

INDEPENDENT SCRUTINY OF NHS BOARDS PROPOSAL FOR MAJOR
CHANGES

RESPONSE FROM:

PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP (HEALTH) GROUP, TAYSIDE

Our details
PPG Chairs
Public Partnership (health) Group
Public Involvement
NHS Tayside
Tayside NHS Board
Freepost SE06181
Dundee DD3 8ZR

Email: ppg.tayside@nhs.net

Responding on behalf of a group

Yes

Yes – content for response to be made available

Yes – contact us again about our response

17508

Question 1

Do you agree that an expert panel is the most effective way to provide independent scrutiny? If not, what would be your preferred choice.

Yes – we agree

Question 2

Do you agree that the role of the panel should be to assess the safety, sustainability, evidence-base and value for money of the NHS Boards proposals for major changes to local NHS services.

Yes we agree

Question 3

Do you agree that the chair should be a lay person appointed by Scottish Ministers

Yes we agree

Question 4

Do you agree that the panel should have a lay majority amongst its members?

Yes we agree

Question 5

Do you agree that the panel should assess the evidence and options during the process of public engagement prior to consultation and provide a commentary on these that would be available to the Board and to Ministers in reaching decisions?

Yes but see comments in 7

Question 6

Do you have any other comments on how independent scrutiny should be carried out or the guidance on “Informing Engaging and consulting the public in developing health and community care services” at Annex 3

No

Question 7

Do you have any other comments on either the consultation process or you preferred choice?

It is difficult for the lay person to differentiate between engagement and consultation. To describe independent scrutiny as something that takes place in advance of consultation or something that happens before progressing to the public consultation stage is not easy to relate to.

We are familiar with the term ‘consultation’ and see the whole process as being part of the public consultation. If there are different elements of this could they not be described as, for example – ‘first stage of consultation’ is to gather the views of the public in developing proposals.... ‘second stage of consultation’ is to etc.....and then to finish with the ‘final stage being the formal consultation’ is to get public opinion on the proposals.

There would be less confusion if the term consultation was used throughout any process or scenario. Then the description of the consultation activities would demonstrate what had taken place to involve and get the views of the patients, carers and public affected or likely to be affected by the change.