

Public and Patient Involvement Assurance Group (PPIAG)

Report from meeting of: Wednesday 22 February 2023

Attendance: Evan Rees, Rasheed Cader, Nishita Andrea Ganatra, Brigitte Heller, Mathew Hulbert, Janet Thompson, Vaughan McLeod, Andy Murtha, Brian Rowlands, Mary Smith

Integrated Care Board (ICB) representation: Sue Venables, Kirstie Swinfield (notes)

Apologies:

The meeting was quorate.

There were no declarations of interest.

First item

| | |
|---|--|
| Topic presented | Hinckley Community Services Review – midpoint review of engagement |
| Presented by | Sue Venables, Head of Engagement and Insights |
| Purpose of presenting | The PPIAG were asked to assure that, in the first half of the 6 week engagement (ending on 8 March 2023), the proposals to change and improve healthcare services in Hinckley were being developed with appropriate and sufficient public and patient involvement. |
| Geographical scope of proposed engagement | Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland |
| Demographic scope of proposed engagement E.g. age, gender, income/occupation, cultural background, disability | People who live in or around the Hinckley and Bosworth area. |
| Proposed engagement timescales | 23 January 2023 – 8 March 2023 |
| Evidence of engagement activities is provided by | Presentation and data received at mid-point (anonymised) |
| Any (relevant) groups not engaged with | |

A proud partner in the:



**Leicester, Leicestershire
and Rutland**
Health and Wellbeing Partnership

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Which LLR-wide workstream does this impact</p> | |
| <p>Key themes emerging from the presentations as identified by the Group</p> | <p>As discussions about Hinckley community health services have been taking place for many years, the ICB may face some cynicism from the public.</p> <p>It's unclear whether the ICB is engaging or consulting and, consequently, how much of an influence the public's voice will have on decision making.</p> <p>The ICBs efforts to engage with the public have been substantive.</p> <p>The low level of participation from people under the age of 35 is surprising, particularly considering the percentage of people who heard about the engagement through Facebook.</p> |
| <p>Are there any implications for consultation processes?</p> | <p>The group agreed with the actions identified to be implemented in the second half of the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on 16 – 44 year olds – promotion with large local businesses (i.e. Triumph), gyms and leisure centres • Local rural area promotion (i.e. Stoke Golding), plus convenience stores and pubs, leave copies of the questionnaires in local sites (i.e. libraries) • Paid for Facebook advertising • VCS push to get action plan dates in the diary and feedback early • Organic social media promotion of remaining events • Contact Parish Councils to put posters up on locked local noticeboards • Contact LPT about portacabin staff to check plans and visit Hinckley hub site • Consider engagement over half-term with families • Push on events and closing date reminders through press • Reminders to the VCSE and Children and Young People |
| <p>Areas of good practice</p> | <p>Providing a paper questionnaire option for those who cannot or do not want to complete it virtually.</p> <p>The engagement questionnaire is comprehensive.</p> |
| <p>Areas for improvement and recommendations</p> | <p>Increase efforts to reach communities that have not completed a minimal number of questionnaires, such black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) communities and Gypsy, Roma and Travellers (GRT).</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Increase efforts to reach younger people. |
| Was the Group assured that engagement/consultation had been satisfactorily completed? | Yes |
| Was the Group assured that insights had impacted decisions/planning? | N/A |
| Second item | |
| Topic presented | Volunteering in the NHS campaign and reinvigorating PPGs |
| Presented by | Sue Venables, Head of Engagement and Insights |
| Purpose of presenting | The PPIAG is asked to consider whether the approach was appropriate and sufficient. |
| Geographical scope of proposed engagement | Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland |
| Demographic scope of proposed engagement <small>E.g. age, gender, income/occupation, cultural background, disability</small> | Anybody registered with a GP surgery in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland. |
| Proposed engagement timescales | 12 weeks, commencing 27 February 2023, although campaign will be ongoing. |
| Evidence of engagement activities is provided by | The PPG toolkit was shared with the PPIAG and the proposed engagement activities were detailed in the presentation. |
| Any (relevant) groups not engaged with | N/A, as engagement has not yet commenced. |
| Which LLR-wide workstream does this impact | |
| Key themes emerging from the presentations as identified by the Group | <p>The willingness to actively support and participate from GP surgeries, particularly practice managers, is essential; otherwise, volunteer retention rates will be low. Volunteers need to feel valued.</p> <p>Different methods of patient involvement should be considered. Often, groups are not diverse or representative.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>It is useful for PPGs to connect with other networks, such as neighbourhood forums.</p> <p>It is important for people joining a PPG to understand that it is not a forum to raise their individual complaints, but to be a critical friend to the surgery.</p> <p>The approach is good and there is present need for this the campaign.</p> |
| Are there any implications for consultation processes? | |
| Areas of good practice | <p>The toolkit is useful.</p> <p>Branding the campaign as volunteer recruitment as opposed to PPG recruitment is positive, since the public do not understand or associate with the term PPG.</p> |
| Areas for improvement and recommendations | <p>Emphasise sections of the toolkit focussed on positive relationship building between PPGs and the practice.</p> <p>An important part of the toolkit will be enabling the sharing of good practice.</p> |
| Was the Group assured that engagement/consultation had been satisfactorily completed? | Yes; the Group were assured that the <i>approach</i> to engage was appropriate and sufficient. |
| Was the Group assured that insights had impacted decisions/planning? | N/A |
| Standing agenda items | |
| Report from the previous meeting | The report from the PPIAG meeting on 26 January 2023 was approved. |
| Horizon scanning | No new items were added to the planner, but it was noted that NHS 111, maternity services and elective care are key areas that the Group would like updates on. |
| Other business | The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 22 March 2023 at 10am and will be held at County Hall in Room 205, with the option to join virtually. |