

Meeting Notes: PSE Sub-Group 9th May 2012

Document No:	270
Status:	Adopted
Author:	3KQ
Title:	PSE Sub-Group meeting notes 9 May 2012
Notes:	Published on 23 May 2012

Future PSE Sub-Group meeting dates

- **30th May** 9.30am to 4.30pm, Carlisle, Hallmark Hotel – to consider the detailed wording of Partnership responses to PSE issues for the PSE3 Report, and agree the overall structure of the report.
- **15th June** (conference call) 1.30pm to 3.30pm

1 – Initial Summary of Views

The draft Summary of Views of consultation responses was discussed in preparation for the Partnership meeting on 22nd May. The conversations and agreements are summarised below: Specific comments on content/drafting will be incorporated into the final draft.

1.1 – Quotes

- It was agreed that quotes should be included – checks will include whether the quotes used match the ‘weightiness’ of the paragraph.
- Quotes will be anonymous (i.e. no user ID/organisation name) – a reference list will be made available for those who want to reference the full response.
- It was noted that people tended to write more if they disagreed with the Partnership’s initial opinions, therefore quotes are generally shorter for the sections on those who agreed than those who disagreed.

Actions:

All chapter reviewers – Check/comment on the quotes that are included in the chapters they reviewed.

1.2 – Use of numbers

It was agreed that:

- The numbers for how many people agreed/disagreed with the Partnership’s initial opinions should be included for the tick boxes in Questions 1-7, with a caveat in the introduction about the non-statistical nature of the consultation responses. Although there are concerns that this will lead to people carrying out quantitative analysis, it was agreed that the figures are available and should be included.
- It would be useful to restate the Indicators of Credibility (page 108 of the consultation document), provide a clear reminder that the consultation is a qualitative analysis, and remind people that the Opinion Survey will provide the statistically representative data on public views.
- The ‘broad’ numbers for Q8 should also be included with an explanation that there was no tick box for this question, and a further reminder that quantitative analysis would be misleading.

1.3 – Broad support

A discussion was held regarding broad support (as defined in the Indicators of Credibility), including how the Partnership will make a judgement on the extent to which there is broad support or not, and how much the Partnership should comment on this in the PSE3 Report and the Final Report.

Concerns about how the Partnership will respond to public concerns and the issues raised in the consultation were discussed, particularly with regard to the potential for the public to feel that their views have been ignored. CALC have concerns that if the Partnership's responses are consistently that things will need to be looked at in later stages of the process, there will be a real issue, however it was also acknowledged that there is a risk that the Partnership could end up doing too much by way of response at this stage. CALC suggested that some of the responses should be recommendations to the DMBs that certain things should be done/taken into account before a decision about participation is taken.

1.4 – Geographical analysis

The level to which geographical analysis of responses could/should be done was discussed. It was agreed that this should only extend to demographic analysis i.e. number of respondents from each district. The rationale for this is that:

- There are concerns regarding people carrying out quantitative analysis. The consultation responses are not statistically representative – it is the opinion survey that is designed to give this kind of statistical analysis.
- There are concerns that it could lead towards other versions of the report being requested e.g. a summary of views from Copeland only.
- There is a danger that people could fall foul of reading results only from people on 'their patch'.
- Many respondents don't have a clear geographical area, or straddle more than one area.

2 – Design and print for PSE3 Report and the Partnership's Final Report

The details of the requirements for design and print of the PSE3 Report and the Partnership's Final Report were discussed and agreed. It was also agreed that a preliminary Word version of the Final Report will be produced once it has been signed off by the Partnership for circulation to the DMBs in advance of the Final Report being fully designed.

Actions:

- **Jane** – Circulate plans for sending materials/reports to the Partnership and DMBs, including to DMB officers, for comment and agreement on numbers required for print.
- **Ian/Cath** – Prepare graphic design quote, circulate to all for comment before issuing.
- **Paul** – Provide information on smaller print requirements for graphic design quote.

3 – Opinion Survey

The interviews are almost complete. The headline results will be presented at the Partnership meeting on 22nd May 2012 and the full report will be ready approximately one week later. It has been agreed that Ipsos MORI will be asked to disaggregate responses by rural and urban areas, but not by areas that have been screened out or not by the BGS study.

4 – Future of the Partnership and the PSE Sub-Group

A discussion was held about the forward process, including the future of the PSE Sub-Group once the Final Report has been handed over to the Councils. It is possible that the PSE Sub-Group's role will end once the PSE3 Report has been completed, however there may be role to play in production of the Final Report. A Communications Group is likely to still be needed to handle ongoing communications.

The current position is that the Partnership will end once the Final Report has been handed over, however there is also an argument that the Partnership should be 'held in place' for the purpose of continuity and communication. This is due to be discussed with the Steering Group and the Partnership for them to be very clear about the implications of both options and a final decision on the way forward.

5 – Other actions

All – Advise Ian Curwen if you see any consultation adverts that are still being displayed.