

# Pharmacy Review Steering Committee (PRSC) Minutes

23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020

## Attendees and role

David Wright, Independent Chair (UEA, Norwich) [DW]

Shilpa Shah, LPC Representative (LPC Chief Executive Officer representative) [SS]

Ruth Buchan, LPC Representative (LPC Chief Executive Officer representative) [RB]

David Bearman, LPC Representative (LPC member representative) [DB]

Vicki Roberts, LPC Representative (LPC member representative) [VR]

Mark Ireland, Contractor Representative (CCA) [MI]

Adrian Price, Contractor Representative (CCA) [AP]

Reena Barai, Contractor Representative (Independent) [RBa]

Asif Alidina, Contractor Representative (Independent) [AA]

Peter Cattee, Contractor Representative (non-CCA multiple) [PC]

Simon Dukes, PSNC Representative (CEO PSNC) [SD]

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

Bethany Atkins, Administrator (UEA, Norwich) [BA]

## **Minutes and Actions**

### **Welcome and apologies**

The committee were welcomed by the chair.

Apologies had been received from Richard Whittington from LOCSU.

DW noted that there was still a lot of concern about the review. He stated that he had just come from a London LPC meeting where it was pointed out to him that no-one from London was included on the PRSC. The meeting highlighted the common concern that DW and his team have an agenda. DW reiterated that the steering committee are only there to steer, and ultimately it is his team that will decide the final recommendations.

DW noted that people have also expressed concerns about the 'rushed' time frame of the review. He believes there has been a misunderstanding about the purpose of the focus groups – these were conducted to get an overall sense of what the issues are. He stated that he and his team got to half of the LPCs in the country which is good representation and that after the second focus group they had reached data saturation and were not getting any new data coming through.

DW emphasised that trying to solve everything with this review at this point is not achievable and the survey is there precisely so that everyone gets a voice. Everyone will have one month to complete the survey.

VR mentioned an e.mail she had sent DW with some observations, concerns and points requiring clarity that she had been asked by one of her LPCs and Community Pharmacy West Midlands to send. Namely, she noted that the point about this being a review, not research, is very valid and that this should be relayed back to the LPCs.

DW noted that while the 1.5 hours allowed for the focus groups was seen as too short by many, this was sufficient for the data needed. Again, the surveys are there to capture all voices.

DW noted that at the focus group which he had observed there was a lot of anger in the rooms and at times some serious arguing between independents and CCA, cementing his concerns about the 'them and us' situation.

Surveys: The review team got together on Friday (17<sup>th</sup>) and they sent the questionnaire to DW on Monday. DW stated that there were initially too many closed questions and made it more open so people could explain their responses throughout.

### **1) Minutes from 19<sup>th</sup> December (Accuracy)**

DW asked the PRSC if they were happy with the accuracy of the minutes from the last meeting so that these could be released onto the website.

DB stated that the review and recommendations being a future view is not adequately reflected in the minutes either. It needs to be made clear that it's not current facing but making sure the outcome of this is future facing. It also needs to be pointed out how the context of the NHS was captured.

DW stated that he is including and capturing the views of the NHSE & I and infrastructure leads.

RBa questioned if the terms of reference would be added to the website. DW agreed.

SD wanted page numbers added.

VR noted that Lucy Dean was now available for a telephone interview with DW.

**ACTION:** DW to send PRSC latest minutes to be finalised before they are uploaded onto the website, along with the terms of reference.

**ACTION BA:** Add page numbers to the minutes.

**ACTION BA:** Contact LD and arrange telephone interview.

## 2) Actions from minutes not already on the agenda

DW noted that he has been asked several times why Richard Whittington (LOCSU) is on the committee. DW stated that LOCSU has gone through a similar review process very recently. DW emphasised that he is going to spend time with the medical lead and dental lead so will also be including those views in the review process. DW noted that people seem to like the medical model and so he wants to understand this and how it works.

The PRSC discussed conflict of interest forms and whether these had all been completed.

**ACTION BA:** Check/chase conflict of interests from all PRSC members.

**ACTION BA:** Add PRSC member's conflicts of interest forms to the Pharmacy Review website.

DB pointed out to DW that the Cornwall LPC and Devon LPC visits have not been conducted yet. DW stated these visits are planned for March.

VR notes that in the minutes it says that DW would confirm the list of interviewees with the PRSC prior to commencement which the review team did not do. DW reported that he had removed interviews with those who were planned to be visited and that he added the names sent to him from members of the committee.

Questions for the interviews – DW noted the interviews were producing a lot of data and that people have a lot to say. In light of completing the survey he has changed the focus of his interviews to understanding the context and examples of good practice.

DW noted that Taunton was the one place where the team struggled to fill the focus groups and this only included 4 LPC contractors. VR stated that it was probably the fact it was a Friday.

DW reported that his Christmas emails had caused some confusion, however he had responded to all questions requiring clarification within a day.

DW reported that the provision of representatives by CCA/AIM worked well.

### **3) Statements from the chair**

DW stated that following his response to Mark Lyonette regarding the decision not to include the NPA on the committee, ML had sent a follow up e.mail to DW where he clearly remained unhappy he was not included. DW noted that he is visiting him in February in order to get the views of NPA as part of the review process.

DW will invite him and Bruce Warner from NHS England to next meeting if he feels it is necessary.

DW stated that the survey responses will already be formulating his thoughts and recommendations by the next PRSC meeting in March.

PC suggested that DW considers seeing Keith Ridge as part of the review process. DW stated that it makes more sense to meet with and involve Ed Waller as he is now responsible for the pharmacy integration fund and development of new community pharmacy services.

DW noted that nine interviews have been undertaken so far and that he is enjoying it. He stated that he is getting a lot of information and is able to allay some concerns in the process.

Michael Twigg (MT) who is on the review team has visited Somerset and DW has visited London but is visiting again as he attended a meeting of the confederate. DW is visiting Northampton, York and Durham. MT is visiting Norfolk and Suffolk. DW noted that so far the visits are providing good context.

DW stated that the perfect size for a focus group is eight and that they invited 10 individuals in case people did not attend. He noted that the distribution of gender, age, ethnicity and geographical representation in the focus groups was good.

DW reported that agreement between the review team on the questions they needed to ask in the survey following the focus groups and his interviews was strong.

#### 4) Local Optical Committee Support Unit

RW was not in attendance. In his absence, DW read through the LOCSU context document which RW had prepared for the meeting.

DW asked for clarity on what a primary care eye care model is. LOCSU have set up a national provider company. DW asked if provider companies should be national or local?

AP noted that a collection of representatives across MPA and PSNC set up a provider company 'Healthcare Together' and couldn't get engagement from organisations.

SD suggested that it might be worth in the interviews asking about why he went down that [National provider company] path.

RBa suggested that we look at the constitution of LPCs as they can't be provider companies.

RB reported that Local Medical Committees can be provider companies.

DW stated that he would look into this when visiting the General Practitioner Council.

**ACTION PRSC:** Members to put together a list of core questions to ask RW at the next PRSC meeting in February.

DW asked what 'Commission support and advice' is and if they need this?

AP stated that one of the strengths is 'incubation support', nationally coordinated but locally delivered which works their way into the national contract. PSNC is not currently doing this.

RB stated that working with your own commissioners means not everyone is talking to each other and that this is where we're missing a trick.

DW stated that there seemed to be an agreement that a national template on its own is not useful and there needs to be an implementation toolkit and also what you can adopt locally and the variations.

RBa stated that pharmacy has a problem with pilotitis.

DB stated that the learning and experience bit is what people find hard to listen to because they think they are different.

RB stated that it is about their learning and how you can do better and that sharing of ideas is important.

DW asked the PRSC if the PSNC provides training.

SD stated that the PSNC provides some training for LPCs.

**AP questions for RW (ACTION RW):**

1. If you were doing it again, what would it look like?
2. When 80% of share is dominated by Specsavers and a couple of contractors – what impact does this have on LOCSU and engagement?

RBa stated that some people think the LOCSU model is not ideal.

DW stated that the review team are looking at all models, and are wanting to take the best from each. He stated that a visit to the General Practitioner Council was planned and he had not yet identified a dental Council lead.

**ACTION ZL:** Send DW the dental contact to speak to as part of the review process.

**5) Website review update (Appendix 2)**

DW reported that six website reviews had been undertaken to date. DW asked the PRSC if there was anything else the team should be capturing as part of the website review process.

It was noted in the room that LPCs often have number 1 accounts, 2 accounts, etc. so the review team probably doesn't have a full picture because a lot of it is off book.

DW asked how the team could capture this in the final report.

It was agreed that this wouldn't be possible in the final report but DW needs to be aware of this when making his final recommendations.

RBa asked if you can you tell when the websites were last reviewed or changed.

**ACTION Hannah Family (HF):** Date of last revision of website to be collated where possible.

DW stated that this information was available and the team will add this on. He then asked is the team were wrong in thinking the information on websites should be standardised?

RB stated that it would be helpful for contractors to know where to look. Re: duplication, she noted the website should not include information that is on PSNC website. It should be local.

VR noted that locally commissioned services should be included too, and contractors should be able to see who their LPC committee members are, their attendance and conflicts of interest.

## **6) LPC questionnaire (Appendix 3 & 6)**

The following changes were recommended by the PRSC for consideration by the review team:

- Get people to rank responses to Q19 instead of yes/no
- Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment to be added as a support role
- CCG local authority liaison as a representative role
- Add an open question regarding behaviours and their management
- Add a question 'Should there be a code of conduct for LPC members, if No, please explain, if Yes, what should they consider'
- Add 'Who manages your Chief Officer and how?' and 'Are they employed?'
- Add 'Do you have any other employed staff? What do they currently do?'
- Add 'Should committee members be employed by the LPC?'
- Add 'What roles do you need to deliver whatever you do as an LPC?'
- Ask for clarification on how the survey was completed
- Add 'Over the past few years... Please provide a list of additional income/resources'  
Non-levy income
- Add 'Where do you see the greatest future opportunities?'
- From the discussion it was agreed to add 'diversity' to next agenda.
- Question 15 - add 'If not, has this been considered and why is this not seen as appropriate?'
- Change the word 'resources' to 'people or functions'
- Add 'Do you have a PSNC committee member on your LPC?'

It was agreed that due to concerns regarding how the review will be handled, there should be a question regarding how the recommendations from the review should be implemented.

## **7) Contractor questionnaires**

SD stated that for contractors there should be a 'don't know' box for many of the questions, particularly regarding the PSNC.

DB on question 49 – how they decide on recommendations. Rather than PSNC led, and also add about timing so that LPCs have time to consider.

DW re: report and how it lands, recommendations and how they're taken forward. He noted that he has seven days after the last PRSC meeting to work on the report and then the team will make it available - mid-April latest - so a couple of weeks before the LPC/PSNC conference, May 5<sup>th</sup>. He noted that this should be about discussing it and moving it forward.

DW noted that LPCs are still obviously scared/worried, and so he thinks he may need to consider having another webinar to let them ask questions once the survey goes live.

DW stated that he wanted the report to be available 2/3 weeks before the conference so it can be considered in advance and discussed at the conference.

There was a discussion regarding whether the conference will be an opportunity to amend, tweak etc. the report. There was agreement that this would not be possible with such a large attendance.

Concerns were raised regarding when the media should see it and be able to report on it, and whether it would be possible to keep it from the media if it is widely distributed.

It was agreed to add 'landing the report and managing the media' to the next PRSC meeting agenda.

**ACTION BA:** Add report dissemination to the next PRSC agenda.

The question was raised as to what would happen if the report splits people 55/45?

DW stated that he is hoping that his recommendations would not divide opinions in such a manner and that the PRSC would help to ensure that.

RB reported some LPC employees were worried about the outcome and that there is some 'we will start looking for a new job now' mentality.

DW reassured RB that the recommendations would have recommended timings on them and that nothing would happen overnight.

DW explained that there were two surveys for contractors, one regarding LPCs and PSNC generally and then one regarding their specific LPC(s). He stated that he wants to capture variation in performance and satisfaction if it exists.

DW was concerned that he would not get responses from CCA and AIM contractor representatives in each area i.e. branch managers.

MI noted that it would be down to 'us' [CCA/AIM] to make sure that happens.

There was agreement from PRSC that the contractor surveys need to be in one for independents with an option to comment on another LPC at the end if an individual has contracts in more than one LPC.

For the CCA and AIM companies the head offices would complete the first 'general' part and then a link to the shorter version, commenting on the local LPC only, would be sent to their employees (contractor representatives).

RBa stated that she was more worried about independents not realising the importance of completing the survey.

RB noted that LPCs can send it out to everyone.

SS stated that CCA might not want to respond until their head office have said they can.

**ACTION DW:** To distribute the survey through LPCs.

**ACTION DW:** To send AP, MI and PC an additional link to the short survey.

The following amends were suggested for consideration:

- Question 5 - LPC member or committee member - DW agrees to have this on there
- Typo on question 24. 'Governance of the LPC....'
- Questions 24 and 43 – typos – 'the importance' 'governance'
- Question 2 add 'in England' and for consistency, change question 31 to say 70% (as we have previously said 30%)
- 'What does the PSNC do well?' (q.17) needs to be repeated in appendix 4 q. 49.5
- Add question about governance in contractor survey

RB asked how the review team could stop people submitting multiple responses.

**ACTION DW:** Speak to Michael Twigg about capturing IP address so the survey cannot be completed multiple times. This is still anonymous.

There was agreement that surveys will be made available until Saturday 29<sup>th</sup> February.

MI noted that firewall restrictions might make accessing the survey difficult.

**ACTION PRSC:** Send DW and Michael Twigg any corrections/questions re survey questions.

**ACTION DW:** Send minutes and amended survey questions to PRSC to be signed off.

**ACTION DW:** Communicate survey website address/dates to PRSC and LPCs so that they can check they will definitely be able to access the website.

## **8) PSNC interviews (Appendix 7)**

SD asked DW if he could interview all 31 PSNC members.

DW agreed that MT and himself would offer them all an interview.

It was agreed that SD, AP and PC would be included in interviews although part of the PRSC.

**ACTION:** DW and MT now to offer all 31 interviews, 60 minutes each.

Agreement to add in a question regarding 'How could PSNC and LPCs work better together'.

RBa suggests adding 'How do you measure your member engagement?' and 'Are their individuals who hold the organisation back?' and 'Are conflicts of interest managed appropriately?'

DW asked RBa to send him these questions and noted that while they are helpful he was not sure if he would ask every member that.

**ACTION:** RBa to send list of suggested questions to DW.

## **9) Contractor/LPC/PSNC Communication Update**

DW stated that he would write up the minutes and send to the PRSC for comment before circulating.

## **10) Any other business**

No other business noted.

## Appendix 1 Focus Group Attendance

### Overall summary of data collection

#### 1. Interviews

Nine telephone interviews have been undertaken so far.

#### 2. LPC focus groups

Four focus groups were conducted in Taunton (10<sup>th</sup>), London (13<sup>th</sup>), Leeds (15<sup>th</sup>) and Leicester (16<sup>th</sup>). Demographics of the sample:

- 32 participants attended
- 11 (34%) female
- Mean age: 50 years, range 32 – 70.
- 29 LPCs represented from across England
- Each discussion lasted just over 90 minutes

#### 3. Contractor focus groups

Four focus groups were conducted in Taunton (10<sup>th</sup>), London (13<sup>th</sup>), Leeds (15<sup>th</sup>) and Leicester (16<sup>th</sup>). Demographics of the sample:

- 40 participants attended
- 18 (45%) female
- Mean age: 45 years, range 28 – 64.
- 18 (45%) representatives from independent contractors
- Good representation from contractors in terms of ethnicity
- Good geographical representation from contractors
- Each discussion lasted just over 90 minutes

#### 4. Process for developing themes for analysis

We have listened to 72 people from across England representing LPCs and contractors. Half of all LPCs were represented. We have over 720 minutes of recorded discussion. Each focus group was attended by two facilitators so that detailed notes could be taken alongside the discussion.

Upon completion of the data collection, MT, HF and LB independently collated their thoughts from the focus groups by reading the discussion notes and, if necessary, listening to the recordings again. DW collated his thoughts from the interviews. A discussion was then held to establish the commonality and differences in the common topics identified from the data. This approach to analysis enabled the review team to develop their own understanding of the data to ensure that different perspectives were taken into account during the development of the surveys.

After the initial generation of the survey, multiple iterations were developed to refine and focus the questions.

## Appendix 2 Website review

Information extracted (n=6)	Findings
Number of contractors representing	Stated by one LPC
Governance form completed	Yes = 3, No = 2, 1 in 2015
Calendar of events	Yes = 1, This monthly only =1, No=4
Social media engagement	Yes = 4, No = 2
Training	Yes = 7
Information about PCNs	Yes = 2, No = 4
Resources to support national contract	Yes = 1, Link to PSNC =2, No = 3
Resources to support advanced services	Yes = 6
Information about PQS	Yes = 4, No = 2
Annual report available	Yes = 4, No = 2
LPC strategy	Yes = 4, No = 2
Levy stated	Yes = 3, No = 3
Income breakdown (Levy, other, total)	Yes = 4, No = 2
Other income sources	Yes = 4, No = 2
Amount in reserves	N=4 Range 50k to £150k
Breakdown of spend	Yes = 4, No = 2
Ability to calculate % spend admin	Yes = 4, No = 2

## **Appendix 7 PSNC Interviews**

### **Questions for PSNC members**

Tell me about your day job and your reason for being a member of the PSNC

What are your thoughts on the review? What would you like to see come out of it?

How effective do you feel the PSNC committee is? Explain your answer

What do you think of the make-up of the PSNC committee? Representation

What does PSNC need to do its job effectively moving forward? Expertise/funding/infrastructure?

What does the PSNC need to ensure it is fit for the future of community pharmacy?

What do you think the PSNC does well?

What do you think the PSNC could do better?

Do you think the PSNC has a representative role for community pharmacy in general (not just contractors)? If not, who should fulfil this role?

How involved do you feel in the national negotiations either informing the strategy for them or agreeing the outcomes?

What do you think the role split should be between LPCs and PSNC?

What are your thoughts on the operations of LPCs? Can you think of good and bad examples?

Where do you think there is duplication between the PSNC and LPCs?

### **Questions for PSNC employees**

Tell me about your day job

How do you think it will evolve over the next five to ten years?

How does it provide value to contractors?

How does it provide value to LPCs?

What would you like to be able to do more of / differently and why?

What are your thoughts on the review? What would you like to see come out of it?

What do you think the PSNC does well?

What do you think the PSNC could do better?

What demand for help do you get from LPCs which you are unable to support?

What do you think the role split should be between LPCs and PSNC?

What are your thoughts on the operations of LPCs? Can you think of good and bad examples?

Where do you think there is duplication between the PSNC and LPCs?