Executive 29 June 2017

Health & Adult Social Care Policy & Scrutiny Committee

Public Health Grant Spending Scrutiny Review – Cover Report

Summary

1. This cover report presents the Final Report from the Public Health Grant Spending Scrutiny Review and asks Executive to approve the recommendations arising from the review.

Review Recommendations

2. In March 2017 the Health & Adult Social Care Policy & Scrutiny Committee considered the Draft Final Report of a Task Group which carried out a Scrutiny Review into Public Health Grant Spending, Appendix 1, and agreed to note the continued challenges on effective delivery of public health services against a background of cuts to the Public Health Grant and endorse the review recommendations listed below for the Executive's consideration:

    i. Request the Director of Public Health undertake a detailed Health Impact Assessment of the anticipated impact on residents with a further report to Scrutiny to help inform the budget setting process for 2018/19 onwards.

    Reason: So that the Council can make informed decisions about how best to spend the public health grant to deliver improved public health outcomes for residents when the ringfence is removed in 2018/19.

    ii. Ask the Executive to support the recommendation that the Director of Public Health develop a Public Health Strategy for the City that utilises a "Health in All Policies" approach.

    Reason: In recognition of the fact that the Council can only deliver its statutory responsibilities for public health by making the task of improving the public's health everyone's business, at the core of

the practice of the wider Council workforce whilst also working pro-actively with city partners such as education and voluntary sectors and empowering citizens as partners in improving health and wellbeing at the level of the individual, family and community.

iii. The CYC Public Health Team are asked to strengthen their management of contracts and oversight of delivery of public health services against clearly defined performance and financial targets.

Reason: So that the Council can be assured of value for money in the delivery of public health services and that the statutory responsibilities for public health are met.

iv. In order that Members are reassured about the level of contract management going forward, the Director Public Health is asked to show the impact on residents' lives. It would be useful for a simple summary to show the breakdown of where funding is allocated this year which could be a template for future years along with specific outcome indicators. This would be for analysis to ensure these are delivered and remedial actions available if they are not.

Reason: To ensure that members are assured about the level of contract management and that contracts are delivered against specific outcome indicators.

Background

3. On 1 April 2013 responsibilities for Public Health were transferred from the NHS to local authorities with implementation of the Health and Social Care Act 2012. Local authorities receive an annual ring-fenced public health grant from the Department of Health which has a core condition attached that it should be used only for the purposes of the public health functions of local authorities. The local authority statutory duties for public health services are mainly outlined in the Health and Social Care Act 2012 legislation which include a duty to improve the public's health through mandated and non-mandated functions. There are additional regulations for the use of the grant for delivery of mandated 0-5 child public health services and delivery of services for alcohol and drug treatment.

4. At a meeting of the Health & Adult Social Care Policy & Scrutiny Committee in June 2015, the former Acting Director of Public Health suggested Members might wish to examine, as part of a scrutiny review,

how the Public Health Grant to Local Government was spent and in July 2015 the Committee received a scoping report on this topic.

5. The Committee agreed to undertake scrutiny review of expenditure on Public Health Grant, with benchmarking against other local authorities, as this would be feasible and would provide useful information to inform resource allocation decisions.

6. The review stalled initially while revised figures from the Department of Health were confirmed then, after gathering the information contained in the Final Report at Appendix 1 during a series of meeting, the Task Group was able to make the review recommendations detailed in paragraph 2, above.

Implications

7. **Financial**: This Scrutiny Review scrutinised financial information which led to the recommendations in the Final Report.

- **Human Resources (HR):** There are no HR implications
- **Equalities:** Reducing health inequalities to enabled people to achieve and maintain healthy lives is a consideration of the final report.
- **Legal**: There are no legal implications
- **Crime and Disorder:** Spend on crime and disorder is one of the considerations in the final report
- **Information Technology (IT):** There are no IT implications
- **Property:** There are no property implications
- **Other:** No other implications were identified in the final report

Risk management

8. The failure to be able to respond to a reduction in public health budgets while also delivering mandated public health responsibilities is included on the public health risk register rated as a red critical risk. With mitigating actions in place this risk is reduced to an amber medium risk.

Options

9. Having considered the Final Report at Appendix 1 and its associated annex, the Executive may choose to amend and/or approve, or reject the recommendations arising from the review.

Council Plan 2015-19

10. The Final Report at Appendix 1 is linked to A Focus on Frontline Services and A Council That Listens to Residents elements of the Council Plan and supports the key strategic goals that all residents enjoy healthy and independent lives and achieve their full potential.

Recommendation

11. Having considered the final report and its annex, the Executive is asked to approve the recommendations as set out in paragraph 2 above.

    Reason: To conclude the Scrutiny review in line with City of York Council scrutiny procedures and protocols.

Contact Details

Author:
Steve Entwistle
Scrutiny Officer
Tel: (01904) 554279
steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Andrew Docherty
Assistant Director – Legal & Governance
Tel: (01904) 551004

Report Approved ✓ **Date** 23/05/2017

Wards Affected: **All** ✓

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Appendix

Appendix 1 – Public Health Grant Spending Scrutiny Review Final Report