November 2011



Patient and public involvement in the education of Tomorrow's Doctors



# Team and partners/contributors

1. In addition to UCL academics, the project team included a junior doctor and a medical student.

2. Many others contributed to this project: UQ\_students and staff; simulated and surrogate patients; those working in non-statutory or community services involved in the curriculum; professional PPI leads in affiliated NHSTrusts and GP practices; and the Patients Association.

3. Over 40 patients and advocates recruited through these services participated in the focus groups.

4. The Patients Association (PA) – (a national, independent charity that advocates for better access to accurate and independent information for patients and the public, equal access to high quality health care for patient, and the right for patients to be involved in all aspects of decision making regarding their health care) – organised and led the largest focus group based on an agreed agenda.

### Method - what we did

- 1. This was a multi-level project consisting of staff interviews, an on-line student survey, key PPI informant interviews and five focus groups. The focus groups were audio-taped and transcribed. All data was pooled and analysed for themes verified by at least two members of the team.
- 2. A novel aspect was the involvement of students in all stages of the project.

# Key findings

- 1. The results were organised under four headings: expected purposes; expected challenges; unexpected purposes; and unexpected challenges.
- 2. Overall, participants were very positive about PPI in medical education.
- 3. The expected purposes and challenges conformed to those reported in the PPI literature (summarised above) and suggestions were made for addressing these challenges.
- 4. The data provided specific insights of immediate relevance to educators on caring, importance of the link between consent and safety, learning from patients with cognitive and sensory impairment by including family and carers, and focusing on the experience of illness by devising "patient pathways".
- 5. Patients are keen to offer feedback/advice to students on their performance but are sensitive to the possible negative impact on learners of unconstructive criticism, bias or prejudice.

6.



Patient and public involvement in the education of Tomorrow's Doctors Berlin, C. Seymour, I. Johnson & S. Oupit.



#### November 2011

### Key recommendations

#### General

1. Disseminate and implement key findings within and outside UQ\_through reports, publications and presentations.

**PPI & Governance** 

- 2. Include PPI in the Medical School Strategy.
- 3. Establish mechanisms to "Open-up" the medical school through, for example, open days, websites, fact-sheets and posters
- 4. Foster new links with, for example, NHS and Royal College PPI professionals, UCL researchers, other medical schools, and representative organisations such as the Patients Association.
- 5. Maintain map of PPI activity and evaluate the PPI framework annually against GMC standards
- 6. Develop a Medical School PPI Framework building on the project findings and links esTw / F3 11.03 Tf 10019

