

# Pharmacy Review Steering Committee (PRSC) Agenda

19<sup>th</sup> December 2019

## Attendees and role

David Wright, Independent Chair (UEA, Norwich)

Shilpa Shah, LPC Representative (LPC Chief Officer representative)

Ruth Buchan, LPC Representative (LPC Chief Officer representative)

David Bearman, LPC Representative (LPC member representative)

Vicki Roberts, LPC Representative (LPC member representative)

Mark Ireland, Contractor Representative (CCA)

Adrian Price, Contractor Representative (CCA)

Reena Barai, Contractor Representative (Independent)

Asif Alidina, Contractor Representative (Independent)

Peter Cattee, Contractor Representative (non-CCA multiple)

Simon Dukes, PSNC Representative (CEO PSNC)

Richard Whittington, LOC representative (CEO LOCSU)

Zoe Long, Observer (Director of Communications and Public Affairs at PSNC)

Bethany Atkins, Administrator (UEA, Norwich)

## Minutes and Actions

### 1) Welcome and introductions

The committee were welcomed by the chair and thanked for their involvement in the process.

In addition to the nominated and selected members, Zoe Long was present from the PSNC as an observer, with a responsibility of supporting all work with the media resulting from this process.

The committee were asked to discuss what a conflict of interest for this role on the steering committee may consist of. Examples provided included membership of other relevant boards and committees both within and outside of England.

All members reported their conflicts around the table so that everyone in the room was aware. DW stated that he was very pleased to see that so many hats were available in the room and so much experience was being brought to the committee. RW provided a brief overview of the local optical committee review as part of this. DW asked RW to create a 2 page summary for the committee to review and discuss at the next meeting.

**ACTION RW:** present LOCSU context (2 pages) at January meeting

**ACTION BA:** Add LOCSU to January meeting agenda

It was agreed that the NHS Conflict of Interest form would be most appropriate and that all members would complete these, post this meeting, for inclusion on the pharmacy review website.

**ACTION BA:** BA to set up shared OneDrive with PRSC and email declarations of interest form to members

**ACTION PRSC:** all members are to complete and save conflicts of interest forms to OneDrive (or email to BA to upload)

One member reported difficulties in accessing the pharmacy review website.

[www.pharmacy-review.org](http://www.pharmacy-review.org). BA agreed to address this as it should be available to anyone with an interest in the process. Other members of the PRSC were not aware of the website. DW apologized as whilst its availability had been made clear to the LPCs, this information had not been communicated to PRSC members.

**ACTION BA:** Check website access issues and share website link with PRSC members

DW reported that he had received a large amount of communication from across England since appointment to role and this had created far more work than anticipated. A number of committee members reported similar experiences.

It had become very apparent to DW that the level and nature of the communication demonstrated that the organisations involved were not used to being reviewed regularly. This was the first ever review of the PSNC/LPC infrastructure.

DW stated that he believed one of his first recommendations would be for more regular review and independent oversight so that when these events occurred they would be part of the culture within the system and therefore create less angst.

DW shared an e.mail which expressed concerns regarding the make-up of the PRSC and that there was a centrist and CCA led agenda driving this review.

A number of PRSC members stated that the individual had sent the e.mail as he wanted the best for their profession and that his motives were positive.

SD made it clear that the review derived from increased pressures on PSNC and LPCs from contractors and the external context which had led to a desire to review structures and processes to determine if things could be done better or more efficiently.

His concern about the role and influence of the Steering Committee was reported by PRSC members to be widespread and that it probably arose from a misunderstanding regarding the role of the PRSC. It was agreed that it was important to make it clear that the independent review team would write the final report and make the final recommendations and that the role of the PRSC was to support the independent team.

It was also agreed that the report would provide recommendations which were not binding and ultimately it was up to the LPCs and PSNC and Contractors to decide which they chose to implement.

The committee asked DW to respond to the Chief Officer explaining the rationale for the review, the independence of the team collecting the evidence and writing the report and that they should wait until the final report comes out.

**ACTION DW:** Communicate PRSC response to the Chief Officer.

## **2) Statements from the chair**

DW believed that the aim of the review was to optimize the current infrastructure to deliver best outcomes for contractors and that this was to be achieved within the current budget.

DW stated that he and the review team would be responsible for all recommendations and would base these on the large amount of evidence which they intended to collect as part of this process. DW recognized that he did not understand what it was like to be a contractor,

LPC or PSNC member and that he had a lot of learning to do. DW stated that had sent a list of questions to SD to better help him understand the context. VR asked if the questions and answers could be made available to the PRSC. DW was happy to do this but admitted that he was somewhat embarrassed by the baseness of the questions.

**ACTION DW:** Share the questions for and answers from SD with the PRSC.

The steering committee's role is to ensure that DW and team are fully aware of context, politics and the facts associated with the organisations.

DW stated that he recognised that this review was not going to change the current structure and processes overnight. All we are doing at this stage (over the next three months) is to make some sensible suggestions as to how to start to redirect it. There's lots of good activity and lots of good ideas across the LPCs – his only agenda is to optimize the current system that is already in place. DW recognised that due to the limited time frame then some of the recommendations may pertain to the need for further work.

### **3) PRSC terms of reference - Draft (Appendix 1) and communication**

The committee reviewed the proposed ToR and were supportive of what was being proposed.

RB asked for clarification regarding the term 'support'? DW stated that this meant that if he asked for help with something from the PRSC outside of meetings they would help him with this. DW stated that this was more likely to happen when he was writing the final report and that he recognized the need to be open and transparent when seeking support and not to pick individuals without knowledge of others.

With respect to the objectives it was made clear that these were what had been agreed between the PSNC and LPCs when commissioning the review. It was agreed however that we could add to these if deemed necessary.

RB requested that the difference between support and representation be captured and carefully considered in the project. DW stated that this would be captured in objective one.

There was however agreement that developing a better understanding of how the LPCs and PSNC interacted with each other, and how this could be enhanced, should be more clearly stated.

**ACTION DW:** Add objective regarding PSNC/LPC interaction to minimise duplication and optimise efficiency/synergies.

**ACTION BA:** Update and upload terms of reference and plan to website

Clarification regarding communication and role of steering committee was sought. DW stated that he would like to ask the PRSC to review and comment on any planned external communications prior to dissemination to ensure that the communication was accurate, and was not likely to not create further problems or unnecessary angst amongst external stakeholders.

It was agreed that the steering committee was to be involved in the external communications that are sent out and uploaded onto the website. It was agreed that DW would give the PRSC 48 hours to read and check any external communication before he then disseminated it.

DW stated that he intended to send regular updates to LPCs, which outlined where the review was at after each PRSC. He would ask the LPCs to forward this to their contractors.

Re transparency: there was agreement that PRSC members should provide honest, fair and quick responses to those outside of the committee, but should refer to the public communications on the website and remain within the confines of the points on which we had agreed. DW hoped that the PRSC would all speak with one voice when communicating our progress.

DW stated that the PRSC members which he had selected were chosen to ensure even geographical spread and diversity. He had selected based on expressions of interest where applicants had stated a desire to achieve a positive outcome for contractors.

DW noted that following the inclusion of himself, SD from the PSNC and the nominations from the CCA and AIM that there was a potential for the steering committee to consist largely of one gender and ethnic group and he had been cognizant of this when putting the committee together. DW stated that one of the things he wanted to explore was the processes for ensuring appropriate representation on the different committees with respect to gender and ethnicity and whether this was already sufficiently addressed. If not, he felt that this would be a likely recommendation in the final report.

### **NPA representation**

DW reported that he had received an e.mail from the CEO of the NPA regarding NPA representation on the PRSC. He stated that he had considered this but he felt that as NPA was not represented at LPC level (in the same way as CCA and AIM) then their inclusion was probably not appropriate. However on receipt of the e.mail he recognized that there was likely to be some interplay between the review recommendations and the role of the NPA. Consequently, DW had promised to ask the PRSC for a view on this. It was noted however that RBa (Reena Barai) was a member of the NPA board but DW was not cognizant of this when selecting contractors for the committee.

The PRSC agreed that the NPA are potentially part of a future solution, but agnostic about whether they need to be included in the review at present. It was agreed that by including interest groups in the review it could narrow the thinking in the room there was agreement that the PRSC does not require any additional NPA representation at present.

Arising from this, the PRSC recognised that any perception of interest-groups being excluded might impact the landing of the final report. The PRSC agreed to reassess at the March meeting whether it is appropriate/necessary that representative groups identified as being affected by the review, or necessary to maximize its acceptability / likelihood of implementation, then they would be invited to the final meeting to help us to consider their role and the impact of any relevant recommendations.

### **NHS England and Improvement Representation**

DW stated that it had been his idea to include an NHS England representative on the PRSC as any recommendations regarding constitution changes would need to be in agreement with them. DW had therefore contacted Bruce Warner to invite him onto the committee. Once the proposed constitution of the PRSC was made public it became rapidly apparent that this decision was not well received. Consequently, DW had asked BW not to attend the first meeting so that it could be discussed.

There was agreement that NHSE shouldn't be in the room but there should be a dialogue between the PRSC and NHSE. It was agreed that DW would arrange to meet BW to receive input from NHS England and that this should include members of the contracting team. DW stated that BW had suggested that these individuals be included as his representatives recognizing that they may be more appropriate. It was noted that this opportunity should be used to obtain better insight into context and future plans relevant to LPCS, PSNC and Contractors.

**ACTION DW** to inform BW of the committee's decision and arrange to meet with all appropriate NHSE individuals as part of the review process.

### **4) Objectives and plan (Appendix 2)**

The objectives were discussed in point 3 above as they are part of the ToR. The PRSC were in agreement with the proposed plan. DW stated that the first thoughts regarding the report would be presented at the March meeting and then DW and his team would have 3 weeks to prepare it and present as first draft to the PRSC, one week before the final meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of April.

DW stated that as this was the first review of this nature it would be necessary to reflect on the review process at the end to consider how it may be better done in the future.

### **5) UEA team responsibilities**

DW reported these but noted that in addition to the original plan he had asked BA and HF to review all LPC websites to obtain information on activities, fees and finances. Also, to determine whether any variation in communication by LPCs exist. DW stated that he had not realised that fees were not standardised and that he had picked up concerns regarding variability in LPC websites and therefore had chosen to collect this additional evidence.

AP stated that we should also look at achievements and this would be in the final report. It was agreed to include this in the data collection process.

**ACTION DW:** To add in achievements into the website database

### **6) Additional Interviews / visit proposals**

#### **Interviews/visits proposal (Appendix 4)**

The PRSC discussed the plans for visiting LPCs and agreed with the five presented. DW stated that he also wanted to visit Cornwall. This was agreed as it would result in two inner city, two urban and two rural visits and that it was important to recognise that one size would not fit all.

**ACTION DW:** Add Cornwall LPC to visit list

DW sought permission to conduct phone interviews with LPC representatives in January (this is not an opportunity to get the views of the committee, but a chance to hear their individual views, provide reassurance and stress objective approach).

PRSC noted that some of the interviewees were the same as those being visited and it was agreed that if an LPC was to be visited then there was no need for an interview.

**ACTION BA:** Remove interviews for those individuals for whom visits were planned

AP stated that it may be difficult to reconcile a friendly approach when recommendations may not be so friendly. DW stated that his approach was to be positive and that he would seek honest and open discussions. RBa asked if the conversations would be anonymous. DW stated they would and that he would only take written notes. No comments made by LPC

Chief Officers would be reported with names attached. RBa stated that this would help with obtaining honest opinions.

There was discussion regarding the selection of individuals for interview. The names selected by SD were those who contributed most to the gaggle group and it was felt that by focussing on the 'noisiest' we may not capture the broader views of those individuals who may not be so vociferous but equally effective in their roles.

DW stated that he could not do more than was already planned but with the removal of those lined up for interview who were planned to receive visits, then there was a possibility of arranging a small number of additional interviews. It was agreed that the PRSC members could nominate a small number of additional LPC chairs or Chief Officers.

**ACTION PRSC:** To provide DW with a small number (3-4) of additional Chief Officer names whom we could seek to individually interview

DW agreed to resend a final list of interviewees to the PRSC to sign off before interviews commence.

**ACTION DW:** Confirm list of interviewees with PRSC prior to commencement.

VR asked if LPC committee members could be included within these. DW stated that this was focused on LPC Chief Officers and that LPC committee members would be included in the national survey. Reassurance was sought regarding how we would ensure that their voices would be heard. DW stated that he would ask for all LPC responses to the national survey to be provided with a statement that all members of the LPC had signed off the response and that it fairly reflected their views.

**ACTION DW:** To ensure that the national survey sought confirmation that response reflected the views of the whole LPC and not just a select few.

It was noted that LPCs do not meet every month and there is a good chance that many of them will not have planned to meet in February. Consequently, they will not be in a position to provide an agreed response. It was agreed that we would communicate the need to meet and agree a final response in February.

**ACTION DW:** To communicate with LPCs the plans for the national survey and potential need to arrange a special meeting to agree a response to the survey

There was a discussion regarding ensuring that the report was future facing and that it was important that the context of the NHS was captured.

**ACTION DW:** To include and capture the views of NHSE/I and infrastructure

## **7) Interview questions (Appendix 5)**

It was agreed that in addition to 'what do you do well' the question 'what could you do better?' should be asked

**ACTION DW:** Amend interview questions accordingly

The PRSC recognised that the perception of what happens in the PSNC and LPCs is not understood very well by Contractors. Therefore, it is important that the same questions are asked of PSNC, LPCs and Contractors.

**ACTION DW:** To standardise questions for all audiences

It was also agreed that these interviews could be used to better understand the context within which they are operating.

**ACTION DW:** To seek better understanding of context within interviews

## **8) LPC and contractor focus groups (Appendix 6)**

DW apologised for tabling the questions at the meeting. He explained that these had only been agreed with the internal review team the day before and therefore it was not possible to provide them in advance. He stated that he would try to avoid this in the future.

The PRSC reviewed the proposed questions for Contractors and LPC questions (Document tabled) to be asked within focus groups and agreed with them. The PRSC also agreed the proposal to pay contractors £100 for attendance. A light lunch would be provided for LPC chairs and Chief Officers and a buffet dinner for contractors in the evening. The proposed timings were also agreed.

The proposed focus group locations of London, Leicester and Leeds were agreed. Bristol was not seen as the central location for the South West and the NHS used Taunton for this purpose. Consequently, it was agreed to move the location in the South West to Taunton.

Agreement on focus group locations – note change from Bristol to Taunton as this is the central point for the South West.

**ACTION DW:** To confirm with HF that this change would be acceptable.

DW asked if all contractors and LPC representatives who had expressed a desire to join the national steering committee could be given first refusal on attending the focus groups. This was unanimously agreed. There were approximately 16 LPC reps and 8 contractors to whom this related, therefore leaving 24 additional LPC spaces and 32 contractor spaces.

**ACTION DW/BA:** Contact all individuals who expressed a desire to join

Agreement that DW can offer places to all individuals not selected for steering committee (this will leave 18 LPC places and 30 Contractor places)

Agreement that DW will ask each region to provide 2 names for focus groups in order to recruit and select the remainder

Noted that AP, PC and MI can also help DW coordinate

**ACTION DW:** ask each region to provide 2 names for LPC focus groups

The PRSC considered the proposed questions and suggest that the following topics were included:

- 1) How do we support Contractors in their role?
- 2) re blurring of boundaries – how could everybody work better together?

**ACTION DW:** To review proposed focus group questions

DW confirmed that he would e.mail LPC Chief Officers to seek LPC representatives for the focus groups. He would also ask LPCs to forward a request to ask independent contractors to nominate themselves. It was agreed that for the contractor focus groups to represent contractors equally then the number of representatives should be 4 CCA, 2 AIM and 4 independents. AP & MI agreed to identify CCA representatives and PC agreed to identify AIM representatives.

**ACTION AP/MI:** Nominate CCA representatives for contractor focus groups

**ACTION PC:** Nominate AIM representatives for contractor focus groups.

## **8) National LPC and Contractor focus groups surveys**

DW stated that the focus groups were to inform the development of the national survey. Agreement that PRSC will agree the Contractor national survey at the January meeting. The survey will provide the main evidence for the review as this is where everyone will be given a chance to contribute.

It was noted that the PSNC questions had not been tabled. DW stated that these would take place in February and that the plan is to agree questions at the next meeting. The review team had decided to delay these because they wanted to understand the landscape better and obtain LPC and contractor views of the PSNC before formulating questions. DW confirmed that the interviews would include both PSNC committee and PSNC employed senior staff.

#### **9) Final report structure – Draft (Appendix 7)**

MB asked how the report would go from synthesis to actions/recommendations. DW stated that this would be the role of the independent review team. He would present the evidence to the PRSC as it develops and seek views to ensure that nothing recommended was politically inappropriate. Furthermore, DW would seek views regarding the potential consequences for recommendations to help but ultimately the review team would decide what to recommend.

Agreement that the context of the review needs to be more explicit. The review needs to think more about the external context within which LPCs etc.

**ACTION DW:** To ensure final report includes a section on the context within which the review was being conducted

#### **10) Proposed agenda for the next three meetings (Appendix 8)**

DW presented the proposed agendas for the next three meetings. It was identified that 2 hours would not be sufficient cover all proposed topics and therefore planned times were changed accordingly:

23<sup>rd</sup> January 13.00 – 16.00

5<sup>th</sup> March 10.30 – 15.30

2<sup>nd</sup> April 13.00 – 16.00

Light lunch provided 12.30

#### **11) Any other business**

VR identified that on the focus group document - ‘worked’ to ‘work’ together so it doesn’t look historic.

VR identified that on the external interviews all LPC representatives were described as chairs when this was not the case.

**Action BA:** To amend documents accordingly

Communication with LPCs was discussed. It was agreed that the main messages would be:

- The first meeting had been held and was successful.
- The role of the PRSC was clearly identified as providing support and guidance to the independent review committee, who would be ultimately responsible for the synthesis of the evidence and making the final recommendations.
- Review recommendations would not be binding but would be for the LPCs, Contractors and PSNC to jointly consider.
- It was agreed that neither the NPA nor NHS England would be formally represented on the PRSC but would be consulted with as appropriate throughout the process.
- PRSC agreed to the review team visiting a small number of LPCs and that the interviews planned with those LPC Chairs or Chief Officers will be cancelled to enable other LPC representatives to be interviewed.
- Focus groups with contractors and LPC representatives would be held mid-January in London, Leicester, Leeds and Taunton to develop the national survey
- All nominees to the PRSC who were not given a place on the PRSC would be given automatic first refusal at attending the focus groups
- The national survey would be the main evidence source for the review team
- LPCs would be asked to actively include all committee members in developing their response to the questions in the national survey and would be asked to confirm inclusion of all members in developing their response.
- LPC representative focus groups would be held in the afternoon and contractor focus groups in the evening. Locations would be close to train stations.
- Each of the 13 PSNC regions for LPCs will be asked to nominate a further 2 representatives for the focus groups
- LPCs will be asked to forward invites to contractors on behalf of the PRSC
- The PSNC review will take place in February when the national survey is out for consultation with contractors and LPCs
- To remind all that the website is [www.pharmacy-review.org](http://www.pharmacy-review.org)

It was agreed that these would be used to create a press-release for the pharmacy press. DW would draft a first version, ZL would support him in this. DW would present to the PRSC for review and comment before releasing.

## **Appendix 1 PRSC Draft Terms of Reference**

### **Remit**

- To ensure that the review process is fair and transparent
- To oversee the delivery of the independent review from data collection, to data synthesis and final report provision.
- To provide support and guidance to the independent review team
- To direct and support external communication regarding the process
- To ensure that the final report answers the following questions:
  - What is working well in LPCs and PSNC and what could be improved?
  - What representation and support is needed by contractors now – and what is the future requirement likely to be?
  - What are the most effective structures for current and future demand?
  - How should the representation and support for contractors be financed?
  - What is the best structure to ensure all contractors are represented well?
  - What, if any, changes are needed now and over the life of the new Contractual Framework and beyond?

### **Expectations**

- All members attend all meetings
- All external communication via any route, regarding the steering committee activities and decisions, to be signed off by the chair

### **Process**

This will be achieved through the following:

- Agreement of steering committee remit and methods of communication (December)
- Agreement regarding contractor and LPC questions to be asked within focus groups (December)
- Agreement regarding national survey content for contractors and LPCs (January)
- To identify additional evidence for inclusion within the review (December and January)
- To identify case studies, additional groups or individuals whose voices should be captured (December and January)
- To provide advice and support with respect of participant recruitment and survey completion (December and January)
- To provide advice and guidance with respect to media and press-releases
- To review high level evidence to support generation of further questions and final report recommendations (March)
- To agree format and content of final report (March and April)

- To review final recommendations (April)

**Planned meeting dates**

19<sup>th</sup> December,      23<sup>rd</sup> January,      5<sup>th</sup> March,      2<sup>nd</sup> April

## Pharmacy Review Steering Committee Membership

Independent Chair (UEA, Norwich)	David Wright
4 LPC Representatives (CEO – South East)	Shilpa Shah
 (CEO – North)	Ruth Buchan
 (LPC Member –South West)	David Bearman
 (LPC Member – West Midlands)	Vicki Roberts
2 Contractor Representative (Multiple) (Boots UK)	Mark Ireland
 (Tesco, PSNC)	Adrian Price
2 Contractor Representatives (Independents) (London)	Reena Barai
 (Midlands)	Asif Alidina
1 Contractor Representative (non-CCA multiple)	Peter Cattee
1 PSNC Representative (CEO)	Simon Dukes
1 LOC representative (LOCSU)	Richard Whittington

## Appendix 2 Review Objectives and Plan

**Objectives (numbered)**, below, taken from the terms of reference for review agreed between LPCs and PSNC

### Plan

#### 1) What is working well in LPCs and PSNC and what could be improved?

- 4 regional LPC focus groups to develop survey tool January
- National LPC Survey February

#### 2) What representation and support is needed by contractors now – and what is the future requirement likely to be?

- 4 regional contractor focus groups to develop survey tool January
- National contractor survey February

#### 3) What are the most effective structures for current and future demand?

- Selected LPC chair interviews (telephone) January
- PSNC Committee Member interviews January
- Interviews with Community Pharmacy Scotland and Wales February
- Review of other professions (Dentistry, medicine, opticians) January
- Example case studies February

#### 4) How should the representation and support for contractors be financed?

- Included within contractor and LPC national surveys February
- Information obtained from devolved nations February
- Review of other professions (Dentistry, medicine, optometry) January
- Interviews with others identified as relevant e.g. NPA, CCA, AIMp CEOs February

#### 5) What is the best structure to ensure all contractors are represented well?

Obtained from national surveys

Steering committee to review evidence

Early March

**6) What, if any, changes are needed now and over the life of the new Contractual Framework and beyond?**

Report writing chair with steering committee sign off

End of March

### Appendix 3 UEA Team Roles and Responsibilities

LPC interviews (Jan)	David Wright
Visits (Jan/Feb)	David & Michael
PSNC interviews (Feb)	Michael
Other interviews (Feb)	David
LPC & PSNC website review (Jan/Feb)	Hannah Family & Bethany Atkins
Focus group responsibility and attendee decisions:	
North	Michael Twigg
Midlands	David Wright
London	Linda Birt
West	Hannah Family
Contractor survey	Linda Birt
LPC survey	Hannah Family
Programme steering committee	David Wright & Bethany Atkins
Website and communications	Bethany Atkins

## Appendix 4 Additional Interviews/Visits

### LPC representative interviewees

1. Jay Badenhorst: Chair of Tees LPC
2. Jeff Blankley: Chief Officer of Birmingham, Solihull and Wolverhampton LPC
3. Richard Brown: Chief Officer of Avon LPC
4. *Ruth Buchan: Chief Officer of Community Pharmacy West Yorkshire?*
5. Jackie Buxton: Chief Officer of Derbyshire LPC
6. Jack Davies: Chief Officer of Community Pharmacy North Yorkshire
7. Tania Farrow: Chief Officer of Suffolk LPC
8. Sanjay Ganvir: Chair of Camden & Islington LPC
9. Kath Gulson: Chief Officer of Community Pharmacy Lancashire
10. Nick Hunter: Chief Officer of Doncaster, Rotherham and Nottinghamshire LPCs
11. Aneet Kapoor: Chair of Greater Manchester LPC
12. Michael Lennox: Chief Officer of Somerset LPC
13. Anne-Marie King: Chief Officer of Northamptonshire LPC
14. Raj Matharu: Chief Officer of a number of London LPCs and an officer of Pharmacy London
15. Hemant Patel: Secretary of North East London LPC
16. James Wood: Chief Officer of Community Pharmacy Surrey and Sussex
17. Paul Robinson: Chief Officer of Hull and Humber LPC

### Contractor representative interviewees

1. Malcolm Harrison: CEO of the Company Chemists Association
2. Leyla Hannbeck: CEO of the Association of Independent Multiple Pharmacies
3. Mark Lyonette: CEO of the National Pharmacy Association

### External individual interviews

1. Russell Goodway: CEO of Community Pharmacy Wales
2. Harry McQuillan: CEO of Community Pharmacy Scotland
3. Gerard Greene: CEO of Community Pharmacy Northern Ireland
4. Dr Krishna Karananeni: BMA/GCP representative
5. *Local Dental Committee representative?*

### Visits

- |                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Greater Manchester  | Aneet Kapoor            |
| 2. Northampton         | Anne-Marie King         |
| 3. London LPCs         | Raj Matharu             |
| 4. Norfolk and Suffolk | Tony Dean, Tania Farrow |
| 5. North East LPC      | Mark Burdon             |

## **Appendix 5 Interview Questions (Draft)**

### **LPC Representatives**

- 1) Can you please describe your role for me
- 2) Can you please describe how your LPC represents contractors, with examples
- 3) Can you please describe how your LPC supports contractors, with examples
- 4) What is especially good about your LPC?
- 5) Can you please describe how you communicate with contractors?
- 6) What are your thoughts on how we can ensure that contractors get the most value from LPCs?
- 7) What are your thoughts regarding the PSNC?
- 8) Is there anything you would like to say about the review or anything else which you would like to say?
- 9) Is there any advice you can give me regarding the review?

### **Contractor representative reviews**

- 1) Can you please describe your role for me?
- 2) What are your thoughts regarding the role of the PSNC and its effectiveness?
- 3) What could it do better or differently?
- 4) What are your thoughts regarding the role of LPCs in representing contractors?
- 5) What are your thoughts regarding the role of LPCs in supporting contractors?
- 6) What would you like to see result from this review?
- 7) What advice would you give me regarding the review?

### **External individual interviews**

- 1) Can you please describe your role to me?
- 2) Can you please describe the structure of your contractor support?
- 3) Can you please describe the funding model?
- 4) What works really well within your structure and what doesn't?
- 5) Any advice you would give to me in reviewing the community pharmacy structure?

## Appendix 6 LPC and Contractor Focus Groups

### Proposal

#### *1) Locations?*

<b>Bristol</b>	Friday 10 <sup>th</sup> January	<b>Location</b>
<b>London</b>	Monday 13 <sup>th</sup> January	<b>Location</b>
<b>Leeds</b>	Wednesday 15 <sup>th</sup> January	<b>Location</b>
<b>Leicester</b>	Thursday 16 <sup>th</sup> January	<b>Location</b>

#### *2) Proposed timings appropriate?*

LPC members 2 to 3.30pm

Contractors 7.30 to 9.00pm

### Attendees

*3) Automatically offer place to all individuals not selected for steering committee? This would leave 18 LPC places and 30 Contractors places*

#### *4) How to recruit & select remainder?*

##### Payment

£100 to contractors for attendance plus travel

#### *5) LPC chairs and Chief Operating Officers? Travel? Or provide lunch and dinner?*

### Aim of focus groups

- To understand the current landscape to enable us to develop a national survey tool

#### *6) Questions to be tabled*

## **Appendix 7 Final Report Structure (Draft)**

Main body of report (Paper version and on-line)

1. Executive summary
2. Recommendations
3. Independent review team and steering committee membership
4. Background information (rationale for the review)
5. LPC structures, funding and constitution (summary)
6. PSNC structures, funding and constitution (summary)
7. Project plan and summary of activities
8. Contractor interviews
9. Contractor focus groups
10. Contractor national survey
11. LPC interviews
12. LPC focus groups
13. LPC national survey
14. PSNC interviews
15. Website review data
16. Other pharmacy models (Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland)
17. Other representation models (Medicine, Dentistry, Optometry)
18. Summary of findings and discussion
19. Detailed recommendations (Rationale, consequences, plans, timelines)

Appendices (On-line only)

- i. Detailed constitutions
- ii. Relevant background information
- iii. Interview and focus group topic guides
- iv. Data analysis underpinning each section (not raw data)

## **Appendix 8 Proposed Agenda for next three meetings**

### **January Meeting**

- 1) Welcome and introductions
- 2) Feedback and guidance from steering committee
- 3) Update on progress and main findings
  - Interviews (LPCs)
  - Focus groups
  - Website review
- 4) Plan for national survey for LPCs
- 5) Plan for national survey for Contractors
- 6) Contractor/LPC/PSNC Communication Update
- 7) Any other business

### **March Meeting**

- 1) Welcome and introductions
- 2) Feedback and guidance from steering committee
- 3) Update on progress and main findings
  - Interviews (PSNC)
  - Interviews (Others)
  - National LPC survey
  - National contractor survey
- 4) Initial thoughts regarding recommendations
- 5) Contractor/LPC/PSNC Communication Update
- 6) Any other business

### **April Meeting**

- 1) Draft final report
  - Background
  - Presentation of findings
  - Recommendations
- 2) Communication strategy