Patient Participation Group (PPG) - Minutes

Date: 10:04:2014
Time: 6.00pm
Location: SHC
Attended by: Paul Thompson PT / Neil Huntingford NH / Alan Webb AW/ Sylvia Webb WB / Dorothy Linter DT / Polly Healy PH / Dr Dave Gill DG / Varsha Mandalia VM / Elke Carling EC / Jackie Sheehan JS / Brian Catt BC / Wendy Doyle WD / Cllr Daxa Patel DP

Chair: Paul Thompson
Minutes: Neil Huntingford

Subject: PPG Meeting

Apologies: Cllr Tim Evans TE / Helen O'Shea HO'S

Changes to previous Minutes

DT – Surname spelt wrong – should read 'Linter'.

DT - Complaints – should read 'complaints should **not** come through the PPG'.

PT – Comment re nurses should be attributed to BC not PT.

Matters arising: Healthwatch/CAB

Discussion

PT – requested if Healthwatch posters/info was being displayed.

DG – asked for clarification on Healthwatch.

Conclusion

Unsure where posters/info are.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Staff and others to try to locate posters/info PT to resupply if needed	PH / VM / JS / PT PT	Next few days If required

Matters arising: LOSRA article

Discussion

PT – Article published in LOSRA newsletter.

DG – Has had some positive feedback from patients.

Conclusion

Completed

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
None		

Matters arising: Steve McCarthy

Discussion

No more details available at present.

Conclusion

Carry forward

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Carry forward	HO'S	BNM

Matters arising: Patient survey

Discussion

Published on SHC website – positive comments on the whole – 206 responses. Lowest satisfaction score was with the telephone appointments system.

SW – raised issue re patients with hearing loss and difficulty communicating with SHC via telephone. Discussion took place re various options to improve situation such as SMS (texts) / use of ipads/pen and pad once patient is at surgery etc. Raised larger issue of communications with elderly patients who may be averse to using modern IT methods.

Conclusion

No obvious solutions identified as this is a complex issue – further investigations to be undertaken.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Matter to be raised at next local Practice Managers' Meeting to establish how other practices deal with this issue.	VM	24:04:14

Matters arising: Booking system

Discussion

VM – Developing the booking system is proving to be more difficult than expected. Delays caused by current

company re-quoting work at higher costs than anticipated. Exploring options of new providers.

Conclusion

Ongoing

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Ongoing	VM	BNM

Maters arising: Notice board review

Discussion

NH – meeting had taken place between NH & PH to look at best way forward. They would like a designated member of SHC staff to work with them to develop the way forward.

VM – proposed JS as ideal person.

Conclusion

Agreed

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Meeting arranged	NH/JS	1.00pm 14/4

Matters arising: Hand sanitiser

Discussion

VM - Bottle of sanitiser available in waiting room but not allowed to fit to wall without permission from NHS England, owners of building.

NH – Suggested commercial free standing unit with signage as supplied to hospitals may be available as a way of avoiding fitting to wall.

Conclusion

Current bottle was a good short term solution - further research needed to find permanent solution.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Investigate commercial free-standing unit	VM	BNM

PPG draft website – linking/updating/synchronisation

Discussion

DG – Partners had looked at PPG website and very happy with it to go live.

PG – Raised issue of funding - £47.00 needed to make site live.

Discussion on how SCH and PPG sites would link appropriate items/areas. Flu vaccinations used as example of how sites could support each other to encourage patients to take up offer.

Conclusion

DG – Agreed SCH would fund launch of PPG site.

PH – Agreed to update PPG site as needed and work with SCH re links.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Invoice SCH for £47.00 for PPG site launch	PH / VM	ASAP
PPG site to go live	PH	17/4/14 or earlier

SCH website - linking/updating/synchronisation

Discussion

See above

VM – SCH does not update SCH website locally – has to be requested through third party.

Conclusion

SCH would work with PPG re links.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Once PPG site is live, links can be established between sites.	VM / PH	TBC

NHS submission - update

Discussion

DG – Updated on NHS submission – no further information available from NHS regarding the SCH submission – had been chased by email but no result other than expect answer April onwards...

DP – Confirmed that very difficult to get updates from NHS.

Discussion followed on options if negative response received from NHS.

Conclusion

Little point in planning any further actions at this stage until results of submission are known.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Ongoing		

Premises – update from Cllr/s or SHC

Discussion

DP – Gave an update on the various options the Council had been looking at regarding possible new sites for SHC if that was the direction we were heading. Very early days and no firm conclusions, but early indications were:

Car park at end of Green Street – too small

Page Electronics – unsure of vacation date and future use – could be commercial/residential/available.

Adult Education Centre premises on The Avenue – this looked the most viable at this stage as owned by SCC. Meeting planned after Easter to bring appropriate parties together for discussions.

Stressed that this is all about scoping ideas at this very early stage and every option would be influenced by sourcing funding streams.

NH – Given that it was still very early days, it would be helpful to have a broad timeframe to help put expectations in context.

VP – Agreed and suggested that it could be at least a year before we had a firm indication of which direction we are heading.

DG – informed the meeting about the complexity of the current set up within SHC and shared use of the premises with Virgin Health Care.

Various discussions around who provided what services / patients' perceptions that everything was 'the health centre' / issues that might arise should services be split across sites.

Conclusion

Ongoing long term issue that would become clearer over the next year.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Ongoing		

IT services – outstanding issues

Discussion

VM – Issues regarding the use of computers upstairs had been resolved and the facilities were now in use.

Conclusion

Resolved

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
None required		

Waiting Room screen – future utilisation

Discussion

PT – How is information added/deleted/changed on the waiting room screen?

VM – Again, this is managed by a third party outside of the SHC. Any changes have to go through them, including adjusting the voice.

BC – Asked if the company were helpful to deal with.

VM – No issues, very helpful.

NH – Asked what form information had to be supplied in for screen updates – PDFs for example.

VM – Simple text via an email or pictures and text.

Conclusion

System was improving, especially the voice element.

PPG could put up advert.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
As required PT to supply wording for PPG advert	PT	28:04:14

CQC inspection - results

Discussion

VM – Explained how the inspection was run - once a year with two days notice. Based on discussions with staff / patients, backed up by evidence.

Positive results despite poor premises noted by the inspectors.

Results posted on SHC website.

Discussion on how complaints were handled by the SHC. Led to discussion on the suggestions box.

WD – raised the fact that no information was available to patients who did not come into the building but were perhaps dropping off a prescription request outside.

Conclusion

Consideration should be given to information outside / placing of suggestion box / highlight on screen. Could be looked at by 'display team'.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Look at options for info outside	JS / NH / PH	BNM

PPG future promotion to patients / structure / objectives / newsletter

Discussion

Discussion around size and structure of PPG – should it be fully open – should it have a core group but any patient can attend a meeting etc?

Poster ideas were discussed based on samples provided by PH & NH. Discussion on the importance of diversity of any images used and accessibility of text.

EC – Encouraged use of all inclusive imagery on poster – important to include older people.

NH – Pointed out that there is a danger of tokenism with all inclusive imagery and how it is better to show diversity across a range of information/publications rather than a one size fits all approach.

DG – Very keen that the PPG should reflect views of diverse patient profile.

PT – Asked what the SHC wanted from the PPG in regard to objectives – for future thought.

Conclusion

General agreement that a promotional poster was a good idea. Revised version should be drawn up for consideration.

PPG structure needed more discussion as time went on to establish best way forward. Meanwhile, meetings of the PPG are open to anyone who wishes to attend.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
PPG structure Poster	All PH / NH	Ongoing 18:04:14

Patient advocacy – role of PPG if any

Discussion

Discussion around what is meant by advocacy – system already in place for patient to have support when attending doctor appointment but what about other matters?

DG – Quite clear that on medical issues, these are dealt with by the Practice and no need for PPG involvement. There might be a case for patients bringing non-medical matters to the attention of the PPG.

SW – informed the meeting that there is an advocacy 'hub' in Walton offering support for people with disabilities. Hoped that this model could be rolled out elsewhere.

Conclusion

The group might want to consider a policy on advocacy.

DP would look into local 'hub' models.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Policy on advocacy	PT	BNM

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Local Hub models	DP	TBC

A.O.B.

SW – Is there PPG representation to the LPRG (Local Patient Reference Group)?

PT – Confirmed there was, himself and Helen O'Shea.

BC – Explained his connection to Ashford Hospital.

DP – Is there a link to the CCG?

PT – Yes,through the LPRG and quarterly Locality Stakeholder meetings.

VM – Asked for shorter agenda for future meetings.

PT – Agreed, as the outstanding issues are being resolved.

DP – Does the PPG work with Virgin Health as well as SHC?

DG – Virgin operate completely separate and this could be mentioned on PPG website to prevent confusion for patients.

Follow-up	Who's responsible?	When?
Supply Virgin complaint contact details to PH for website	VM	18:04:14 latest
Speak to other LPRG members to see how they handle Virgin/others	PT	BNM
Agree date of next meeting	PT	18:04:14

Meeting closed	8.10pm	