

PSIRF Engagement Principles

Nine principles should inform the design of our systems and processes for engaging and involving those affected by Patient Safety Events.

1. Apologies are meaningful

Apologies need to demonstrate understanding of the potential impact of the incident on those involved, and a commitment to address their questions and concerns. Ideally, an apology communicates a sense of accountability for the harm experienced, but not responsibility for it ahead of investigation. Getting an apology right is important – it sets the tone for everything that follows. Apologising is also a crucial part of the Duty of Candour.

2. Approach is individualised

Engagement and involvement should be flexible and adapt to individual and changing needs. These needs could be practical, physical, or emotional. Engagement leads should recognise that every response might need to be different, based on an understanding of the different needs and circumstances of those affected by a patient safety event.

3. Timing is sensitive

Some people can feel they are being engaged and involved too slowly or too quickly, or at insensitive times. Engagement leads need to talk to those affected about the timing and structure of engagement and involvement, and any key dates to avoid (eg birthdays, funeral dates, anniversaries), particularly where someone has lost a loved one.

4. Those affected are treated with respect and compassion

Everyone involved in a learning response should be treated respectfully. There should be a duty of care to everyone involved in the patient safety event and subsequent response, and opportunities provided for open communication and support through the process. Overlooking the relational elements of a learning response can lead to a breakdown of trust between those involved (including patients, families, and healthcare staff) and the organisation.

5. Guidance and clarity are provided

Patients, families, and healthcare staff can find the processes that follow a patient safety incident confusing. Those outside the health service, and even some within it, may not know what a patient safety incident is, why the incident they were involved in is being investigated or what the learning response entails. Patients, families, and healthcare staff can feel powerless and ill-equipped for the processes following a patient safety incident. Therefore, all communications and materials need to clearly describe the process and its purpose, and not assume any prior understanding.

6. Those affected are 'heard'

Everyone affected by a patient safety incident should have the opportunity to be listened to and share their experience. They will all have their individual perspective on what happened and each one is valid in building a comprehensive picture to support learning. Importantly, the opportunity to be listened to is also part of restoring trust and repairing relationships between organisations and staff, patients, and families.

7. Approach is collaborative and open

An investigation process that is collaborative and open with information, and provides answers, can reduce the chance litigation will be used as a route for being heard. The decision to litigate is a difficult one. Organisations must not assume that litigation is always about establishing blame – some feel it is the only way to get answers to their questions.

8. Subjectivity is accepted

Everyone will experience the same incident in different ways. No one truth should be prioritised over others. Engagement leads should ensure that patients, families, and healthcare staff are all viewed as credible sources of information in response to a patient safety incident.

9. Strive for equity

Organisations may differ from patients, families, and healthcare staff in what they consider is the appropriate response to a patient safety incident. The opportunity for learning should be weighed against the needs of those affected by the incident. Engagement leads need to understand and seek information on the impact of how they choose response types on those affected by incidents and be aware of the risk of introducing inequity into the process of safety responses.

Figure 2. Four steps of engagement

