

Digital Technology for Mental Health: Asking the right questions
#digitalMHQ

Steering Group meeting 7
Monday 10 July 2017, 10.30 – 16.00
Mental Health Foundation, Colechurch House
1 London Bridge Walk, London, SE1 2SX

Attending (alphabetical order): Leah Bijelic, Debbie Butler, Iris Elliott, Toto Anne Gronlund (Chair), Chris Hollis, Thomas Kabir, Paul Radin, Mat Rawsthorne, Liz Rye, Stephanie Sampson, Lucy Simons, Andre Tomlin.

Apologies: Victoria Betton, Kate Cavanagh, Kathy Chapman, Rachel Churchill, Sophie Dix, Katherine Easton, Chris Packham.

Action points

No.	Action point	Who	Due by	Status
11.	Ideas for further funding to be discussed with LS	ALL	Ongoing	Ongoing
65.	Lucy and Andre to produce a short report on the outcomes of the Tweet Chat	LS/AT	July/Aug 2017	ongoing
66.	Lucy, Liz and Paul to produce a short report on the format and outcomes of the workshops to gather uncertainties.	LS/LR/P R	July/Aug 2017	ongoing
68.	A plan for how to respond to questions that are already answered and those which are out of scope but useful will need to be developed	LS/ALL	Sep 2017	ongoing Nov 2017
69.	Consider incorporating comparative analysis of our sample with any reference data for assessing representativeness	CH/LS	Aug/Sep 2017	ongoing Nov 2017
70.	Signed off protocol to be made available on the PSP	LS	July 2017	Complete

	webpages			
71.	A more detailed demographic report to be produced for the next Steering Group meeting	LS	Aug 2017	Complete
72.	Lucy and Iris to discuss the possibility of further workshops with targeted groups supported by the MHF	IE/LS	July 2017	
73.	Toto to provide the final workshop and out of scope question lists for each of the previous mental health PSPs	TAG	July/Aug 2017	Complete
74.	Data management team to search PSPs and NICE/SIGN guidelines for questions which explicitly mention digital technologies	LS/SS/KE/AT	July/Aug 2017	Complete
75.	Revised version of the framework to be circulated to SG members for review and feedback	ALL	July 2017	Complete
76.	SG members to support assurance of the analysis of submitted questions, during July and August, by a) reviewing all out of scope questions b) reviewing questions which have been grouped together (duplicates) c) reviewing whether indicative questions suggested for grouped (or individual) questions reflect the intention of the original questions	ALL	July/Aug 2017	
77.	SG members to support - if they wish - the analysis of submitted questions by a) identifying extra support in their organisation for this task b) agreeing to take one section of the data to review closely - for example a specific category of data, or a random selection of questions to review how they have been categorised	ALL	July/Aug 2017	
78.	Steering group 9 in October will be held in Nottingham	ALL	Oct 2017	Complete
79.	Lucy and Toto to discuss the dissemination plans for the top 10 after the final workshop and seek funding to support this activity	LS/TAG	July 2017	Complete
80.	Develop a workshop version of the interim prioritisation survey to return to the previous workshop participants	LS/LR/PR	Sep/Oct 2017	ongoing
81.	To consider options for using social media to engage people in the interim prioritisation process	AT/LS	Sep 2017	ongoing
82.	Lucy to explore Survey Monkey for functionality for the	LS	Aug/Sep	Complete

	interim prioritisation process		2017	
83.	Toto to provide further information about the interim prioritisation methods and expected level of participation in this stage.	TAG	July 2017	Complete
84.	Lucy to devise a grid to describe the range of experiences and background required to achieve a range of perspectives in the participants for the final workshop	LS	July 2017	Complete
85.	Lucy to circulate a Doodle Poll to set the date for the final workshop	LS	July 2017	Complete
86.	Chris H to contact Til Wykes to discuss venue options for the final workshop.	CH	July 2017	Complete
87.	Beyond the Room options for the final workshop to be discussed outside of the meeting.	AT/TAG /LS	Aug/Sep 2017	Complete

Notes of the discussion

1. Welcome, apologies and introductions

Toto welcomed us all to the meeting and invited a round of introductions for those present.

2. Notes of last meeting and actions not covered by the agenda

Actions from last meeting:

11. Funding - would digital providers be able to fund the PSP? Andre is presenting at digital conferences and may be able to find new partners to offer further funds. Toto to seek advice on whether this would create a conflict of interests for the JLA.

42. Joint workshops - can still be open about future gathering of questions, but will need to draw a line at some point. Will still be gathering questions from other sources, so could be considered.

60. Beyond the Room options for the final workshop - a paper was sent to Sandra after last meeting describing digital methods to involve people and live stream the process on the day. Sandra sought advice from JLA. Aim to discuss in the meeting later today.

62. Revised section 5 of the protocol - It was agreed the protocol was signed off. Lucy to add Steering Group members' names and post on PSP webpages (**action point 70**).

All other action points are ongoing or are on the agenda for today's meeting.

Notes from the last meeting were accepted as correct.

3. Survey update and gathering questions from other sources

(a) Survey and workshop update

LS gave a presentation on the final number of survey respondents and their demographic characteristics. During the discussion the following points were noted:

- Present the data according to personal background of the respondent, for example whether they have personal experience and/or professional background (**action point 71**)
- Compare participants use of digital with the Ofcom data these questions were derived from.
- It will be interesting to see whether different types of questions come from the different parts of the UK.
- The response from some BAME communities remained low - MHF may be able to support some round table discussions with community groups (**action point 72**)

However, it was generally felt that we have gathered a lot of questions from a good number of respondents, so further actions to boost these is not required.

Steering Group members were interested to understand the range of questions submitted and if we would detect gaps in the type of question asked:

- What would be the implications of any gaps - is this part of the story and reflects the JLA process. Or are there genuine gaps that are a limitation of the process we have used?
- Caution was expressed about how we value the questions that come in - it's not just about frequency; questions asked only once will also be important (as not trying to have a representative sample).

(b) Questions from other sources

The group discussed three other sources which could be used to generate questions for this PSP:

i. Other JLA PSPs - Lucy and Kat had looked at the top 10s from the other PSPs and no questions explicitly mentioned digital technologies. However, some questions, it could be suggested, might be answered through digital technologies. It was also noted that questions specifically relevant to our PSP may be in the longer lists and out of scope lists for other PSPs. It was agreed that only questions from these longer lists, which explicitly mention digital technologies would be included in our question database (**action point 73**)

ii. NICE/SIGN guidelines - Chris H described that the NICE guideline development Groups were made up of clinicians and patients and so the research recommendations which resulted from these processes were closely related to the JLA approach. Therefore, it was agreed that the relevant NICE (and SIGN for Scotland) guidelines would be searched for research recommendations that explicitly refer to digital technologies (**action point 74**).

iii. Research papers in the COPE database - The papers which are included in the COPE database may also include research recommendations about digital technology. However, because we may not know how those recommendations have come about (i.e. lack of clinician/patient perspectives) and the large and laborious task involved, we would not include questions from this source.

4. Checking the unanswered questions

Lucy explained the processes used so far to develop version 2 of the framework for organising the raw questions. This can be summarised as follows:

Version 1 - Developed by Kat and Lucy:

- separate/independent coding of 90 questions each
- joint discussion to check level of agreement and decide on category labels
- testing the framework with an additional 115 questions which resulted in the addition of 6 new categories

Version 2 – Data management sub-group:

- Familiarisation with example questions
- Review of category labels and revisions made
- Discussion of overarching themes/clustering questions.

The Steering Group proceeded to work in pairs on new sub-samples of questions to begin to get familiar with the questions and to test how well the framework fitted these questions.

In the discussion which followed, it was noted that the questions are very interesting, but often broad and vague, so members noted they were projecting own thoughts on these questions. A level of interpretation will be needed as to which category to place the question into and where there is more than one issue, it was agreed the question would be coded with all the relevant categories.

A number of new concepts, themes and categories were noted to be included in the framework **(action point 75)**:

- Right to healthcare of choice...
- Social connectedness/integration - to what extent does it increase...
- Self-management
- Mechanisms of effectiveness
- Crisis intervention....
- How to get the tech (access)
- Reliability/accuracy of the tech - wider than patient safety??; relates to processes for devices. Quality control
- Ethical standards around how digital is used....

Chris H identified that many of the concepts are focused on outcomes (i.e. what researchers will want to assess), many are generic and could be applied to a range of issues (usability; risk etc) and the IG questions are not specifically research questions, but important questions about the implementation of digital and access to it.

The group had a lengthy discussion about the process of data management and the steps needed to move to more detailed content for the PICO type questions which incorporate more specifics. Paul raised questions about the data management team undertaking this task without Steering Group input. However, the JLA process requires Steering Group member input into these processes and our Terms of Reference require that two clinicians and two people with lived experience need to be part of any decision made. The Data Management Sub-Group of the Steering Group are required to play a key role in the process. The Steering Group will review and agree the questions deemed out of scope, review the proposed lumping of duplicate questions and re-formulating of raw questions into indicative questions **(action point 76)**. It was also suggested that, to support the data management team, members of the Steering Group volunteer to take specific areas of the questions (for example, Access) and get more involved with the analysis of these areas **(action point 77)**.

A critical step is when the 'indicative questions' are being formulated from the raw questions - Steering Group involvement will be vital here as this is the main interpretative work. It will be key to have an audit trail of how the questions are processed/transformed.

The data management would progress through a number of stages:

- Removal of out of scope questions which would be signed off by the Steering Group processes
- Coding the questions into the Framework as a tool to manage the data
- Combining duplicates
- Transforming the questions into indicative questions
- Checking against the evidence base
- Agreement on the questions that have already been answered
- Compiling the long list of unanswered questions in preparation for interim prioritisation

5. Review the project timelines

While it remains ambitious, the proposed timeline, to hold the final workshop before the MindTech National Symposium is possible, assuming we make good progress on data analysis over the summer.

It was agreed to hold the next face to face Steering Group in Nottingham due to cost and admin pressures (**action point 78**).

Toto raised the work that would be required after the final workshop, including dissemination and maintaining a web presence. Lucy and Chris H are applying for a Innovation Network grant from the Institute of Mental Health to support this work through 2018 - 19. Toto to advise on relevant methods for dissemination (**action point 79**).

6. Interim prioritisation

Toto presented information on the interim prioritisation stage which covered:

- The aim of this stage, namely, to move from the long list of indicative questions (likely to be 100 or more) to the short list going to the final workshop (around 25 questions).
- Who should participate - people with lived experience and health and social care professionals
- How we reach them - via partners, first survey respondents and/or a brand new call
- The main methods adopted for this stage - choose 10, choose 10 and rank, rate all questions on importance.

In particular, she noted that the Steering Group needed to consider:

- What would make the most user-friendly approach?
- What are the administrative implications of different approaches to reach people and analyse the data?
- The length of the long list - this has ranged from 40 to 170

The following discussion raised a number of issues and questions for how the interim prioritisation could be managed in our PSP.

Chris H noted that the main challenge will be remodelling the questions from the raw submissions to the indicative questions and that we may still have hundreds of questions - how would we select a smaller number for presenting in a survey? Toto reported that in most PSPs the indicative questions were much reduced because of the number of duplicates in the raw questions. She expected the number to be drastically reduced. But we may need to reduce the number further by applying some selected criteria, such as frequency, spread across the respondent groups etc. The JLA guidebook provides more examples of these criteria.

Concerns were expressed about the demanding nature of the task being asked in the interim prioritisation and the barriers to completion are high - many people would find a survey with 100 items too overwhelming to complete. Various strategies can be used to encourage participation, such as pacing through the process, keeping it as simple as possible (wording such as 'what matters to you the most' to 'which questions to you like/don't like), including elements such as games or quiz-like approaches to make it fun to take part.

It is important that a range of perspectives are included in the process and to encourage people to think about what is most important to them as individuals and ask them to respond from this point of view (rather than thinking about what might be important to others). There was support for involving those people who have already responded to the survey and left contact details for further involvement. There was also support for involving people in a more social way, eg. workshops and social media. After discussion, returning to the workshop participants with the interim prioritisation was agreed (**action point 80**) and to consider whether social media could be used (**action point 81**).

The survey items need to be presented in random order to each participant - so that the responses are not influenced by attentional bias which would occur with a static list in the some order. The questions could be organised by themes but again these would need to be presented in a random order to each participant. Exploring the options for randomisation and introducing other game-like elements in Survey Monkey is required (**action point 82**).

Lucy noted it would be helpful to understand more about the level of participation expected in the interim prioritisation - Toto to provide some more information from other PSPs (**action point 83**).

7. Final workshop

Toto had provided Lucy with a checklist to prepare for the final workshop (paper 4). Key decisions at this stage were the date and discussing the possible participants. Toto explained there is usually about 30 participants (with some observers in addition and by agreement with the Steering Group) with a balance of perspectives so about 15 would be people with lived experience of mental health problems and 15 would be health and social care practitioners. The session is facilitated by JLA advisors, so the Steering Group are not required to facilitate on the day. Members of the Steering Group who have lived experience and/or professional roles are welcome to participate, but are not required to. Some PSPs choose for Steering Group members to not take part, so that other perspectives can be brought into the process.

After discussion, it was agreed that a range of perspectives would be useful, for example, people familiar with the JLA and those new to it; people with expertise in digital technology for mental health and those who are new to it, a range of professional roles. Lucy to produce a table/grid to set out this range which can be populated by the Steering Group with suggestions (**action point 84**). Other PSPs have put out a call for expressions of interest and selected from those who apply. A mix of approaches would probably be needed to recruit people. Networks for the open call could include the survey respondents, McPin, NSUN, all our partner organisations.

Lucy to set up a Doodle Poll for selecting the date (**action point 85**) and Chris H to speak with Til Wykes about the venue; the Maudsley BRC have contributed the funds for the final workshop on the agreement it would be held in London (**action point 86**).

Andre has previously sent Sandra a paper about how Beyond the Room options might be used at the final workshop. Sandra had sought advice from the JLA and forwarded this to Lucy and Andre. Toto, Andre and Lucy to pick up on this conversation via email (**action point 87**).

8. AOB

There was no other business

Steering Group schedule 2017

The next meeting will be a teleconference on Wednesday 6th September 2017, at 2pm

Meeting type	Date	Location
Teleconference	Wednesday 6 th September	14:00 – 15:30
Face to face	Tuesday 17 th October	NOTTINGHAM
Teleconference	Monday 13th November	11:15 – 12:45
Final prioritisation workshop	November/December	TBC