

PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FORUM (RUH BATH)

MINUTES OF A MEETING IN PUBLIC:

Wednesday 29 March 2006

The Somer Centre, Gullock Tynning, Midsomer Norton

1 Attendance

1.1 Forum members present: Jill Tompkins [chair], Veronica Parker [Vice Chair], Jetta Found, Sylvia Humphries, Jeff Rattle, Patricia West.

1.2 Royal United Hospital Staff present: Edwina Lloyd

1.3 Health Advocacy Partnership staff present: Paul Howard

1.4 Public present: two members of the public, including a representative of the Friends of the Royal United Hospital

1.5 Apologies: Peter Dix, David John, Edwina Lloyd [lateness]

2 Declarations of interest

2.1 There were none.

3 Public Forum

3.1 Jon Lale spoke about PAT Centre and the Impact Assessment which had been carried out on proposed changes to it. He had previously supplied comments in writing to the Forum.

3.2 He said that his son attends the PAT Centre. Special needs children age 2-4 are referred there. Children need to have access to 3 areas of therapy. Signs are needed that intensive therapy will help them and give them independence they would otherwise not get.

The Nursery Nurses have some special expertise in this area.

[Edwina Lloyd arrived at this point]

3.3 He said the centre is fantastic. According to Royal United Hospital, numbers needing the service were dropping. He found it difficult to agree with this, as no empirical evidence had been provided. Therapists in the community were referring in and being refused without knowing why.

3.4 The Royal United Hospital did not think they should pay for it from their budget. They were looking at it as a cost cutting exercise. He thought all stakeholders should be involved in the discussions. The process had been half-hearted, ill thought-out, rushed and flawed. The Royal United Hospital

would not go to full consultation without being forced. The parents were first informed around February. They only knew because of staff telling them about job losses. The Royal United Hospital had apologised. In private meetings he had had with Royal United Hospital staff, they had said they first looked at reviewing the service in April 2005, accelerated the process in November 2005, but the impact assessment had not taken place until 25 January 2006. A key feature of the impact assessments is that they should happen at a formative stage. He thought parents were highly underrepresented at the assessment. Two had been invited, but only one could go. More people with knowledge of the centre should have been involved.

3.5 Jon Lale read out a statement from the parent who had participated. A copy is appended to these minutes.

3.6 Jon Lale said that the document provided for the impact assessment was inadequate, and inaccurate. There would be a reduction in service of over 60%. The Trust was not taking into account the people who cared for the children. He was not against change, and the centre had to prove it was value for money. Service to the current group of patients was needed, and it would be good to extend it to older children as well. The proposed change would save money in the long term. His son would finish at the centre in May regardless.

3.7 Sylvia Humphries asked about services available in the community. Jon Lale could not speak for others, but his son went to an opportunities group weekly prior to going to the PAT Centre. He said there was still need for PAT Centre input, and feared they would lose core skills when the nursery nurses were lost. Sylvia Humphries said she did express concern about nursery nurse numbers reducing when she participated in the impact assessment.

3.8 Jeff Rattle asked if there were other places similar to the PAT centre. Jon Lale was not aware of any. He felt it should be used as a national model. The Royal United Hospital used it as a photo opportunity regularly.

3.9 The Forum wondered whether anyone had asked about other sources of funding for the centre.

3.10 Sylvia Humphries commented that one idea behind the proposed changes was to open the centre up to more children. Jon Lale felt there was still a need to keep something that provided services for complex needs children.

3.11 Veronica Parker asked where the evidence was that numbers were reducing. Jon Lale was concerned that the figures could not be substantiated. He believed they could fill the centre with 25 children. Sylvia Humphries thought it would be pushing it to have more than six or seven at any one time with the current level of service to individuals. Jon Lale suggested more flexible ways of working were needed. There was lots of middle ground between what was proposed and what was currently provided.

3.12 Forum members asked how the matter came to the attention of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Jon Lale had contacted them and had earned that they had not been informed of the impact assessment. The other Overview and Scrutiny Committees concerned were happy to let Bath and North East Somerset Overview and Scrutiny Committee lead on the issue.

3.13 Jeff Rattle said that he felt the Forum should have been informed of the potential changes to the Centre much earlier.

[John Lale left at this point.]

3.14 Marjorie Cox [representing Friends of RUH] spoke briefly on the work of the Friends. They had given £409,299 to the Trust in September 2005. Their shop turnover was more than £500,000 per annum.

4 Minutes of the meeting in public of 11 January 2006

4.1 These were accepted as a correct record.

5 Matters arising

5.1 There had been no notification so far of when the next PEAG [Patient Environment Action Group] meeting would be. Jeff Rattle commented that the PEAG group had not produced minutes recently. He had concerns about minutes not being produced and would raise them at the PEAG group. A discussion followed around minutes and Forum member reports. It was decided that HAP would keep copies of minutes of RUH meetings attended by Forum members. It was agreed that individuals who sat on the various groups would ask for extra copy of the minutes go to HAP, preferably in electronic format. Members would still need to report back formally to the Forum.

6 Minutes of the private meeting of 21 February 2006

6.1 These were agreed as a correct record

7 Matters arising

7.1 There were none

8 Core Standards comments

8.1 Members ratified the comments which had been circulated. The comments had been submitted to the Trust by the requested deadline, but had not appeared in the relevant board papers. Members noted the letters of apology from

Viv McHale and Mike Roy. It was agreed that Viv McHale and Glyn Young come again in the autumn to discuss next year's core standards process. The Forum asked Edwina Lloyd to let them to know the outcome of the Healthcare Commission grading.

9 PALS [Patient Advice and Liaison Service]

9.1 David was attempting to set up another meeting with Alan Gorse. Jill Tompkins wondered how they work out how many PALS officers there should be in a particular unit. Edwina Lloyd advised that there was no formula

- only a duty to provide a PALS service. The complaints department covered
- Alan Gorse when he was on holiday. The Forum were concerned that he
- worked alone, and that there was no support mechanism when he was sick.
- The Forum felt there should be a system where someone could contact people
- to cancel a meeting if he was off sick [e.g. the secretary of his boss]. Edwina
- Lloyd advised that Alan Gorse would be going part time from April. The Forum agreed to write to the Director of Nursing querying what would be happening to
- the service, and to ask for clarification about what PALS service would be
- provided. The Forum was concerned that they had not been consulted about
- this earlier.

10 Essence of Care

10.1 The Forum noted the report from Sylvia Humphries and Pat West. They had asked if they could go and observe a ward as part of an 'observation of care' process. The nurse in charge of the Victoria Ward was willing for them to go in one at a time. There was also the possibility of going on a surgical ward. Pat West wanted to see what nurses do now, and who did the 'basic nursing' now. It was agreed that Sylvia Humphries and Pat West initially do the two wards as suggested. They would report both to the Forum and to the Essence of Care Group.

10.2 Marjorie Cox advised that the League of Friends also had ward volunteers who do coffee, flowers, help patients fill out menus etc. They finance some of the hand cleaning stuff and so can do some checking of cleanliness.

11 Work plan

11.1 Members noted the ideas which had been circulated. Members were asked to forward comments to Paul Howard as soon as possible. Jill Tompkins and Paul Howard would produce a draft.

12 Avon Gloucestershire and Wiltshire Strategic Health Authority financial position

12.1 Members noted the letter from Trevor Jones and that the Royal United Hospital would have to work out a budget without knowing their income. They were still being asked to meet targets and save money. The Forum were concerned that services across the country were not equitable. Pat West asked if the Forum could find out what redundancies there would be. Edwina Lloyd explained that they would come about as a result of service changes. The Royal United Hospital wanted Forum involvement in their strategic issues committee.

13 Items for information

13.1 The Forum noted the board report and the publicity group minutes. Jetta Found wondered what the outcome of the event in Frome was. Forum members felt that future members' conferences should be organised by HAP with significant input from chairs.

14 Impact Assessment

14.1 Edwina Lloyd asked to hear Forum members' response to statement that the assessment was led, and not impartial.

14.2 The Forum agreed that the impact assessment was not done early enough to be at a 'formative stage', and felt that the Forum should have been notified of the issue much earlier.

14.3 The Forum members who participated in the impact assessment in question did not feel that Edwina Lloyd was leading. They felt that the only person who was not impartial was the person who wrote the proposal [who was understandably in favour of it]. One Forum member commented that at another impact assessment, she had felt that Edwina had put things in a guiding way, but that she had not followed Edwina's lead. Another member felt that Edwina had supplied necessary guidance

14.4 The Forum agreed that it was essential to have background information provided before impact assessment meetings, rather than at them. The Forum also recommended that for future assessments, a visit to the site concerned should normally be part of the process.

14.5 The Forum asked Edwina Lloyd to contact the Forum, rather than individual members to go on future impact assessment panels and participating in meetings.

14.6 Edwina Lloyd advised that the Trust had apologised for the lack of

consultation. If had been no parent at the impact assessment meeting, she would have cancelled it. Edwina Lloyd had felt it was a balanced group.

[Sylvia Humphries left at this point]

15 Issues from Royal United Hospital NHS Trust

15.1 It was noted that Jane Luckham Down was continuing on the Patient Experience Group, but could no longer represent the Forum. Edwina Lloyd asked whether the Forum would send a replacement representative. The Forum would decide at its next meeting. Edwina Lloyd would supply minutes of the group's meetings.

15.2 Jill Tompkins or Veronica Parker would attend the next Public and Patient Involvement Development Implementation Group meeting.

15.3 Edwina Lloyd asked whether the Forum wanted another stand in the Atrium. Jill Tompkins thought it would be a good idea, but the Forum needed to be clearer about what members would we do, and involve the reception staff. It would depend on how many people were prepared to give their time. Veronica Parker could not see the point in arranging a stand until it was known what would happen to Forums.

15.4 Edwina Lloyd advised that the Patient Survey results would be out in 2 weeks. The Royal United Hospital would supply a copy to the Forum. She thanked the Fourm for returning the outpatient survey book. The Royal United Hospital had done their own survey and were happy to let the Forum have a copy. It had more information than the one that goes into the public domain.

15.5 Jill Tompkins asked if there were any further plans over the discharge group. Edwina Lloyd understood that there was one and would find out more and report back.

[Marjorie Cox left at this point]

15.6 Jeff Rattle asked about cancellation of electives, and how the Royal United Hospital treatment centre was doing against Shepton Mallet. Edwina Lloyd thought that emergency patients had got in to the treatment centre.

15.7 Jill Tompkins commented that she has done Out of Hours visits in the B&NES area and the service was were exemplary at the Royal United Hospital end.

16 Dates of future meetings

16.1 The Forum agreed the following amendments to meeting schedule for 2006

- Move 27th April private meeting to 25th April from 10 a.m. to 12 noon [Note – the decision about this meeting was reversed at the private meeting immediately following, and a meeting from 1 to 4 p.m. at St Luke’s Church Hall on 27th April was agreed]
- 16 May meeting – public 12.30 -3, private 3 – 3.30 – Box Methodist Church Hall
- 13 June private meeting [New Oriel Hall] 10 – 12
- 25 July meeting in public 10 -12.30 – Bath – Manvers Street

17 Member issues

17.1 Food wastage. The Forum had been concerned about catering staff not knowing what was good and what was bad. The Royal United Hospital staff could not take the waste back into the kitchens. Jill Tompkins asked of there could there be a record of what was not consumed by patients. Edwina Lloyd advised that the hospital was looking at the issue. The Essence of Care group was looking at nutrition. Jeff Rattle would raise the issue through the PEAG group. EL advised that there was also a catering service users group [nurses] who were looking at how those two groups could work together.

17.2 Expert Patient Programme. Jill Tompkins brought forward this issue from the BMW [B&NES Mendip and Western Wiltshire] informal group of Forums, where it had been agreed that members would invite their Forums to ask their Trusts what the outcomes of the programmes were, what were the financial implications of the changing arrangements. Forums would also be invited to ask how many courses had been held, where they were held, how many tutors there were and what the criteria were for being tutors. Edwina Lloyd advised that there were eight or nine leaders in the group in Bath and North East Somerset and that it worked very successfully. People were not coming to the courses, and GPs were not recommending them. There was an issue about recognition of the programmes by the medical profession. There was not enough academic research to show the impact of these programmes. Edwina Lloyd felt the courses were beneficial, and had been very successful. It was agreed that there was no point in asking the Royal United Hospital Trust questions from the BMW group, as they had been involved in only one pilot.