

Guidance Document 9: Assessment of Indicators of Meaningful Public Involvement for all Parties

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN NATIONAL CLINICAL EFFECTIVENESS PROCESSES

ASSESSMENT OF INDICATORS OF MEANINGFUL PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FOR ALL PARTIES*

This indicator assessment was adapted with permission, from the European Patients Forum "Value Toolkit" to evaluate Meaningful Public Involvement in National Clinical Effectiveness Processes.

Scoring the Grid

Met means that the indicator has been met in full

Partly met means that some effort was made to meet the indicator, but it was not met in full

Not met means that the project did not try to address the topic of the indicator

Please note that this model requires support for public involvement to be planned into the guideline/ audit development process. Much of the support for patient involvement is therefore assessed under that heading.

INDICATOR	Met (2)	Partly met (1)	Not met (0)
<i>Public involvement at the beginning and throughout the project in planning and decision making</i>			
Public identified the guideline/audit topic, or those aspects of the topic of most interest to the public			
All parties were involved in identifying what the public contribution should be, and how and where the public could most effectively be involved			
The public involved represented the type of public who would be affected by the guideline/audit outcomes, taking into account gender, ethnicity, age, etc.			
Meaningful public involvement and its monitoring and evaluation during the clinical effectiveness process were part of the guideline development or audit process design			
The public took part in developing and costing the detailed plans for activities where the public would be involved, taking into account public special requirements, for example, information in different language or formats, needing someone to accompany them to meetings			
The plan included a strategy for communication between all parties, and a strategy for supporting patient involvement			
Maximum Score: 12 Total			

INDICATOR	Met (2)	Partly met (1)	Not met (0)
<i>Co-operative working between the public and other parties, supported by a clear understanding of each other's roles</i>			
There was induction and training for all parties about each other's roles and special expertise			
There was induction and training about the communication methods which would support both public involvement and communication throughout the guideline development or audit process			
There was an agreement about how each party would fully participate in decisions, about what should be presented at full meetings, and which topics were better suited to specialised subgroups (if appropriate)			
There were opportunities to build working relationships through formal and informal activities			
Maximum Score: 8 Total			
<i>Providing information and support for involvement, including clear communication about the guideline development and audit process itself</i>			
There were resources for the recruitment induction, support and expenses of the public, as well as training for specific tasks involved in guideline development or the audit process			
The plan allowed adequate time and resources for appropriate communication with the public			
Mentoring was provided for public individuals			
The public were kept informed about the guideline/audit after their involvement had ended, and about the impact of the guideline/audit results after the developmental process was over			
The contribution made by public involvement to the guideline/audit was acknowledged with appropriate detail in the guideline/ audit results			
Maximum Score: 10 Total			
<i>Monitoring and evaluation of public involvement from the perspective of all parties</i>			
There was a check on how representative the involved public were, in terms of age, gender, disability, ethnicity, sexuality etc. of the public who would be affected by the guideline/ audit outcomes. If it was not possible to involve a particular public members the reasons were recorded			
Perspectives about public involvement in the guideline/ audit process were obtained from all parties			
It was possible to identify the specific contribution made by the public			

INDICATOR	Met (2)	Partly met (1)	Not met (0)
Adjustments could be made during the guideline/ audit developmental process because of the ongoing monitoring of public involvement			
Maximum Score: 8 Total			
<i>Evaluation of the guideline/audit results and impact, identifying how public involvement has enhanced the results/recommendations</i>			
The evaluation described how public involvement shaped the guideline/audit, and achieved more than a similar guideline/audit without public involvement could have done			
The evaluation recorded the reasons for not involving the public in particular tasks or work areas			
The evaluation recorded the reasons for including a patient representative rather than a patient and for not including patients who were representative of a particular patient group			
The evaluation included the impact of the involvement on the public, and on the other parties			
The evaluation identified the impact of the guideline/audit results on health policy			
Maximum Score: 10 Total			

INDICATOR	Met (2)	Partly met (1)	Not met (0)
Planning and decision making			
Co-operative working			
Support for involvement			
Evaluation of involvement			
Maximum Score: 10 Total			