

Influence Panel report from Thursday 7 March 2019

Fylde Coast CCGs' NHS England 'improvement and assessment framework' for engagement

Attendees

Amanda Bate – FWCCG	Elaine Christian
Dan Clough – FWCCG	Maurice Christian
Mark Britton – FWCCG	Jen Olivine
Rachel Naughton – FWCCG	Jim Proctor
Kevin Toole – FWCCG	Norma Rodgers
Lisa Westoby	Allan Slater
Ian Gibson	Russell Hodskinson
Jeanie King	Nick Milne
Charles Bayliss	June Deveney

Dan Clough explained to the Panel about the NHS England 'improvement and assessment framework' (IAF) for engagement. The CCGs had to supply evidence against a number of criteria under different themes (called domains), demonstrating that not only did they carry out good engagement with the public, but that it was properly recorded and viewable by the public.

The communications and engagement team had been asked by NHS England to complete a self-assessment form. The Panel was split into four groups and CCG staff members circulated around each group to discuss how the form had been completed for each different domain, with comments asked for and used to help shape the final submission.

The domains were:

- Domain A: Governance
- Domain B: Annual reporting
- Domain C: Day-to-day practice
- Domain D: Feedback and evaluation
- Domain E: Equalities and health inequalities

The Panel gave feedback not only on the submission itself, but also on areas they felt could be improved on having heard what was in the draft submission.

Domain A

- The six-monthly communications and engagement strategy progress updates that are taken to the Governing Body should be shared more widely.

Domain B

- Talk to Greater Preston CCG and Chorley and South Ribble CCG for their lessons learned around joint annual report work.
- Get people to look at and review the evidence pages references in the IAF submission.

- Identify areas within the annual report that the Influence Panel could assist with (potentially) co-producing the annual report

Domain C

The groups were largely in support of what was stated under this domain and felt the day to day work of the CCG was something to be celebrated.

- Could we please not use the phrase 'engagement architecture'
- One of the criteria states: 'Evidence that a range of partners have been involved in developing and implementing CCG plans for commissioning'. While there is plenty of evidence for 'developing', there is little in the way of 'implementing'.

Domain D

Generally speaking, Panel members agreed with most of the evidence submitted by the CCG for the criteria within domain D.

The main area of contention concerned 'the CCG tells patients and the public, including those who have been involved, about the difference their involvement has made'. The following points were made:

- Not everybody has access to, or chooses to visit, the CCG website.
- There needs to be a more robust process in place to ensure that the Influence Panel receives regular feedback/updates.
- The Influence Panel doesn't always receive feedback. The Panel needs to understand its influence/impact.
- The Panel doesn't always require verbal feedback, a report can be just as useful.

In relation to 'the CCG reviews its involvement activity, including how effective it has been, and takes action in response to what it has learned', some members said it was important the CCG was clear in how it measured effectiveness.

Finally, in relation to 'feedback is communicated using creative and diverse methods' one suggestion was that this topic could be taken to the Panel at a later stage to discuss different ways of communicating feedback in the future.

Domain E

- More evidence of engagement with seldom heard and hard to reach groups is required.
- Increase initiatives in the community such as Well North in Lytham St Annes.
- For the criteria 'public facing communications are accessible' we should include Browsealoud as an example and examples of where we have shared printed materials with visually impaired groups for approval.
- Need to ensure more robust demographic monitoring for engagement purposes.
- The evidence for the CCG strategy and how it links to EDS 2 is good.

Annual report 2019

Mark Britton, communications manager, presented the draft annual report 2018/19 to the Panel for comments on its content and appearance. The Panel had been asked to comment on the redesign of the document in April 2018 and was assured that the latest version would follow a similar format.

The Panel gave its support for the information to be presented in the same format again, including the creation of a summary document that was more reader friendly.