

## 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

<b>Topic presented</b>	Hinckley Community Services Review – midpoint review of engagement
<b>Presented by</b>	Sue Venables, Head of Engagement and Insights
<b>Purpose of presenting</b>	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.
<b>Geographical scope of proposed engagement</b>	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
<b>Demographic scope of proposed engagement</b> E.g. age, gender, income/occupation, cultural background, disability	People who live in or around the Hinckley and Bosworth area.
<b>Proposed engagement timescales</b>	23 January 2023 – 8 March 2023
<b>Evidence of engagement activities is provided by</b>	Presentation and data received at mid-point (anonymised)
<b>Any (relevant) groups not engaged with</b>	

A proud partner in the:



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

<p><b>Which LLR-wide workstream does this impact</b></p>	
<p><b>Key themes emerging from the presentations as identified by the Group</b></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><b>Are there any implications for consultation processes?</b></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"> <li>• Focus on 16 – 44 year olds – promotion with large local businesses (i.e. Triumph), gyms and leisure centres</li> <li>• Local rural area promotion (i.e. Stoke Golding), plus convenience stores and pubs, leave copies of the questionnaires in local sites (i.e. libraries)</li> <li>• Paid for Facebook advertising</li> <li>• VCS push to get action plan dates in the diary and feedback early</li> <li>• Organic social media promotion of remaining events</li> <li>• Contact Parish Councils to put posters up on locked local noticeboards</li> <li>• Contact LPT about portacabin staff to check plans and visit Hinckley hub site</li> <li>• Consider engagement over half-term with families</li> <li>• Push on events and closing date reminders through press</li> <li>• Reminders to the VCSE and Children and Young People</li> </ul>
<p><b>Areas of good practice</b></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><b>Areas for improvement and recommendations</b></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.
<b>Was the Group assured that engagement/consultation had been satisfactorily completed?</b>	Yes
<b>Was the Group assured that insights had impacted decisions/planning?</b>	N/A
<b>Second item</b>	
<b>Topic presented</b>	Volunteering in the NHS campaign and reinvigorating PPGs
<b>Presented by</b>	Sue Venables, Head of Engagement and Insights
<b>Purpose of presenting</b>	The PPIAG is asked to consider whether the approach was appropriate and sufficient.
<b>Geographical scope of proposed engagement</b>	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
<b>Demographic scope of proposed engagement</b> <small>E.g. age, gender, income/occupation, cultural background, disability</small>	Anybody registered with a GP surgery in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland.
<b>Proposed engagement timescales</b>	12 weeks, commencing 27 February 2023, although campaign will be ongoing.
<b>Evidence of engagement activities is provided by</b>	The PPG toolkit was shared with the PPIAG and the proposed engagement activities were detailed in the presentation.
<b>Any (relevant) groups not engaged with</b>	N/A, as engagement has not yet commenced.
<b>Which LLR-wide workstream does this impact</b>	
<b>Key themes emerging from the presentations as identified by the Group</b>	<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>
<b>Are there any implications for consultation processes?</b>	
<b>Areas of good practice</b>	<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>
<b>Areas for improvement and recommendations</b>	<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>
<b>Was the Group assured that engagement/consultation had been satisfactorily completed?</b>	Yes; the Group were assured that the <i>approach</i> to engage was appropriate and sufficient.
<b>Was the Group assured that insights had impacted decisions/planning?</b>	N/A
<b>Standing agenda items</b>	
<b>Report from the previous meeting</b>	The report from the PPIAG meeting on 26 January 2023 was approved.
<b>Horizon scanning</b>	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.
<b>Other business</b>	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.