



296 Central Drive, Blackpool, FY1 5JW
Phone: 01253 344398 / 07460 131188
Email: info@urpotential.co.uk

People's Panel Report Meeting held 25th June 2015 At NHS Office, Derby Road, Wesham

Opening and Presentation

Meeting opened by Scott Smith who welcomed the attendees to the first People's Panel meeting. He explained the thinking behind setting up the Panel and how it would support the CCG. Christine Carty then explained her role and a reminder of the format of the Panel meetings.

Amena Patel from the Commissioning Unit gave the presentation which was an overview of the procedure on implementing the Equality Delivery System (EDS). She explained that this had been reviewed previously by a group of local partners and stakeholders at an EDS Grading Meeting and a grading score had been generated on specific questions asked. The Panel Members were to determine if the process of the Grading Event had been robust enough to determine if the EDS is being followed.

Amena explained that the CCG needs to consider the nine protected characteristics in all they undertake and also ensure they comply with the law on the Equality Act 2010, Human Rights Act 1998, public sector responsibilities and the CCG Constitution and its values. The CCG also needs to ensure that their services are accessible to everyone.

It was explained that the EDS goals explored at the Grading Meeting were 'Better health outcomes' and 'Improved patient access and experience'.





Amena explained the process of the Grading Meeting and gave an example of how Commissioning Managers take into account patient comments to change and develop a service. The Panel Members were then shown a video of patients who had been treated within the Stroke services giving their feedback on their experiences.

It was further explained that during the EDS grading event various presentations were given, either by video or in person, to explain elements of the CCG's current provision. The EDS Grading Meeting attendees were to score using the grades of Underdeveloped, Developed, Achieved or Excelled depending on their review of the information given in the presentation. All Grading Meeting attendees scored individually.

At the end of her presentation Amina Patel and Scott Smith left the room and allowed the Panel members to have a discussion on the information presented.

Panel Members Discussion

The Panel were asked to discuss and make a response to the question;
'We, the Panel, agree / disagree that the EDS grading process that NHS Fylde & Wyre CCG has undertaken was robust.'

The Panel members split into two groups and discussed the evidence that was presented. Various questions were raised in each group including 'How are better health outcomes measured?', 'where do the facts and figures actually come from?'. Comments also included that the presentation was too fast and was sometimes difficult to understand so a copy of the presentation or supporting information would be useful prior to the meeting.

Each group then feedback the main points of their discussion.





Group A

Query that the process may not be robust enough as it was not made clear how are the projects to review are selected?

Questioned how transparent the evidence is that is being presented to the Grading Meeting.

Query as to whether larger GP practices are good at getting feedback in but smaller practices may struggle.

Need more information on the topics reviewed. How are the outcomes measured? Measured against what?

Group B

Questioned how the health needs of a community are determined

Questions as to how the people on the Stroke video were selected – need to ensure it was not a case of 'They would say that, wouldn't they' implying that only relatively positive feedback is selected for entry.

Query around the EDS Grading Event only being annually. What happens in between – where are those reviews and the benchmarking.

What about the patients who don't attend the feedback sessions possibly because they are not well enough – who is listening to their voice?

Chair's Feedback

The Chair then presented the findings to Scott and Amena. The answer to the question was that the People's Panel could neither agree nor disagree with the question posed.

The Chair explained that there was concern about where the evidence that was presented to the Grading Meeting was sourced from – why those particular projects were selected. There was no indication on how the evidence was prepared – it was not clear to this group. There was concern over how good the evidence was as the People's Panel members were unable to determine this with the information they were given.





The Panel members felt that although the EDS Grading Meeting attendees may have made appropriate decisions on the basis of evidence they received it was not obvious to this Panel whether they did or did not. This was due to not having seen all the evidence themselves.

There was also concern that there was not broad spread across the grading with no one saying anything 'Under Achieved'. This raised concern that the EDS Grading Meeting attendees went for the two middle options.

Closing

The Chair was thanked for her comments and Scott Smith said that he would take the comments and feedback to the various committees within the CCG. He extended an invitation to the Panel Members to attend the EDS Grading Meeting in 2016 where they could be involved in the whole process and support the CCG further in their development.

The Panel Members were advised that there would be a questionnaire being sent to them to ask for their feedback on the event and for any improvements / comments for the next event.

The Panel Members were thanked for their attendance and support and it was hoped they would be able to attend the next meeting.

