

# ADR England Public Insights Panel: Meeting 8 Summary Report

7 July 2025

The ADR England Public Insights Panel held its eighth meeting on 7 July 2025, 18:30 – 19:45, on MS Teams.

## Contents

1. Attendance.....	1
2. Feedback from panel members .....	1
3. Forthcoming actions.....	4

## 1. Attendance

**Facilitators:** Tom Curran and Connie Portman (The Social Agency), Shayda Kashef (Senior Public Engagement Manager, ADR UK), Rianna Romeo (Communications and Public Engagement Intern, ADR UK), Job de Roij (Lead Regulator, OSR) and Jenna Fults (Senior Copy Editor, OSR).

**Public attendees:** 9 out of 15 public attendees (referred to as panel members) were present.

## 2. Feedback from panel members

The purpose of the session was for panel members to give their views on how ADR UK should share a research summary with the public, and on how the Office for Statistics Regulation (OSR) should present their findings to the public.

### Responses to ADR UK

Rianna Romeo began by introducing her role as a Public Engagement Intern at ADR UK. Before the session, The Social Agency had circulated Rianna’s draft research summary (based on findings from a study about immigrant vs UK-born employees in the labour market) to panel members. Rianna refreshed panellists’ memory of the research summary by sharing it on screen and then asked for honest responses to the research summary.

Panellists felt that the research summary raised a lot of questions, such as:

- Why was the proportion of immigrants in the study much lower than the UK-born employees? Does this cause the findings to be skewed in some way?
- Why do the pie charts not add up to 100%?
- Are the conclusions indicating correlation or causality?
- Why was the 2011 Census used rather than the most recent 2021 Census?
- What is the main message we should be taking away from this research?
- What is the value in the 'unexplained' section?
- Why are high skilled immigrant employees not spoken about?

Panellists found some of the language confusing, such as “percentage point increase”, “probability”, and “the gap”. While a glossary was provided, multiple panel members felt that the readers should be able to understand everything within the research summary without having to switch between slides to view a glossary.

The graphics received mixed responses from panel members, for example:

- the bar chart on slide two caused confusion. Panel members were unsure about the meaning of “percentage point increase” or how the bar chart represented the data written below it
- panellists expressed confusion towards the broken pie chart that showed the “unexplained” findings. One panellist did not understand why the different parts did not add up to 100%. Some suggested that this chart should have its own subheading to provide more clarity on what the graphic is showing, while another suggest that the slide should be broken down into four distinct sections to aid understanding
- panellists liked the ‘money’ and the ‘clock’ graphics, noting that they were clear and relevant to the corresponding data.

Rianna then showed panel members an alternative version of the research summary that she had created more recently. The panel members were asked to compare the two versions. Most of the panellists favoured the second version due to its “better flow” and “key messages” page which provided more clarity on the core takeaways from the research.

Finally, Rianna gathered panel members' feedback from a research summary designed as a social media post. Responses to the post were as follows:

- panellists thought the message of the social media post was clearer than in the full research summary than as a social media post
- they noted that slides featuring high contrast between background and text were eye-catching and easy to read
- some panellists expressed that the third slide was not “attractive” enough, and that the highlighted words looked as though they have been struck through
- to improve the social media post, some felt that the ‘ADR UK’ logo should be the same colour on each slide, and that the text on slide 3 should be left aligned rather than centre aligned.

Rianna finished her presentation. Tom Curran then introduced Job and Jenna from OSR.

### **Responses to OSR**

Job and Jenna began by introducing the OSR to the panel, and particularly their Communicating Findings Project. This project is about improving the clarity and consistency in OSR's regulatory outputs – such as executive summaries of reports – and improving public engagement with, and understand of, their work.

In a pre-task, panel members had read a recent regulatory output by the OSR and were asked to give feedback to Job and Jenna.

Panel members were able to recall from memory some main takeaways of the summary. Specific responses included:

- waiting time for NHS cancer treatment is changing, based on new standards
- cancer waiting times are being reviewed
- recommendations for reviewed timings for different cancer diagnoses and treatments.

Tom asked panellists to explain the problems they encountered whilst reading the summary:

- some panel members found the summary too data-heavy and overwhelming
- others felt that they were left wanting to know more about current NHS performance and how the new standards have made a difference to waiting times
- some panel members wanted the summary to be more specific in terms of key numbers and percentages from the research
- one panellist wanted to better understand the context of the research and felt that it could be more detailed in the summary.

Panellists gave their suggestions for improvement:

- one panel member noted that it could be made simpler by using a dashboard format and putting the key findings at the top, rather than with context of the research
- some wanted to know more about 'next steps' in the summary – such as the accreditation – while being mindful of the need to keep sentences short and free from “fluff”
- others suggested that the summary should be made more visually interesting (e.g. like an infographic) with an obvious headline at the top and using icons that are more clearly relevant of the findings they accompany
- panel members noted the need for more recent data.
- Panellists ended by citing things they liked about the OSR summary that should not be changed, including:
- the use of a consistent format or template for every data summary, based on a view that consistency leads to credibility)
- the use of colour, which was seen as helpful for distinguishing different sections
- the table of contents, which was viewed as well-structured and clear
- and the length of the summary page, which panel members thought was about right for a summary of this kind intended for a public audience.

Tom Curran wrapped up the session by thanking the panel members for their time.

### **3. Forthcoming actions**

- The next session will be held in September 2025. The Social Agency will canvass availability and preferences for the next meeting.