



## Report

Title of Meeting	Board of Directors
Date of Meeting	May 26 <sup>th</sup>
Agenda item number	

Title of Report	Report on the independent analysis of response to the consultation 'Redesigning adult and older people's mental health services in Central and Eastern Cheshire'		
Presented by	Ian Davidson		
Author(s)	John Loughlin		
Purpose of the report	To appraise the Board on the outcome of the consultation exercise		
Related to strategic goals	SO1	Deliver improved and innovative services that achieve excellence	X
	SO2	Ensure meaningful involvement of service users, carers, staff and the wider public	X
	SO3	Be a model employer and have a competent and motivated workforce	X
	SO4	Maintain and develop robust Partnerships with existing and potential new stakeholders	
	SO5	Performance Manage all services using an evidence based approach within a Risk Management Framework	
	SO6	Improve quality of information to improve service delivery and longer term planning	
	SO7	Sustain financial viability	X
	SO8	Develop Trust's brand value	
Financial and legal implications			
Patient and public implications	CWP will prepare report informing the public on the outcome of the consultation exercise		
Staff implications	CWP will prepare report informing staff on the outcome of the consultation exercise		
Partner organisation implications	CWP will prepare report informing partner agencies on the outcome of the consultation exercise		
Equality issues			
Risk score and assurance rating			
Action required	To receive		X
	To review		

Recommendations	To approve	
	To confirm	

## Document History

### Revision History

Version	Date Revision	Change by	Brief Summary of Change/Sections Changed
1			

### Distribution

Version	Name/Group	Date Issued
1	Ian Davidson ( Executive sign off)	13 <sup>th</sup> May 2010
2	Ian Davidson (second approval following corrections)	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010.
3	Avril Devaney	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010.
4	Trust Board (reformatted into standard format	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010

### Executive director sign-off

	Executive director	Date signed-off
Version distributed to Board of Directors signed off by (state name):		

### Document Owner Contact Details

Name: John Loughlin	Job title: Head of Project Management
Tel:01244 397395	Email:john.loughlin@cwp.nhs.uk

**Report on the Independent Analysis of Responses to the Consultation ‘Redesigning adult and older people’s mental health services in Central and Eastern Cheshire’**

**CONTENTS**

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. DISCUSSION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6 APPENDIX (CHESTER UNIVERSITY REPORT)</b>	<b>7</b>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report appraises the Board on independent analysis of the consultation exercise 'Redesigning adult and older people's mental health services in Central and Eastern Cheshire'.

The independent analysis was undertaken by the Faculty of Health and Social Care at the University of Chester. A copy of the draft report is attached to this document. (The final copy is awaited. The reasons for this not being currently available are given below).

The overall conclusion of the report was that while there were a small number of respondents to the questionnaire contained within the report, many accepted the position of CWP in terms of the necessity to redesign mental health services and understood the position regarding financial constraints. Concerns were expressed about the potential location of a single unit and access to it. However no significant issues were raised that would suggest that, from a consultation point of view, the Trust needs to reconsider or revise current intentions.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

The consultation was carried out by Cheshire and Wirral Partnership NHS Foundation Trust at the request of and on behalf of Central and Eastern Cheshire PCT (CECPCT). It was held between 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009 and 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010. It was agreed prior to the exercise that Chester University, which had provided an independent analysis on a previous consultation exercise, should be approached to provide this service again. All responses were therefore sent directly to the University using a Freepost service.

A report outlining the communications and engagement strategy for the consultation was submitted to a previous CWP Board meeting

The first draft of the report was received at the beginning of April. Two changes to the text have been requested (as well as a number of typing corrections). However the author of the report has been on an extended holiday and then delayed overseas due to airline difficulties and the corrected final report has not yet been returned.

The two suggested changes are;

In the first paragraph refers to the 'consultation .....undertaken by Chester University', rather than stating clearly that the consultation was undertaken by CWP on behalf of the PCT, and the independent analysis was provided by the University.

Throughout the document, responses provided by Trust Members have been abbreviated to 'Trust' as opposed to 'Member'. Within the context of the report this implies that a member of staff submitted the response.

The outcome of the consultation exercise needed to be submitted to the Board of the PCT in May. It is not considered that these changes significantly affect the sense of the report.

### **3. DISCUSSION**

#### **3.1 The Report**

The report provides an analysis of from whom and from where the responses to the consultation questionnaire were received. It then provides an analysis of the responses to each question contained within the consultation document.

A total of 23 completed questionnaires were received plus one letter from a service user group who declined to use the questionnaire.

The first question referred to new ways of working which would see community based services further strengthened and as a consequence a reduced requirement for inpatient beds. The second referred to the provision of inpatient services from a single site. 69% of respondents said that they agreed with the Trust's proposals for both of these questions

The third question offered the opportunity for respondents to raise concerns they may have regarding the location of inpatient services. Predictably words like, 'access', 'hospital proximity,' 'transport' and 'centrality' were contained within 51 of the 55 issues raised.

The fourth question asked for other suggestions to improve mental health services. These have been summarised in the report under the following headings

- Management
- Education
- Communication
- Training
- Service review

The report ends with an overall conclusion that there is broad acceptance of the need to redesign services and operate within financial constraints.

#### **3.2 The next steps**

There was, despite a publicity campaign and four public meetings, very few responses to the consultation exercise. However the issues raised appear not to be so contentious as to cause negative reaction among stakeholders. There has been no single issue raised that would indicate that the Trust should reconsider or revise current proposals.

The University of Chester report will be presented to the CEC PCT Board meeting in May. Subject to the approval of the PCT, CWP can then move to the next stage which is determining how these proposals can be implemented. This will have to be

undertaken in the context of the challenging financial situation in the NHS both nationally and locally.

The Trust will also now have to prepare a report to stakeholders on the outcome of the consultation exercise. This will provide a response to the individual comments made within questionnaires. This will also summarise and provide responses to the questions raised at each of the consultation events which were recorded for this purpose. Reference will also be made to the review of the implementation of the Acute Care Model which offers the evidence of decreased requirement for inpatient beds that was referred to at these events.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

While there were few responses to the questionnaire, no significant issues were raised during the consultation that indicates that the Trust should reconsider or revise current plans. This allows the Inpatient Project team to be reconvened and the planning of service redesign to recommence.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that;

- CWP notes the content of this report and the University of Chester report on the outcome of the consultation exercise
- Subject to the comments of the CEC PCT Board, reconvene the inpatient reprovision project team
- Commissions the preparation of report to stakeholders on the outcome of the consultation exercise.

## Appendix 1

University of Chester report on the responses to the Consultation Questionnaire 'Redesigning Adult and Older People's Mental Health Services in Central and Eastern Cheshire'



C:\Documents and  
Settings\johnloughlin\

This page is intentionally left blank