

Notes of INVOLVE Executive Group Meeting

**Tuesday, 26th September 2017
10:30-15:30**

**Conference Room, Alpha House, University of Southampton
Science Park, Chilworth, Southampton, SO16 7NS**

1. Introductions, welcome and apologies and update of actions from meeting 21st July 2017

Attended: Wendy Baird (WB), Sarah Bayliss (SB) (notes), Tina Coldham (TC), Joyce Fox (JF), Zoe Gray (ZG) (chair), Gill Green (GG), Gary Hickey (GH), Martin Lodemore (ML), Tara Mistry (TM), Mark Mullee (MM), Una Rennard (UR), Lesley Roberts (LR), Kate Sonpal (KS) Paula Wray (PW), Gill Wren (GW)

Zoe welcomed Tara and Joyce as new members to the Executive Group and she explained that it was Una and Tina's last meeting. Zoe expressed her thanks to Tina and Una for their enormous contribution over the past 2 years during the contract bid through the transition and to current day. Gill, Sarah and Martin also thanked them for their advice and support during the very challenging transitioning period. They were presented with flowers, gifts and cards from donations collected from the Advisory Group, Executive group and staff members. Lesley would be a continuing member.

There were no changes to the notes from the previous meeting and no actions to be carried forward.

2. Introducing new members

Ahead of the Executive meeting Zoe requested that all members including new and current and staff to complete a statement that focuses on what people consider being the most important behaviours/approaches/skills that makes an effective member.

All the statements received are listed at the end in appendix A and the following statements were discussed in greater detail:

- **An effective executive member offers constructive criticism of INVOLVE plans and projects making sure they read papers and seek to identify positive aspects of a paper/proposal including opportunities as well as threats and risks.**

It was agreed that reading papers in advance showed respect to all parties and that the critical friend role in governance was important.

- **An effective member helps provide a balanced and fair view (as far as possible) of public/ advisory group members views on the strategic and operational direction of INVOLVE. - provide a critical friend role in balancing the governance role on the EG and accepting corporate responsibility of decisions made at EG.**

Lesley explained that she felt that Executive Members need to be made aware of the bigger picture including the governance and strategy so that they can feedback to the Advisory Group and Associate Members. She felt that more information about how the contract works and the overall picture of who we have links and relationships with would help members of the Executive Group to have a better understanding of the overarching bigger picture. This would enable them to plan for the future and see problems that might come up so that the Executive Group is readier for changes.

- **Effective membership of the Executive Group advances alliances with key groups.**

Mark explained that Tina and Lesley had facilitated and promoted such alliances. For example, Tina offers strategic input to the Wessex Public Involvement Network which is an alliance between NIHR organisations in the Wessex region. Tina had also contributed to the co-production work and Lesley had attended the NIHR RDS (Research Design Service) to review the INVOLVE-RDS partnership. He felt it was very beneficial for Executive Members to be involved in NIHR groups so as well as taking information away from the Exec meetings they could also bring oversight and guidance to the Executive Meetings.

- **An effective executive group member is informed and flexible by being aware of relevant internal and external matters and by listening to the opinions of others, they use this to inform the debate about INVOLVE's strategic direction.**

Joyce requested that the Executive Group was kept informed of what is happening in the external landscape. Zoe explained that we all have responsibility for sharing information that we receive through our networks and at the appropriate times. She asked the group to think about how we can best do this.

Gary informed the group that he thought it is fine to say if you don't agree with something and important to give constructive criticism.

Joyce requested that an email was sent to the Advisory Group regarding the Future Health consultation to ensure they know what the process is going to be.

- **An effective Executive Group member tries to see the bigger strategic picture and finds positive solutions to aide INVOLVE's development.**

Tara said that members of the Advisory Group can feel out of the loop and we need to think as to how we can communicate more effectively. She felt it was a challenge for us all to solve.

Zoe suggested that one of the Executive Public Members (Tara, Joyce or Lesley) could prepare the key points that come out of each Executive Meeting and these will then need to be emailed to the Executive Group for agreement and then communicated to the Advisory Group by the Public Members. It was agreed that Tara, Joyce and Lesley would take it turns to do this.

Una requested that the public members on the Executive Group remind Advisory Group members that minutes are available on the INVOLVE website. She emphasized the importance of the communication loop. The Advisory Group members on the Executive could make the Group aware when they receive the Executive Agenda what is going to be discussed at the next meeting, so they're aware of what's coming up and can mention anything relevant to the agenda/that they'd like to know more about. It was acknowledged that the forum isn't being used by all or consistently and that some find it easier than others. However, it was agreed that Group Members should continue using the forum, as well as email, with a view to it becoming more used over time.

In summary it was agreed that the role and purpose of the Advisory Group members on the Executive Group was to add value, provide oversight and contribute to the bigger picture and be a critical friend. It was acknowledged that the Advisory Group Members gave a public perspective as part of the Group, including drawing upon their wider Advisory Group knowledge and relationships. They are an important bridge and information conduit between the Advisory Group and the Executive Group, however their remit is not to represent the Advisory Group per se.

The forum and or emails are always available for Advisory Group members to follow up with questions or issues to the Executive Group public members in between meetings and vice versa.

Actions

- **Tara, Joyce or Lesley to prepare the key points that comes out of each Executive Meeting and obtain agreement on what those points should be by the Executive Group and then communicate those to the Advisory Group.**
- **Tara, Joyce or Lesley to let group members know when the Minutes are available on the website and to share the next Executive Agenda with AG members when available and respond to any questions/suggested inputs etc.**
- **Zoe/Simon to email the group regarding next steps for the Future Health Consultation.**

- All to let Zoe know ideas for sharing information across the Exec group and the Advisory group.

3. Latest work programme review & prioritisation (including Risk Register) Diversity and Inclusion: Policy, Definitions, Statement.

Martin Lodemore – Learning & Development Update

Martin explained that the Learning & Development project is moving forward within the 6 areas, which are Access, Websites, Learning Needs, Inductions, Top Tips, Diversity, and as well as delivering on this year's objectives, these sub-groups are setting the grounding for further work. He reported that each sub-group is a collaboration of NIHR and public members, with links to charities. Martin also mentioned that an abstract from the L&D Project Group was accepted for a session at the INVOLVE Conference, where there will also be an L&D exhibition stand.

He explained that the purpose of this model of working was to catalyse effective collaboration between NIHR/others by reducing duplication of effort and combining expertise and resources for maximum effectiveness and efficiency and this would be done by exploring innovative solutions including the use of new tech/media. He felt collaborations were working really well and there was a positive ethos amongst the Project Group, but there was always the difficulty of keeping people moving forward in the right direction. He did feel however that the streams are coming together and there is now good discussion and interaction across groups.

Martin felt that the risks were how the L&D project was impacting with other parts of the work programme. Whilst INVOLVE has been updating the Public Information Pack (PIP) recently, it was noticed by the public members of the inductions sub-group (Joyce Fox and Amander Wellings) that there was extensive overlap. This needs careful management to ensure that these resources are complementary. He reported that there was also the risk that work produced isn't used or built upon. A commitment from RDS directors to use the all staff induction materials was a great step forward, and that other piloting work will be required and this had been discussed with regional RDSs and the Wessex Public Involvement Network.

Martin felt that promoting the project over the next 6 months was key to its success, and that the conference session was an opportunity to showcase what we have achieved so far and where we are heading. One of the sub-groups, developing a series of Top Tips, will be sharing the first 6 to 8 sets, and requesting feedback on these and what else might be needed at the INVOLVE conference.

He explained that in February 2018 the L&D Project Group and sub-groups will come to a conclusion, and at that time there will be discussions on what existing work needs to continue, and what other resources might be needed.

Discussions then took place within the Executive group and the following points were raised:

- Look more broadly at L&D guidance to ensure we know what each population requires and what would be helpful to them.

- Public members shouldn't just develop guidance for public, and researchers develop guidance for researchers, but there should be cross-community developments as well.
- We need to ensure Diversity and Inclusion is embedded in the Learning & Development work, as well as in other areas, such as the co-applicant work.
- The conference should be a milestone of the project and not the end – and we shouldn't rush to finish the project just for conference.
- We should use the L&D sub-groups to review the work of other sub-groups.
- There is a danger that if we intend to continuously improve and update the L&D guidance, this may not be budgeted for. Consideration needs to be given as to whether the costs of continuous updating/improvement are covered alongside new work.
- If INVOLVE wants to grow it can't be 'hand-holding' forever. Once we develop guidance then it should be handed over to PPI leads to take forward.

Gary Hickey – Co-Production Project Update

Gary reported that a draft of the guidance on 'co-producing research' had been produced. Gary discussed how the guidance would now be showcased and sense checked at various meetings and events including a conference on co-production, a CHLARCS meeting, RDS Staff Training, INVOLVE conference, PICG group, NETSCC PPI reference group and a NETSCC PPI Leads meeting. Furthermore, the journal Evidence and Policy has asked for an article on the guidance for a 'special' they were publishing on co-production.

He identified a key risk: The guidance is produced but the NIHR does not embrace the changes that would be required to underpin coproduction as set out. For example, changing own processes to enable coproduced research to be funded. One measure to mitigate this risk was ensuring that many different representatives from NIHR organisations were on the working group. A second measure was to seek endorsement from the NIHR Senior leadership Team (SLT) which would help give the green light to NIHR funders to enable them to fund a co-produced piece/programme of work. He asked for further suggestions from the Executive Group.

The following advice was given by the Exec group:

- We should anticipate the turbulence from heads who don't like change when they have no control of the change.
- We should obtain an invite to the NIHR Programme Directors meeting to discuss the Co-production guidance and at the same time plug L&D, Standards and Diversity.
- We should seek formal endorsement at an early stage.
- We should produce a Briefing Notes supplement on Co-production.
- We could potentially offer chargeable training on how to do Co-production to help to those funding opportunities.
- In the NHS there is also an appetite for co-production which gives us the gravitas for engaging wider.

There was a discussion about whether INVOLVE would be advocating that all research be co-produced and/or it would be a gold standard. Gary explained that co-producing research was one way forward and that the approach used in research would, as ever, be dependent on the particular research problem. The intention of the guidance was to prise open the co-production opportunity. Gary explained that the guidance would not be the gold standard but more about giving practical advice, clarity and examples rather than dictating - you have to do it like this - as the contexts are too varied and it would inhibit the creativity and innovation. Indeed, some lay member feedback is that their lifestyles wouldn't suit being part of co-production according to the principles, so maintaining a variety of involvement approaches is important.

Tina recommended an implementation plan be produced which would set out the next stages for taking the project forward and influencing it into practice.

Gary reported that Coproduction was acknowledged by Simon as a 10 year plan as it was one of the recommendations of Going the Extra Mile.

Paula Wray - Diversity Project update

Paula explained that a meeting of the Diversity group was held last week and using a logic model and theory of change principles the group were able to clarify their goals and start to think about potential barriers to achieving these goals. The overarching goal was to create an inclusive research system for all. She reported that more representation is needed in studies and this is a NIHR wide initiative to create an inclusive culture.

Paula explained that we can't do all of this on our own but we should be seen as leaders in advice and guidance. She said that the first stage was to develop definitions, a statement, terms of reference and the policy. She went on to say that the Diversity Group had approved these but she was happy to take comments from the Executive group. She asked the question where are the funding priorities coming from and what groups are we missing? Paula reported that JLA would be reviewing how this could work in a more inclusive manner.

Paula reported that the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in Science (EDIS) network had launched and that INVOLVE were linked into this with GlaxoSmithKline and Wellcome. Ade Adebajo who chairs the Diversity Group is the advisor to the DH on equality and diversity and has been looking at the NIHR tenders and contracts to ensure diversity. She explained that she had been invited to the NIHR Strategy Board in March to present an update on the work programme. She felt that the NIHR needs to reflect on current practice and consider the risks and opportunities if they want to improve future health outcomes.

Tara explained that she is on the Diversity group and found the last workshop helpful and was more focussed now. Tara said she was on the NIHR Advisory Board and felt this could be an opportunity where Diversity could be discussed to influence adoption, particularly on the back of the Future Health Report.

The Executive Group endorsed the definitions, statement, terms of reference and policy.

Action

- **Paula to talk to Tara to discuss the opportunity of attending the NIHR Advisory Board meeting.**

Kate Sonpal - Conference update

Kate thanked the Executive group for all their help so far for the conference and help offered on the day. She reported that there were now 363 delegates attending plus a waiting list. She explained that Biomed Centre would be putting the conference abstracts submitted to them in the Journal of Involvement and Engagement. The BMJ would also be covering the conference and potentially writing an article. INVOLVE would be collecting PPI pledges from delegates via the Patient for Medicines Development website.

Tina requested that some help could be made available with the formatting of the abstracts especially the referencing which could be difficult for non-academics.

Action

- **Kate to ask PB to email those people that haven't yet formatted their abstracts and offer them help.**

Risk register

Zoe asked the Executive Group to review items 7 and 8 that had recently been added to the INVOLVE Coordinating Centre Risk Register to ensure that risk scores were correctly applied.

Risk 7 states that: INVOLVE's position is weakened/reputation adversely affected by an NIHR damaged PPIE reputation.

It was agreed that against risk ref 7 the risk score should be increased from low to medium by increasing the likelihood from 1 to 2 and therefore the risk calculation score increased from 4 to 8 (changed from 1 x 4 to 2 x 4). The reason for this change was that there is already some perception of reputational damage occurring in areas where we don't have control.

Risk 8 states that: Increased draw on time and financial resource for INVOLVE becomes unmanageable.

It was agreed that against risk ref 8 the risk score should be increased from medium to high by increasing the likelihood from 2 to 3 and therefore the risk calculation score increased from 8 to 12 (changed from 2 x 4 to 3 x 4). The reason for this change was due to the already increased cross NIHR work.

Zoe explained that she would also be raising the issue of increased demands on staff working across the NIHR, and within the host Wessex, at the Wessex Institute SMT. Demands have a disproportionate impact on the smaller contracts.

4. Terms of reference review

Zoe explained that the terms of reference had been written before the RDS partnerships had been developed and therefore this was now a good time to review them. She felt that a substantive review was not required but that overall the Executive Group just needed to re-familiarise themselves, and that some points which were no longer relevant etc to be changed.

It was agreed that the following items needed amending

Item number	Section	Change to be made
2.4	The Executive Group is responsible for	The whole item needs to be re-written to make it clearer and blended
2.4	The Executive Group is responsible for	Change Public Involvement community priorities for change to Public Involvement Leadership Areas
3	Members	Change the wording relating to membership to a fully open public process and add that a skill set is required
3	Observers	Needs to be re-written – staff should not be classed as observers. Consider Chair of Advisory Group as an observer to act as conduit between Executive Group and Advisory Group. Observers should be external contributors who are invited for their expertise.
4	Role of chair	Remove any reference to Chair and replace with Director. Consider having a named Deputy for the Chair role (subject to team review in line with strategy).
4.4	Absence of chair	Remove item 4.4
6	Frequency	Amend face to face meetings from 11am to 4pm to 5 hours.
7	Approval	Amend the approval date
9.1	Review date	Amend the review date

Action

- Zoe to make the changes to the terms of reference as above and send to Lesley for checking before sending the amended version to the Executive group.

Zoe then went on to explain that Mark Mullee would be stepping down as a member of the Executive Group with immediate effect. The links between INVOLVE and the Wessex region are strong and the INVOLVE-RDS partnership is well served by the continuing membership of two RDS representatives. Zoe thanked Mark for all his help over the past 2 years during the retender, transition and the establishment of the RDS partnership.

5. Strategy Development

Wide ranging discussions took place to contextualize the discussion of the 5 proposed strategic aims, about developments at DH, NIHR Triennial Review of the National Director of PPI and the Future Health Review and their potential impact on NIHR future strategy. It was explained that RAND had now published the Future of Health report (commissioned by NIHR to seek a wide range of perspectives to inform the development of their strategy).

Zoe reported that she would be meeting with the DH and Simon on the 9th October to discuss INVOLVE's Strategy Development based on the paper provided to the Executive Group. She explained that end output for strategy was to produce a short easy read document with pictures to explain where we are heading. The document will give a broad direction of travel but not tie ourselves down to specific objectives that we can't change which is important in an ever changing environment.

The Executive Group were asked a few questions (from the paper), and raised the following points in relation to those:

- The strategy is missing the definition about involvement (with and by) which should be included as it is the USP.
- We should be clear in what role we are playing and what we can do with the funding we have; we can only consider doing extra or going in a certain direction if there is more funding and resources.
- There should be a handful of strategic objectives under which all the projects would fit but we would need to be flexible with changing priorities.
- Demonstrate to DH why they need INVOLVE.
- Demonstrate the value of answering enquiries and hosting People in Research and spell out all the things that no one else is doing.
- Even if everyone is doing PPI our future role is to improve the quality of PPI.
- Consider what links/collaborations there could be between research and service delivery - we need to be more ambitious.
- Help the NIHR to deliver their strategic objectives.
- Become more aligned and link up more creatively with translational research.
- Should we be involving people in the NHS or corporate sector as lots to be learnt from cross sector working? Diversity and inclusion work with

people not in PPI but from other sectors e.g. housing that we could learn from.

The Executive Group raised the following points of discussion:

- We should be leaders rather than doers to make us influencers.
- We should look at our core strategy/remit which aligns to our contract and see how we have expanded, where are we going in the future.
- We shouldn't be looking for new projects but ensure that projects we are already developing have sufficient breadth and depth. Zoe said that looking at depth and breadth would mean that we focused on, for example, influencing a broader field to include social care.
- We should look to Public Health and Social Care as an area to develop.
- If the current work programme doesn't fit with the strategy then either we drop parts of the work programme or we change the strategy.
- Make it clear that if we don't do the core work what the effect will be.

Paula said that the 5 questions made for good strategic framework, within which to map in existing leadership areas and activities, and plot future focus areas.

Once Zoe had completed the next stages of writing the Strategy then this would be read through and commented on by Executive members.

Actions

- **Joyce and Una agreed to read and comment on the strategy paper and feedback to Zoe.**

Discussions then took place regarding how to best take forward the strategy at the next Advisory Group meeting to be held in October and the following points were raised:

- The Advisory Group should be given something substantive to comment on, making it clear what is in scope for advising and what is not.
- They should be briefed in advance about the history/context of the strategy.
- The Advisory group could identify where the gaps are and how we can work towards strategic objectives. It could be a mapping exercise. Consider asking for each area under strategic objectives where their networks and areas of expertise are to be able to contribute moving forward.

6. AOB Pre-notified

It was confirmed that Deborah Bhatti was no longer an Advisory Group member.

Appendix 1

- An effective executive member offers constructive criticism of INVOLVE plans and projects making sure they read papers and seek to identify positive aspects of a paper/proposal including opportunities as well as threats and risks.
- An effective Executive Group member is prepared for the meetings with a good overview of INVOLVE's work programme and activities, provided through the written updates. They bring additional perspectives to improve the strategic focus of INVOLVE's work.
- An effective Executive Group member understands INVOLVE's work programme and provides strategic advice considering the risks, threats and opportunities that may affect it. They also act as a conduit between the Advisory and Executive Group.
- An effective executive group member is informed and flexible by being aware of relevant internal and external matters and by listening to the opinions of others, they use this to inform the debate about INVOLVE's strategic direction.
- An effective Executive Group member tries to see the bigger strategic picture and finds positive solutions to aid Involve's development
- An Executive Group member exhibits their understanding of the difference between the INVOLVE staff and the Executive Group, and acts accordingly. I believe that the Executive Group assist with the strategic direction and all that it entails, whilst the day to day execution of that, is the responsibility of INVOLVE employees. Operating as a collaborative check and balance, and carrying out scrutiny with the staff, asking the, sometimes, difficult questions when needed, and responding to calls for assistance.
- An effective Executive Group (public) member: has a good oversight of work being undertaken, internal to INVOLVE, and across the wider landscape; acts as a two way channel of communication between the Advisory Group and Executive Group; and provides advice, to the Executive Group and Director, which is representative of wider public/patient voices.
- Help provide a balanced and fair view (as far as possible) of public/ advisory group members views on the strategic and operational direction of INVOLVE.
 - provide a critical friend role in balancing the governance role on the EG and accepting corporate responsibility of decisions made at EG
- An effective Executive Group member uses their knowledge and insight to help INVOLVE to address the strategic challenges ahead.
- Effective membership of the Executive Group advances alliances with key groups.