

Cabinet 6 May 2014

Report from the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

## **Personalisation Scrutiny Review Cover Report**

### **Summary**

1. This report presents the Final Report and recommendations of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee arising from their Personalisation Scrutiny Review (Appendix 1).

### **Background**

2. This topic was put forward as a suggestion at the Scrutiny Work Planning event in May 2012 and at their meeting in July 2012 Members of Health OSC decided to proceed with the review and appointed a three member Task Group to undertake the work. In November 2012 the following remit was agreed

#### Aim

To review, with key partners in the city, areas of strength and areas for development around Personalisation to enable people to exercise as much choice and control over their lives as possible.

# **Key Objectives**

- To bring together residents and service and support providers, in a workshop environment, to identify the areas of strength and weakness in City of York Council's current approach to personalisation
- ii. And from the above to ultimately identify key priorities for the city around Personalisation to make improvements on.
- 3. The Task Group's request to use an independent facilitator to help them with this review, particularly in terms of planning and running the workshop mentioned in key objective (i) of the remit was approved by the

Committee in December 2012. Subsequently two workshops were held in April 2013 at the Council's Headquarters at West Offices.

#### Consultation

4. During its review, the Task Group has ensured that it has co-opted a wide range of organisations to widen its understanding of the impact of the personalisation agenda and to secure the widest possible consultation and views. As can be evidenced by details of the Workshops set out in Appendix 1, the Task Group undertook further consultation of service users and carers.

### **Analysis**

- 5. At its meeting in November 2013, the Task Group agreed that the three key emerging priorities under Objective ii) of its remit were:
  - a need for better engagement with service users as evidenced by the low turnout at the workshops and the lack of cohesive stories about what was working well.
  - a need to improve the Council's care management culture and consultation as evidenced anecdotally from the workshops (see paragraph 22).
  - from anecdotal evidence there is a need to review the Council's existing arrangements relating to the provision of mental health support.

#### **Conclusions**

- At their meeting on 23 April 2014 the Committee found it was unable to properly scrutinise the implementation of personalisation in York and upon reflection felt it should have been more specific in its original objectives.
- 7. Within its limited investigations, the Committee acknowledged that there may need to be disinvestment in existing provision to enable resources to be available to fund personalisation.
- 8. The Committee acknowledged a need for cultural change amongst professionals within the organisations providing services.

- 9. From the information gathered it was clear that increasing engagement with personalisation participants was a priority.
- 10. The need for better engagement with service users was evidenced by the low turnout at the workshop events organised in April.
- 11. However, even though the number of people at the workshops was low, several conclusions emerged that are identified in paragraph 22.
- 12. During the workshops concerns were expressed about the provision of information and the language used, a view shared by Task Group Members, as detailed in paragraph 31. The Task Group agreed there was a need to look at how the Council communicates with service users and carers.
- 13. The Task Group recognised that people who took part in the workshops concluded there was a need for an open assessment process that people understood.
- 14. There are specific issues in mental health services, where people appear not to be able to find out their indicative budget. The Task Group considered it was apparent there were consistent issues with how Personalisation was working in mental health services.
- 15. In Control concluded, having considered the evidence above, that York was typical of a local authority doing some things well but noted that there were areas where improvements could and should be made. This applied particularly to mental health services.

#### **Review Recommendations**

- 16. At a Health OSC meeting on 23 April 2014 Members expressed their disappointment that the review had not achieved what they thought it would achieve and that in no way could it be considered a complete scrutiny review. However, they endorsed the following recommendations:
  - That the language used in leaflets, literature, and all correspondence relating to personalisation is reviewed and simplified.
  - ii. That the Council improves and simplifies its communications with customers at each stage of the process to ensure that co-production underpins the approach

- iii. That the Council investigate how to provide better training and support services to enable people to manage their cash budgets.
- iv. Examine how the care management culture can be complemented by one of enablement and co production where individuals and families are better able to make their own decisions about their care and support needs as well as in managing their cash budgets.
- v. That the Council should consider what improvements could be made to the assessment process to ensure customers are satisfied their needs are fully discussed and support plans are accurately implemented.

### Specific Recommendations for future work on Personalisation

- a. That the topic of Personalisation be revisited in the future with a refined remit looking at how resources can be disinvested before they can be reinvested.
- b. That Health OSC be asked to consider carrying out a scrutiny review in relation to mental health services and commissioning as contracts are being reviewed. The learning from this more focused review can be shared across all personalisation services.

#### **Council Plan**

17. This review is directly linked to the Protect Vulnerable People element of the Council Plan 2011-2015.

### **Implications**

18. There are no implications associated with this report. Implications arising from the recommendations in the Final Report are detailed in paragraph 58 in Appendix 1.

## **Risk Management**

19. There are no risks directly associated with this report.

#### Recommendations

- 20. The Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends Cabinet:
  - (i) Notes the content of the final report at Appendix1

(ii) Approves the recommendations as shown in Paragraph 16 of this cover report.

Reason: To conclude the Scrutiny Review in line with CYC Scrutiny procedures and protocols.

<b>^</b>	<b>D</b>
Contact	1 10+0110
1.0111761	1 101111
Contact	Dotano

Author:	Chief Officer Responsible for the report: Andy Docherty Assistant Director Governance and ICT		
Steve Entwistle Scrutiny Officer Tel 01904 554279 <a href="mailto:steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk">steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk</a>			
	Report Approved	Date	24 April 2014
Wards Affected:			All 🗸

For further information please contact the author of the report

**Appendices** 

**Appendix 1 –** Personalisation Final Report