

**Public Consultation Process
Stakeholder Advisory Group (PCPSAG)
CONFERENCE CALL/MEETING (22.08.16)
EXCEPTIONAL MINUTES**

Attendance: Sue Stevenson (SS), John Underwood (JU), Stephen Hall (STH), Vivian Stuke, (VS), Eileen Turner (ET)

1. Welcome.

Sue Stevenson began the conference call by welcoming attendees and summarising the role of the PCPSAG, which is to advise and provide guidance on the consultation process. SS then informed the group that the purpose of this exceptional discussion was to discuss three format options for health consultation questions and to consider the standard demographics/equalities questionnaire.

VS pointed out that each format included reference to the CCG's preferred option and asked where the reasons for the preference would be clarified. SS explained that the description of the preferred option would be described in the Consultation Document, with further detail available within the Pre-Consultation Business Case and other documentation which would be published.

SS then briefly ran through the three question formats and it was decided that the group would discuss each format in succession.

2. Options

VS commented that she thought the first option could be considered leading given that it specifically requires the respondent to state whether they do or do not favour the preferred option, before then stating which, if any option, they do prefer. ET agreed that this format could be viewed as potentially leading. There was then a discussion which acknowledged that the first option was open and transparent about the fact that the CCG had a preferred option. SS said that the format of the question should endeavour to be as honest as possible.

The group then moved on to the second format which asked respondents to rank the options according to their preference. SS and VS asked how the data would be assessed, and JU said that the Consultation Institute advised that this option provides for clearer and more nuanced data by virtue of the ranking system. There was then a discussion on the data that would be collected, including whether postcode data would be a compulsory element. It was agreed that this would be discussed later in the meeting. ET said that she preferred the second format because of the ranking system and remarked that it was a reasonable approach. VS agreed that it would produce much richer data and that she was open to this format.

The third format was then discussed and ET said that it did not allow for the same nuance as the second format, and that she would like to rank the options to more widely indicate her preferences. VS agreed with this and said the data gathered from the third format could be too simplistic.

3. Part B - Equalities questionnaire

The group then discussed the equalities questionnaire that is voluntary and constitutes the second part of the consultation questionnaire. ET said that the question asking 'Is your gender different to that assigned to you at birth?' only provided a 'Yes/No' option and it was recommended that it includes a 'Prefer not to say' choice.

VS raised a concern that had been mentioned before, that the postcode (without the last two letters) of the respondent should be compulsory and would provide richer, geographically significant data. It was asked whether this could be included in Part A, or if there was a legal obligation that prevented this from being compulsory. JU said he would look into this.

It was then raised that more ethnicities may want to be included in the questionnaire such as 'White/European'. STH advised that there was already an option for those who wish to add more information about their ethnic background.

4. AOB

The group agreed that because fewer PCPSAG members than expected had attended the exceptional meeting, written submissions would be accepted up until 5PM on Wednesday 24 August and would be included in any minutes.

The meeting ended at approximately 6pm.

5. Written submissions

Sandra Guise

Sandra Guise (SG) notes that the options for change should be made as clear as possible and be published alongside supporting information. In her written submission she states that format one could be considered loaded. Format two was considered to have value due to the ranking system but she also advises that more details would need to be published to ensure respondents are informed about what they are ranking. With regards to option three SG states that it could be difficult to analyse the data without asking respondents to rank their preferences.

SG also writes that there should be free space after each question for respondents to make any specific points they wish to make. With regards to Part B SG states that there is a lack of reasoning given for why we are requesting this information and also questions why 'Do you have a child under 24 months' is not more widely addressed to parents, given that paediatrics will be consulted on.

Jan den Bak

Jan den Bak (JdB) recommended format three as he thought it would provide respondents with the ability to give one answer. He writes that having people rank their preferences could lead to too many possibilities.

He agrees that postcode information should be made compulsory when answering the consultation questionnaire.

Sarah Hall

Sarah Hall recommended the third format citing its simplicity and readability.

Jane Smith

Jane Smith (JS) more broadly advised that the consultation process would need to adhere to Section 221 of the Local Government and Public Involvement Act 2007 and evidence that decisions have not been pre-determined. JS also raises the issue of accountability and asks if a consultation plan can be published so that the public can question contributing organisations. As well as this, JS asks whether the dates of Board meetings will be published in advance and whether there will be minutes provided after these meetings. JS also requests that accurate and differing levels of supplementary information be available to allow people to provide an informed response.

John Brown

John Brown noted that he agreed with the points made by Sandra Guise and that they should be considered.

DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

Monday 12th September 5pm - 7pm

Thursday 13th October 1pm - 3pm

Monday 31st October 1-3pm