysed the governance processes, systems and structures used to:

- improve the existing governance system to meet quality requirements
- develop an SLA between existing stakeholders
- assess the impact of the changes in the Steering Group processes on the Steering Group members and their organisations
- demonstrate effective support to the award holders to influence practice and policy development.

## 4. Methodology

This review used both a qualitative and quantitative approach. Firstly, an analysis of the main documents used by the Steering Group was completed. Then a focus group session with all members of the Steering Group was held. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight participants, including three members of the Steering Group and one manager representative from each of the five professional organisations.

### 4.1 Analysis of Mary Seacole Scholarship Award documents

It was not possible to report on all the documents analysed. The review will focus on the documents that are the key drivers for the workings of the Steering Group and the awards. These documents provide guidance and the information required to handle the specific activities of the Steering Group and are mentioned below.

#### Documents related to the management and administration of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards

The main documents consisted of:

- The protocol for the Mary Seacole developmental awards that formed the SLA. It sets out the Department of Health's support for the awards, the terms of reference and the working arrangements with the five professional organisations. It also describes the process of the awards and the roles and functions of Steering Group members.
- The document on the Mary Seacole leadership and development award interview questions captures information regarding the questions asked at interviews. The document is designed to grade the performance of candidates and to record the responses made by members of the panel.
- The Mary Seacole leadership and development awards appeals procedure describes the expectations of the award holder and the support that they will receive throughout the period of the award. It sets out the steps that the award holder can take if he or she is dissatisfied at any time during any stage of the award. The document explains the decisions that the Steering Group may take during an appeal.

#### Other important documents available but not analysed in detail included:

- The mentor–awardee joint update for the Steering Group is a document designed to capture detailed information on the progress made by the award holder towards completion of their project. It tracks progress based on the questions asked.
- The Mary Seacole Scholarship Award Steering Group funds document is a template designed to record information under five headings. This tracking system shows information about the finances available to the award holders and how they spent the funds allocated to them.

# 5. The Views of the Focus Group

Seven out of the eight members of the Steering Group attended a focus group session. The views of the focus group presented across three main areas included what their roles and responsibilities are, what systems and processes they used, and what the updated SLA should look like. The impact the changes in the increased workload have had on the Steering Group members was also considered.

## 5.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group

The focus group responses on the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group included:

- ensuring awards are administered effectively
- ensuring that funding for the awards is appropriately used
- providing mentoring support and development to the award holders
- contributing to the professional development of the award holders as future leaders
- performance-managing award holders according to their project or research proposal
- conducting pre-award workshops to prospective award applicants
- helping raise the profile of projects undertaken by award holders both locally and nationally
- using projects to influence policy and practice at a national level.

## 5.2 Systems and processes of the Steering Group

The Steering Group members outlined:

- the responsibility to work within the systems of their own professional organisations
- the primary responsibility of independent members to provide academic mentoring to award holders
- the utilisation of systems to support the Steering Group and award holder.

## 5.3 What the updated SLA should consist of

The focus group members identified a need for an agreed Steering Group governance procedure, as there were differences in the governance of the various member organisations. It was also argued that the SLA would be more robust if the roles and responsibilities of the administrator and the way that funds should be managed were clearly defined.

## 5.4 The impact of the changes on the workload of Steering Group

The members acknowledged that the impact of the increased workload created by the change from two to six award holders in 2004 had a major impact on their substantive roles, which at times some members found stressful.

In recognition of this, the focus group members stated that:

- there was an increase in the time spent on the recruitment and selection of applications and also on interview panels
- the Steering Group meetings were much longer as more time is spent supporting and mentoring award holders
- more time is required to plan and manage the workshops for award applicants
- increased time needs to be spent raising the profile of the awards to host organisations, as often these organisations do not know about Mary Seacole.

# 6. The Views of the Steering Group Members Interviewed

## 6.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Steering Group

Members stated that they hold both a strategic and operational role in the group. Their roles and responsibilities include:

- being a critical friend/mentor providing constructive feedback, advice and support to award holders
- providing an academic evaluation, as well as research governance to the award holders' projects
- providing shadowing opportunities for award holders to influence their professional development.

Different members of the Steering Group may have different roles such as being responsible for managing pre-award holders' workshops or being involved with induction programmes for new award holders.

## 6.2 The systems and processes of the Steering Group

In addressing this issue, the Steering Group members:

- felt that the systems and processes work well to support the award holders. However, the increased numbers of award holders mean that the systems need to be more refined to accommodate the greater workload
- would welcome a process to reward members of professional organisations for their contributions to the awards
- suggested that if a process was in place to reduce the tension between the management of the leadership awards and the development awards, it would strengthen the existing system. This change would lead to a more flexible timetable for completion of the different award holders' projects.

It was generally felt that the systems and processes are continually being improved.

## 6.3 What should the SLA look like?

In response to this question, the Steering Group argued that:

- the SLA should explain the expectations for Steering Group members and the process for performance management
- the frequency of Steering Group meetings should be set
- there should be clear lines of accountability for Steering Group members
- the mechanisms used to manage the finances of the award should be clearly defined
- the number of days per year required to carry out the duties of Steering Group members should be stated

- the SLA should include the level of competences and development support for Steering Group members (to make it a robust tool)
- the SLA should be a governance framework to provide strategic support to the members.

#### **6.4 The impact of changes on the workload of Steering Group members**

While aiming to work productively across roles, the Steering Group members stated that they had learned to cope with the increased workload by prioritising work. On average, 15 days a year are allocated to complete the work of the Steering Group. This includes a day for Steering Group meetings and one day a month for mentoring/supporting award holders. Some members mentioned they could not quantify specifically how much time they allocated, as extra time may be required to look at reports and carry out short-listing, interviews and pre-application workshops, as well as induction programmes for award holders.

Members reported that they use a wide range of expertise and knowledge to support the award holders and to manage the impact of the workload.

In their responses all expressed commitment to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. They agreed that the awards are an excellent way of developing leaders and honouring the name of Mary Seacole and her contribution to nursing.

# 7. The Views of the Managers from the Professional Organisations

The review engaged with five managers to elicit their views on commitment to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards and to the working arrangements to ensure they remain fit for purpose.

The managers responded to questions on workload balance, governance processes, finance and the SLA, and their answers are summarised below.

## 7.1 Workload balance

The managers recognised that the fundamental shift from one leadership award to four development and two leadership awards has increased the workload of their staff who manage, prepare, mentor and support award holders throughout the awards programme.

Some managers felt that the Steering Group workload was not a concern. It was suggested that the Steering Group should have put mechanisms in place to accommodate the changes. Managers recognised and valued the work their staff did to acquire strategic support for the awards. Most stated that their staff kept them updated on the work of the Steering Group.

## 7.2 Governance processes of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards

It was suggested that the governance processes for the Steering Group should be documented in the SLA.

Managers would like to be more involved with major decisions regarding the awards, as they felt that professional organisations should have a say in any changes to the awards process. They felt that a system for keeping in contact with previous award holders should be set up to evaluate whether the award holders continue to enhance quality and whether they develop in their leadership roles. The tracking system could also identify the relevance of the awards to the current NHS agenda.

## 7.3 Funding for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards

The professional organisations contribute to the additional cost of hosting the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards ceremony annually. Further contributions related to the time spent by members in carrying out the functions of the Steering Group need to be taken into consideration.

Managers felt that the funding of the awards through the Department of Health with support from NHS Employers made the awards more prestigious.

All the managers agreed that there should be a commitment to long-term funding for a period of five years to reduce the tension that accompanies the year-on-year funding agreement.

In addition to the specific responses made, interviewees stated that the review was an opportunity for them to contribute to changes that they believed were important to enhance the outcomes of the Steering Group. They were keen to share their ideas and information about their experiences and involvement in the awards.

Managers were proud to be involved with the awards and felt that they benefit their organisations. The awards fit with the ethos of supporting organisations to make best use of their staff and to contribute to staff development.

It was suggested that an annual written report detailing the work of the Steering Group and the projects of award holders would be beneficial. The organisation would then be able to explore the best way to use the information to influence leadership development, good clinical practice and demonstrate health benefits to the BME communities.

All the managers confirmed their commitment to the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards.

# 8. Conclusions and Recommendations

## 8.1 Conclusions

The Department of Health (DH) has worked in partnership with the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) (which has responsibility for administering the awards), the Royal College of Midwives (RCM), Unite/CPHVA, Unison and the NHS Employers, which also provides funding, to offer the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards to nurses, midwives and health visitors.

The Chief Nursing Officer, on behalf of the DH, commissioned this review to evaluate the governance of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group. The following recommendations address the analysis of the governance processes, systems and structures used by the Steering Group and provide opportunities to enhance its performance.

The Steering Group members and their managers are committed to continue their support for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. The awards provide leadership and development opportunities for nurses, midwives and health visitors to undertake a project or training programme that demonstrates the impact of leadership skills on service development and on the health of black and minority ethnic communities.

The increased workload created by the change from one leadership award to two leadership and four developmental awards produced a tension within the Steering Group. The Steering Group members have now identified the impact of this change and have begun to address it. This tension has not influenced the effectiveness of the Steering Group.

An updated SLA is required to equip the Steering Group to meet current expectations.

All Steering Group documents need to be stored electronically so they can be easily accessed.

The establishment of a network forum for past award holders would provide an opportunity to develop the awards further. In this forum, data on the progress of projects and the health benefits to the BME communities and the progress of award holders could be collected and stored. The information collected could be used to demonstrate that the criteria of the quality agenda has been met and further promote the awards as an example of good practice for leadership development in nurses, midwives and health visitors.

## 8.2 Recommendations

The Steering Group members made several recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the awards including:

- separating the management of awards from the mentoring of award holders. The responsibility for mentoring award holders could be transferred to the line manager or another appropriate person within the award holder's organisation. This change will strengthen the working relationship between the Steering Group and the award holder's organisation. The time gained from this change could be utilised to refine the governance processes
- recommending that records and documents should be stored electronically to standardise the filing system of the award documents
- increasing the length of time given for the SLA. The current SLA expired in November 2010. The review recommends that the SLA is signed for up to five years at a time. The SLA supports the working arrangements of the Steering Group. It provides the overarching governance arrangements for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards
- strengthening the governance systems. The Steering Group has guidance on the management of the award funds and monitoring the progress of the award holders, as well as managing complaints. It is recommended that these are enhanced to include a more robust communication system for award holders and their employers, and the Steering Group and the professional organisations
- developing a forum network for past award holders and implementing a system to gather information on progress of the projects to help keep track of past award holders. It would:
  - provide information on the professional development of the award holders
  - assess how their projects have continued to influence their organisations and communities
  - give insight into continuous professional development after they have completed their projects
  - provide a tracking system that gathers and stores information for use in establishing the effectiveness of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards
  - provide opportunities for award holders to share information on new practices and explore ways to measure their successes

- facilitate the development of a database of completed projects providing useful information for the Steering Group to measure the outcomes of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards
- produce a tracking system to identify key projects that could be used to influence policy development and to cascade learning to a wider audience
- reviewing the funding arrangements for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards. The present funding arrangements create a sense of uncertainty for the Steering Group. The planning process is delayed as the Steering Group members await confirmation of funding each year before continuing plans for the following year. The general opinion is that the funding for the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards should be agreed for a period of five years at a time. This arrangement will reduce the tension experienced by Steering Group members and enable them to plan over a longer period.

## 9. Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holders, 1994–2009

Leadership awards	Year	Mary Seacole Scholarship Award project
Professor David Sallah	1994	A study into effectiveness of mental health services with a view to developing outcomes measures for forensic mental health
Lilieth Smith	1995	Provision of home management service for sickle cell crises
Mary Mullix	1996	Home nursing services for children – an option for minority ethnic families
Professor Gina Higginbottom MBE	1997	An investigation into knowledge of heart health promoting behaviours amongst secondary school children of African descent in the UK
Professor Laura Serrant-Green	1998	Exploring the sexual health information needs of black men
Rita Melifonwu	1999	Developing evidence based stroke care for minority ethnic patients
Dr Kathy Ann Sienko OBE	2000	An evidence based approach to identify the health needs of African and Caribbean elders living in Camden and Islington
Yana Richens	2001	An exploration of women of Pakistani origin's experiences of UK maternity services
Esther Slattery	2002	A study of the experience of women with severe mental illness with dependent children
Dr Sharon Simpson Prentis	2003	A study of the medicine needs of South Asian and African Caribbean patients in primary care
Sandra Anto-Awuakye	2006	An exploration into the child rearing practices of South Asian communities living in London's East End: developing culturally sensitive services within health visiting practice

Leadership awards	Year	Mary Seacole Scholarship Award project
Stella Sebuwufu	2007	Improving maternity services for HIV positive women
Beverly Thomas	2007	Engaging staff to deliver patient centred high dependency care in a reconfigured neurosurgical ward
Ofrah Muflahi	2008	Improving the health of children and young adults living with sickle cell disease and thalassaemia
Concilia Ajuo	2009	Improving the sexual health of black African and black Caribbean youths in Brent, London – preventing the transmission of HIV/AIDS
Titilayo Babatunde	2009	An exploration of perception of postnatal depression in African women in Greenwich community health care services

<b>Development awards</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mary Seacole Scholarship Award project</b>
Shahida Hanif	2004	A study into the perceived health needs of local older people from ethnic minority communities
Pamela Inniss	2004	To establish and develop a midwife-led diabetic clinic
Juliet Ozuzu-Nwaiwu	2004	An exploratory study of the perceptions of black women regarding the uptake of HRT for menopausal symptoms
Itai Nyamatore	2005	A project focusing on the delivery of equitable care to black and minority ethnic mental health service users in an acute care setting
Mandakini Amin	2006	Developing and introducing a teaching tool to raise staff awareness on equality and diversity in a primary care trust
Florence Kanikasamy	2006	An evaluation of childbirth education
Theo Machingambi	2006	Promoting and protecting children's mental health
Lihua Wu	2006	An exploratory trial to assess the feasibility and acceptability of nurse-led structured telephone follow-up of weight management in Type 2 diabetes mellitus
Gillian Houghton	2007	Developing an information DVD for maternity care
Stephanie Allen	2007	A pilot study into the drivers and barriers to ethnic minority older people accessing health and social care in the UK
Gloria Urhoma	2008	Informing the development of a maternity information DVD for Pakistani women: a social marketing approach

Development awards	Year	Mary Seacole Scholarship Award project
Pamela Shaw	2008	The positive contributions of black and minority ethnic professionals to the NHS – through role models
Sonia Clarke-Swaby	2009	Exploring the understanding and cultural beliefs surrounding organ donation amongst black African Caribbean and Asian populations affected with kidney disease in Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham
Gillian Francis	2009	Developing the cultural competence of health professionals working with gypsy travellers

## 10. Acknowledgements

The Chief Nursing Officer, on behalf of the Department of Health, acknowledges and appreciates the commitment and enthusiasm of the Steering Group members who work in partnership to manage and promote the continuance of the Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards.

### 10.1 Mary Seacole Scholarship Awards Steering Group members

Gail Adams, UNISON representative, Head of Nursing (new chair)

Obi Amadi, Unite/CPHVA representative, Lead Professional Officer

Professor Carol Baxter, CBE, NHS Employers past representative, Head of Equality, Diversity and Human Rights

Frances Day-Stirk, RCM past representative

Janet Fyle, RCM representative, Professional Policy Adviser

Sue Higgins, UNISON representative, Learning and Development project coordinator (new member)

Sue Jacob, RCM representative, Student Services Adviser

Mohamed Jogi, NHS Employers representative

Moira Lambert, awards officer and administrator for the Steering Group (provided by RCN)

Dr Vina Mayor, past independent member

Christine McKenzie, RCN representative, Learning and Development Facilitator

Joan Myers, Department of Health representative, Professional Officer for Diversity

Professor Laura Serrant-Green, past Mary Seacole Scholarship Award holder, independent member.

We would like to acknowledge the work of Lynette Phillips OBE from L. Phillips Management Consultancy Ltd in preparing this work.

