

# **Adults, Well-being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee**



*Fenwick Resource Centre - Seaham*

**Light Touch Review Working Group**

**MENTAL HEALTH DAY SERVICES**

**July 2009**

## CONTENTS

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>One</b>	<b>Foreword</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Two</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Three</b>	<b>Context, Objectives and Review Terms of Reference</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Four</b>	<b>Evidence – The Need for Change</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Five</b>	<b>Evidence – Community Involvement in the Review process</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Six</b>	<b>Evidence – Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate response to Public Consultation exercise concerns</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Seven</b>	<b>Evidence – Visits to Day Centres</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Eight</b>	<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Nine</b>	<b>Response to the Consultation</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Ten</b>	<b>Written Evidence Submissions</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Eleven</b>	<b>Additional Correspondence</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Twelve</b>	<b>Outstanding Information Required</b>	<b>36</b>

## **Section One -Foreword**

### **By Councillor Richard Burnip, Chair of the Adults, Well-being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Mental Health Day Services Light Touch Review Working Group.**

This Light Touch Review of Mental Health Day Services has been prompted by Durham County Council's proposals to make significant changes to its Mental Health Day Services. Set against a backdrop of improving mental wellbeing and social inclusion whilst challenging the stigma and discrimination often attached to Mental Health Day Services, the proposals have been the cause of some anxiety amongst service users and carers.

From a service user perspective, change can be a highly emotive subject particularly when it impacts on the more vulnerable members of the community. All the more reason then that the County Council should be an exemplar authority in setting out why change is needed, what is being proposed, what will be improved, what it will cost, the pace for proposed change and what the benefits will be for those accessing the services.

The Review has sought clarification from the Council's Adults, Well-being and Health Day Services Commissioning team on the proposals as well as views from the wider NHS family on the impact of the proposals on their own work in improving mental health and well being within County Durham.

Critically, the review process has canvassed the views of service users and carers on the services currently enjoyed, the consultation process generally and the proposed service changes. The views of the Community and Voluntary Sector have also been sought as they have been identified as having an important role in supporting the new Mental Health Day Service delivery model.

This report presents the evidence and details the Working Groups findings that will be submitted as Overview and Scrutiny's formal response to the consultation. I hope that this will assist the Mental Health Day services Commissioning Team in developing improved, fit for purpose services which will improve the quality of life for residents with mental health conditions and their carers/families.

I would like to thank all the witnesses who gave evidence, my County Council Councillor colleagues together with co-opted representatives who worked with me on this scrutiny review, and finally the officers who supported and advised the working group.



Cllr Richard Burnip

## Section Two -Executive Summary

- 2.1 On 1st May 2009, Durham County Council's Adults, Well-being and Health Service commenced a twelve week formal consultation period on proposals to change in-house Mental; Health Day Services. The Consultation period closed on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009.
- 2.2 The Council's Adults Well-being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed as part of its 2009 work programme to undertake a Light Touch Review of Mental Health Day Services in order to ascertain why the service needed to change. The Review has examined the inter-relationships between the Council's Day Services Commissioning Team and the NHS family as far as their responsibilities for improving Mental Health and Well-being in County Durham is concerned.
- 2.3 The Working Group established to undertake the Review has taken evidence from service users, carers and other interested parties in respect of the proposed Community Recovery Service Model and the consultation process itself. This allowed the Group to establish their views regarding the proposed changes and the extent to which they have felt engaged in the consultation process.
- 2.4 The Group have drawn up a series of key issues, findings and recommendations in relation to the case for change and the service user experience of the Consultation process. These can be summarised as follows:
- The Case for Change is considered to be robust and will deliver improved Mental Health Day services through the Community Recovery Service model particularly in respect of the Individual Recovery Plans proposed.
  - Service users consider it vital that the service continues to provide a "safe space" for group activities and social interaction and are keen to explore alternative models with Mental Health Service professionals.
  - Service users and carers should be involved in the analysis of the responses to the consultation process and subsequently involved in the design and implementation of proposed service improvements
  - Any service improvements which are agreed should be implemented at a pace with which service users are comfortable and which will not compromise their mental health and wellbeing.

- The review has highlighted the need for greater integration between all Mental Health service commissioners and providers when service changes are proposed and consulted upon.
- a fundamental “re-branding” exercise accompany any service improvements developed from this consultation exercise with the emphasis placed upon **service improvements** rather than change.

2.5 The key findings and recommendations are explained in more detail in Section 9 of this report (pages 31-32).

## **Section Three -Context, Objectives and Review Terms of Reference**

### **Context**

- 3.1 The County Council's Adults, Wellbeing and Health Directorate commenced a consultation exercise of proposed changes to Mental Health Day Services. The consultation period runs from 1<sup>st</sup> May to 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009.
- 3.2 The Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee identified within their "long-list" of work programme issues for 2009/10, responding to the consultation exercise. Accordingly, it was agreed that a "light touch" review be undertaken to inform that response.

### **Objectives**

- 3.3 The Objectives of the review have been identified as follows, namely:
- To understand the rationale behind the consultation exercise and to examine the relationships and inter-dependencies that exist between the County Council's Day Services Commissioning Team, NHS County Durham and the Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust in respect of their role/duties to improve the mental health and well being of the residents of County Durham.
  - To satisfy members that the consultation exercise is sufficiently robust in ensuring that all interested parties have the opportunity to input into the review process.
  - To obtain the views of service users, carers and other interested parties in respect of the proposed changes to Mental Health Day service provision in County Durham.

### **Terms of Reference**

- 3.4 Building upon the objectives set out above, the review sought to identify outcomes and make recommendations relating to:

#### **The need for change**

- Identify the reasons why Mental Health Day Service provision in County Durham needs to change.
- Ascertain the National and Local Policy drivers behind the proposed review.

- Understand the relationships between Mental Health Day Service Commissioners and providers and their role in improving Mental Health wellbeing within County Durham.

### **Community Involvement in the Review Process**

- Consider how service users and carers can be involved in the review process and provide their views on the existing service delivery model and the proposed changes.
- Examine the role which the Community and Voluntary Sector have in contributing to improvements to mental health and wellbeing in County Durham.
- Experiencing first hand the services provided via existing “day centres” by undertaking a visit to such a facility.

### **Developing a response to the Consultation document**

- Respond to the consultation document against a framework of questions posed therein.

### **Review Group Membership**

- 3.5 The following members of the Adults, Well-being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee sat on the Light Touch Review Subgroup:

Councillors J Armstrong, B Brunskill, R Burnip, J Chaplow, A Shield and O Temple.

- 3.6 Councillors were joined by the following co-opted members:

E Carr, R Hassoon, D Haw and D Maskery.

### **Scrutiny Support**

- 3.7 The Working Group were supported during the review by:

Stephen Gwilym, Scrutiny Support Manager  
Jonathan Slee, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Feisal Jassat, Overview and Scrutiny Manager  
Jeremy Brock, Health Scrutiny Liaison Manager  
Barry Charlton, Senior Democratic Services Officer.

## **Officer Support**

- 3.8 The Working Group would like to thank the following officers for the evidence provided to them during the course of this Light Touch Review:

Nick Whitton, Head of Commissioning, Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate, D.C.C.

David Shipman, Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate, D.C.C.

John Yorke, Mental Health Day Services Change Manager, Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate, D.C.C.

Les Shaw, Principal Support Officer, Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate, D.C.C.

Karen Vasey, Team Manager Mental Health, Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate, D.C.C.

Jackie Ball, Henknowle and Lighthouse Day Centre Manager, D.C.C.

Diane Smith, Horizons and Fenwick Day Centre Manager, D.C.C.

Nigel Nicholson, Joint Commissioning Manager Mental Health, NHS County Durham.

Kate Harrington, PCPE (Mental Health) Manager, NHS County Durham

Dominic Gardner, Head of Healthcare, North Durham, Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust



## **Section Four -Evidence -The Need for Change**

4.1 The Working Group first met on 26<sup>th</sup> June to consider evidence from representatives of:

- Durham County Council's Adults, Well-being and Health Day Services Unit in respect of the proposed changes to Mental Health Day Services.
- NHS County Durham in respect of how the proposals would impact on their on their services and responsibilities to improve the mental health of the residents of County Durham
- Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust.

### Evidence from DCC Adults Well-being and Health Day Services

4.2 The Group were informed that currently Durham County Council Mental Health Day Services are provided by four teams of staff working from six sites, these are:

- The Chester-le-Street and North Durham Team, providing services out of the Cuthbert Resource Centre, Chester-le-Street.
- The Derwentside Team, providing services in Stanley from temporary premises of the Louisa wing of Stanfield House.
- The Easington Team, providing services from The Horizons Resource Centre in Peterlee and the Fenwick Resource Centre in Seaham.
- The Wear Valley Team, providing services from the Lighthouse Resource Centre in Spennymoor and the Lighthouse Resource Centre in Bishop Auckland located at the Henknowle Community Centre.

4.3 The Working Group heard that the main drivers for change were:

- The Joint Commissioning Strategy
- National Service Framework for Mental Health – this sets out best practice about how the NHS and partners should provide services to mental health service users.
- Social Exclusion Unit reports -identifies how to make mental health day services more inclusive for people with mental health problems.
- National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) Guidelines – identifies how to treat certain mental health illnesses such as anxiety and schizophrenia.

- Need to develop fit for purpose modern services with local partners – the Lord Darzi report emphasises how the community treatment teams work and this places more emphasis on recovery.
- 4.4 Members were shown a diagrammatic model of how the proposed Community Recovery Service would fit into the Service User Experience. A copy of the model is appended to this report.
- 4.5 It was proposed that the current in-house Day service which provides a service based primarily in the community and uses mainstream opportunities as a way of promoting better mental health be changed. In the new model, staff would work alongside the Service users on achieving pre-agreed goals which will have been determined by the service user. This will have been facilitated with the support of their Care Co-ordinator and in consultation with the day service worker. The goals will be included in their Individual Recovery Plan (IRP).
- 4.6 Members heard that the emphasis would be on one to one work that promotes recovery through developing peoples' ability to challenge their own symptoms of mental illness and achieve social inclusion by promoting access to opportunities and services. If it is felt that group activities would better meet the needs of the individual, then it would be the responsibility of the day service worker to source this. The model promotes the identification of such group activity from sources other than Durham County Council.
- 4.7 Where an IRP indicates a desire to return to employment or access training and education services, then the day services staff will support this by working with individuals to access specialist services such as WorkAble Solutions and/ or Job Centre plus.
- 4.8 The Working Group was advised that the people who would be immediately affected by the proposed changes would be those currently attending the day service. The service would continue to develop efforts already commenced with people on their Individual Recovery Plans.
- 4.9 Other people affected by the changes were:
- People newly referred into the service
  - Social Workers and Community Psychiatric Nurses (collectively referred to as Care Co-ordinators) who work in the Community Home Treatment Team or Community Intervention Team
  - Staff in the day services
  - Providers of services that people will be helped to access.

- 4.10 One of the major issues that would result from changing the service to a more individual community focused service, is that a review would be needed in respect of the buildings currently being used to deliver the day service. Concerns were expressed by the Day Service regarding the under-utilisation of existing premises and the adequacy of some premises to deliver the type of services under the new model.
- 4.11 During the debate at the session, reference was made to the level of qualification and training of Cognitive Behavioural Therapists and how problems in identifying suitable capacity in this area of work had resulted in backlogs in treatment for service users. This was being examined as part of the development of support service to supplement other support mechanisms such as books on prescription or facilitated self help. The working group felt that it was imperative that in order to support service users through the transition phase as well as the Individual Recovery Plan process itself, work should be undertaken to ensure that there is sufficient availability of suitably qualified and trained staff **across all mental health service providers and commissioners.**

#### Evidence from NHS County Durham

- 4.11 The Working Group was given evidence regarding the role of NHS County Durham in commissioning in partnership with stakeholders, Mental Health Services for both adults and young people on behalf of the residents of County Durham. This involved:
- Developing Strategy
  - Developing Services and Care Pathways
  - Procurement from service providers and performance monitoring
- 4.12 NHS County Durham's broad commissioning principles are:
- To ensure that high quality services are secured which provide value for money
  - To reduce social exclusion of people with mental health issues and to stop stigma and discrimination
  - To work in partnership with Durham County Council
  - To ensure that there is service user and carer involvement
- 4.13 An explanation was given on the Joint Commissioning Structures. The Local Involvement Groups (LIG's) for the Durham Dales, North Durham and East Durham provide the local voice with colleagues from the Tees Esk and Wear Valley NHS Trust, Durham County Council, the third sector and service users and carers participating. The LIG's feed into the County Durham and Darlington Local Implementation Team which in turns feeds into the County Durham Joint Commissioning Mental Health Group.

- 4.14 The Joint Strategy has been developed and influenced by national drivers including:
- National Service Framework for Mental Health
  - Our Health, Our Care Our Say
  - National Institute for Mental Health Guidance
  - National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidance
  - Increasing Access to Psychological Therapies Programme
- 4.15 The national drivers emphasis the need to focus resources on early prevention, primary care mental health, developing services locally and on common mental health problems such as anxiety, depression and obsessive compulsive disorder
- 4.16 The key Joint Commissioning themes which have come out of the Joint Strategy are:
- Mental Health Improvement/Promotion – mental health first aid
  - Improve the choice/individualised services – facilitated self-help/counselling/CBT4.
  - Improving access to services and early intervention – reduce waiting lists
  - To reduce social exclusion
  - Promote recovery
  - Personalisation agenda
  - To promote access to mainstream activities and services
- 4.17 The Joint Commissioning Strategy supports the general direction of the proposed Community Recovery Service. It is acknowledged that there is a need to ensure that there is high quality and appropriate alternative provision. This will need to ensure that the alternative provision is included in the Individual Recovery Plans and that the consultation feedback received is assessed.

Evidence from Tees, Esk and Wear Valley (TEWV) NHS Foundation Trust

- 4.18 The Working Group was informed that the Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust broadly supported the direction of travel of the Day Service Review given that the Trust was largely governed by the same policy drivers, principles and philosophy as NHS County Durham.
- 4.19 TEWV's principles include the introduction of greater emphasis on home based treatments rather than admission to hospitals because it is important to maintain a person's social context to aid their recovery.

4.20 It was confirmed that access to the Day Service was via Care Co-ordinators who sit within the Community Hub Treatment Teams who, whilst being managed by TEWV were joint teams of TEWV and Durham County Council staff. A key role for the Care Co-ordinators is to develop individualised care and TEWV consider that the proposals for the Community Recovery Service fits with the direction of travel for the hub teams.

**Key Issue**

4.21 Whilst it is encouraging to note the positive comments from NHS County Durham and the Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust, there still appears to be a lack of a holistic approach in incorporating the ongoing Mental Health Day Services Review with other emerging issues in Mental Health. There ought to be demonstrated a seamless pathway between the various Mental Health service areas including Acute Services, Day Services, Employment, Leisure, Housing and Education.

## **Section Five -Evidence -Community Involvement in the Review Process**

- 5.1 The Working Group met again on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2009 to seek views from service user and carer representatives regarding:
- the existing service
  - the consultation process
  - the proposed service changes
- 5.3 The Group also took the opportunity to take evidence from a representative of MIND, a third sector organisation whose work supported mental well-being and health.
- 5.4 At the start of the session, representatives were informed of the role of Scrutiny and how the views given as part of the Light Touch Review would be incorporated into a Review Report and fed into the consultation process as a formal submission from the Adults Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 5.5 Service User and Carer representatives from the following Day Centres were in attendance:
- The Cuthbert Resource Centre, Chester-le-Street.
  - Stanfield House, Stanley.
  - The Horizons Resource Centre in Peterlee and the Fenwick Resource Centre in Seaham.
  - The Lighthouse Resource Centre in Bishop Auckland located at the Henknowle Community Centre.

### ***Existing Services***

#### The Cuthbert Resource Centre, Chester-le-Street.

- 5.6 User representatives considered the services provided at the Cuthbert Resource Centre to be vital.
- 5.7 One user had personal experience of the support provided by the Centre during a prolonged period of Mental Illness. The service provided an essential “fall-back” mechanism for those who suffered relapses during their illness and the drop-in element of accessing support via the Day Centres should not be allowed to diminish. The quality of advice provided by the Day Centre staff had allowed one user to improve her quality of life and confidence levels to such an extent that she had been able to re-enter employment.

- 5.8 Some concerns surrounded the stigma and abuse attached to people using the Day Centres and it was suggested that the local authority should do more to de-mystify the services provided by the day centres and to ensure that service users felt more socially included.
- 5.9 Reference was made to a visit that had been undertaken to the Cuthbert Centre by Councillor Maurice Nicholls. At that meeting it had been pointed out by service users that 50% of those people attending the day centres lived on their own and therefore relied on them for including social engagement activities.
- 5.10 Service users considered the support provided by the Care workers employed at the Day Centres to be a vital part in improving their mental well-being. Good services existed at the facility but Users acknowledged that they could be improved.
- 5.11 Specific concerns were raised around service changes that had occurred following the location of the Cuthbert Day Centre in Chester-le-Street. The range of activities was severely curtailed leading to a reduction in attendances. Service users felt that DCC must plan such changes better, particularly where this involves building relocations, as the suitability of premises should be such that it supports a full range of services and activities.

The Horizons Resource Centre, Peterlee and the Fenwick Resource Centre, Seaham.

- 5.12 Service users were very complimentary about both centres, particularly in respect of their accessibility and the range and quality of services provided at the Day Centres.
- 5.13 One service user was able to provide a comparison between the level and quality of care and assistance provided within County Durham and Suffolk to people with mental health and well-being problems. In his experience there was a much quicker mechanism for accessing treatment and services. The level of support at both of these Day Centres was far superior to anything that the User had experienced with reference being made to the service being a lot more "personable".
- 5.14 Reference was specifically made to the availability of activities which contributed to Service Users' Individual Recovery Plans, something that was critical to the success of the proposed new model of Service delivery.

### Stanfield House, Stanley

- 5.15 Service users stated that they use Stanfield House as a base within which they can take up a range of “self help” services and that they can also increase their social networking.
- 5.16 Past experience had led to a degree of mistrust amongst service users. Specific reference was made to the recent closure of the Day Centre facilities at Beaconsfield House and the transfer of the service to a wing of Stanfield House. Users have expressed concerns regarding the absence of either short or long terms plans for the service and that this delay is having even greater repercussions for service users’ health and well-being.
- 5.17 Service users welcomed the provision of educational/learning courses at the centre, however these had now ceased for a three month period and no information had been given in the meantime regarding the availability of such activities through the third sector.
- 5.18 There were increasing concerns amongst the users of Stanfield House at what they continued to see as a process of managed decline within the Day Centre service. To their knowledge, new referrals were not being made into the service due to the temporary nature of the day centre facilities and the absence of the service plans referred to previously.
- 5.19 Service users also took issue with the reference to a dependency on Day Centre services re-iterating the point made by other service users that the Centres provided a vital mechanism for social networking amongst users.
- 5.20 A Carer representative stressed how the availability of the Day Centre service provided her with a valuable mechanism for respite as well as the added bonus for the service users of networking with other people.

### The Lighthouse Centres, Bishop Auckland (Henknowle Community Centre) and Spennymoor

- 5.21 Service Users at the Lighthouse Centres were concerned about continuing rumours circulating that the Bishop Auckland and Spennymoor services were to merge and that the Henknowle Centre was to close. These concerns had been exacerbated by the removal of transport offered to some service users to access these centres.



- 5.22 A number of Service users had stopped coming to the centres because of the difficulties in getting there and this added additional stress to their conditions. Service users were worried about whether the services would continue to be provided and also indicated that the absence of any firm proposals to this effect were also causing distress.

### ***The Consultation Process***

- 5.23 Service Users were unsure about what the proposals actually meant in terms of how the service would change and how this could impact on them.
- 5.24 Whilst service users acknowledged that staff had visited the Day Centres as part of the ongoing consultation exercise, they had reservations about the level at which the information was being pitched to service users. In service users' past experience, services that they perceived to be first class had been allowed to deteriorate and Day centres had been relocated often to the detriment of the services provided. This had an obvious effect on the health and well-being of some of the more vulnerable service users. A query was raised whether staff undertaking the consultation exercise have received training on giving presentations to a range of audiences as PowerPoint presentations are not always the best way of getting the message across.
- 5.25 There were concerns about whether any representations or views submitted by service users and carers would be taken on board as part of this process and how the information received by the Service as part of the exercise would be shared. Service users were interested in what other agencies and interested parties thought about the proposals.
- 5.26 As part of the ongoing consultation exercise, service users had asked about the business plan for and budgetary implications of the proposed service remodelling only to be told that it would be within existing budgets - but service users don't know what the existing budget is.
- 5.27 Service users suggested that the consultation process has been rushed and questioned if more information could have been circulated amongst service users in advance of the formal consultation period. There also appeared to be gaps in the consultation process with service user groups in Teesdale and Spennymoor not knowing about the proposals and the consultation process in general.
- 5.28 In conclusion, service users stated that they did not feel fully engaged in the consultation process and that more notice should be taken of service users' views when service changes/ improvements are being considered and ultimately consulted upon.

- 5.29 In response to a specific query regarding the involvement of the public in the ongoing consultation exercise, Service users were reassured that the process did include general public consultation sessions, the results of which would be fed into considerations at the end of the process.

### ***The proposed Service Changes***

- 5.30 The key concern of Service Users and Carers is the potential removal of the Day Centres as a focal point for service users to meet for group activities and social engagement. This coupled with the advice and support that they receive from staff based at the day centres are seen by users as critical to their recovery.
- 5.31 Service users are generally supportive of the move to Individual Recovery Plans and the use of these in identifying treatments and activities that will meet these plans and set Service users on the road to recovery. However these must be supplementary to existing day centres and not be seen as a replacement for them.
- 5.32 Service users have concerns that the proposed model places a large emphasis on service users accessing mental health services identified as part of their IRP's from third sector/voluntary groups. Users are not confident that the existing relationships between the County Council, the NHS Family and the third sector are sufficiently well developed at the current time to support the proposed new Community Recovery Service model. Accordingly, any failures in these relationships, coupled with a reduction in Day Centre activity, would have significant impact upon the health and well-being of service users.
- 5.33 Service Users have made reference to another service provision model which is known as the "clubhouse model" and operates in Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead. This is a Service user-led model which is operated and managed by service users with the support of Mental Health professionals. Service users would welcome the chance to examine this model as a potential for service enhancement.
- 5.34 Whilst welcoming the idea that service users will be encouraged to access group style activities, there remain concerns that the issue of stigma or abuse may continue unless sufficient support is provided to staff in the locations for this group activity if it is not to be in existing day centres.
- 5.35 Service users are keen to be involved in the development of Mental Health Day Services and are keen that they can help to shape future service provision. However, they are at pains to point out that the pace of such improvement must not adversely impact on the Mental Health and Well-being of existing service users.

## Evidence from the Countywide Forum

- 5.35 The representative from the Countywide Forum informed the Working Group that it is essential that the social engagement element of the Mental Health Day service is not lost. Whilst agreeing that day centres should not be “just somewhere to sit”, it was acknowledged that many service users currently accessed day centres to engage in meaningful activity in a social context. This activity was a vital element of their individual recovery.
- 5.36 He also acknowledged the benefits that could be achieved with the integration of the DCC In house Mental Health Day service with the third sector to increase the diversity of activities available to service users that would complement their Individual Recovery Plans. However he reiterated the fact that if the social engagement element of this activity was lost, then this could do irreparable damage to service users’ mental health and well-being.

## Evidence from MIND

- 5.37 The Working Group were advised that there were significant risks involved in what will be a period of transition for Mental Health Day services and service users. Key risks might include:
- Users dropping out of the existing service during this transitional period due to change-related stress
  - The absence of a robust communications strategy during the transitional period
  - The absence within the consultation exercise of any demographic information or projected service user numbers.
- 5.38 It was acknowledged that there are pockets of good practice across all Mental Health Service areas including the third sector. However there are issues regarding the level of resource available to third sector organisations to provide services as this often was dependent on their ability to generate income.
- 5.39 MIND has concerns that commissioners did not know the full picture in terms of the number, range and quality of mental health service providers in the third sector
- 5.40 The representative from MIND was fully supportive of the Individual Recovery Model, indicating that he was disappointed to hear that some service users had been regularly attending the day centre service over a period of 15-20 years. Nevertheless, he acknowledged the valuable “safety net” function of day centres when service users experience a relapse in their condition. In his view the proposed recovery model could enhance the levels of services delivered by the third sector provided that it could be demonstrated how greater integration between other elements of mental Health services could be achieved.

5.41 He also stressed that, for the proposed model to work effectively, it was essential that service users were able to feed their views into how services could be improved.

#### Attendance at Formal Consultation Events

5.42 Scrutiny Officers have attended a number of formal consultation events arranged by the Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate including:

- A Public consultation meeting held at County Hall, Durham on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009.
- A Service User and Carer consultation event held at the Glebe Centre, Murton on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

5.43 Observations and feedback from the events have suggested that the consultation meetings would have benefited from a “Frequently asked Questions” section with responses. The use of anonymous “case studies” to demonstrate how the new Community Recovery Service would operate would also have been useful.

## **Section Six – Evidence – Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate response to Public Consultation exercise concerns**

- 6.1 The Working Group met again on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 to consider the draft Review Report and preliminary findings. At this meeting, the Working group took the opportunity to receive additional evidence and information from the Adults, Well-being and Health Directorate regarding the Consultation process for the proposed changes to the Mental Health Day Services.
- 6.2 This was following the previous concerns that had been expressed by Service Users but also by the Light Touch Review working group based upon the lack of information contained within the consultation document about the specific dates, times and venues of the proposed consultation meetings with members of the public, users and carers.
- 6.3 The Group was advised that, prior to the formal consultation Adults, Well-being and Health service Management attended meetings at The Horizons Centre, Peterlee and Stanfield House, Stanley with service users to discuss the proposed changes. They also attended a meeting with Day Centre managers and a further meeting with the St Cuthberts Resource Centre, Chester-le-Street manager and her staff to discuss the proposed changes.
- 6.4 These discussions had been preceded by the Project Manager's work for over a year, with informal discussions with staff and service users, followed up by discussion at team meetings and at the managers meetings. At all of these meetings the proposed direction of travel, policy requirements, recovery model etc had been discussed.
- 6.5 The formal consultation process was developed in conjunction with the PCT Service User and Carer Engagement team after it was recognised by the Project Steering group that there was a need for a formal consultation process. Consequently, service user and carer representatives have been involved throughout. Planning meetings were held to design the consultation process. The consultation document was drafted and redrafted with service user and carer input and feedback, with input on content and format. Information has been made available in hard copy and electronic formats, with 700 hard copies being circulated, distributed to each current service user, stakeholders and partner agencies. The document was also sent to elected members and a Members Seminar was held in County Hall.

- 6.6 In line with service user suggestions sessions were timetabled and programmed to cover the key areas required. Specific issues have been raised by service users in Teesdale and their views are being fed into the process by the PCT, who have held a number of meetings with them. People from Teesdale were invited to the recent meeting in Murton and transport assistance was offered but it was recognised that travel was an issue. Unfortunately, the venue in Murton was the only one large enough to host a significant service user group. An additional meeting in Teesdale will also be arranged.
- 6.7 Also in line with service user requests, an experienced independent facilitator was used at the second event with them, drawn from the corporate community development service. At that session the planned programme was modified to allow for the consideration of some specific questions (over 20) developed by the service user and carer groups.
- 6.8 Regarding public consultation initially two public meetings were held, one in Bishop Auckland and one in Durham. When it became apparent that these had not been as well publicised and not as well attended as had been hoped, a further meeting was timetabled and a half -page advert ,in colour ,was placed in the Advertiser Series, in an effort to gain better attendance. The initial press release had been picked up by the Evening Chronicle and the Northern Echo but not by the Advertiser, hence the additional action to ensure wider coverage. Unfortunately, it did not have a significant impact on attendance by members of the public.
- 6.9 Members were advised that it was always part of the timetabled plan that all of the feedback would be collated at the end of the consultation period , analysed and then fed back to service users and stakeholders. In addition, as the presentations have progressed some of the "key messages received so far" have been added to give participants a flavour of the ongoing debate.
- 6.10 Regarding consultation with agencies / professionals, as part of the planned consultation, a session was provided for the TEWV NHS Foundation Trust integrated team managers which was badly attended. Subsequently, the Project Manager has attended each of their team meetings to discuss the proposals. Formal letters have also been sent to partner agency Chief Executives and senior managers bringing the proposals to their attention. Via the PCT, negotiations have been held with the GP practice groups about how they wished to be consulted and they rejected the offer of John doing presentations as they felt they would rather receive written information via their Practice Based Commissioning clusters.

- 6.11 Following the analysis of consultation feedback, the next steps will be to share the findings with service users and stakeholders, identify the implications and next steps then take a proposals paper to the Project Steering Group, then formally through management and elected member processes. Full risk / impact assessments will be carried out as part of this process along with the development of a detailed, SMART, implementation plan.
- 6.12 At every presentation reassurances have been given that there will be no closures, no sudden deadlines, that the pace of change will need to be handled very carefully, taken at the pace of individuals and based on their individual needs. The messages about vulnerability and isolation have been clearly heard during the consultation, with DCC County Durham Care and Support recognising the role which their services play in supporting people with Mental Health needs.

## Section Seven – Evidence – Visits to Day Centres

### The Lighthouse Resource Centre – Spennymoor

Feedback from visit on Friday 17<sup>th</sup> July by Cllr Brunskill and Jonathan Slee

#### THE BUILDING

- 1960's single storey building
- The inside of the building was very clean with welcoming and relaxed atmosphere
- DDA Compliant
- DCC property and is also used by a range of DCC Social Care Providers



*Car Park and entrance to the Lighthouse Resource Centre*

#### LOCATION



*View looking outward from the Lighthouse Resource Centre Car Park*

- Located on an Industrial Estate
- Approximately 1 mile from Spennymoor Town Centre
- Difficult to access by public transport
- Accessible Car park on site

#### FACILITIES



*Kitchen*



*Quiet Room/Lounge*

*Facilities include....*

- Open 9am – 5pm Tuesdays and Thursdays
- Mainly used for drop in sessions and signposting advice to other agencies
- In partnership with PCT, food nutrition sessions are carried out in the kitchen
- Lounge to hold one to one meetings with Service Users



## Henknowle Centre – Bishop Auckland

Feedback from visit on Friday 17<sup>th</sup> July by Cllr Brunskill and Jonathan Slee

### THE BUILDING

- 1960's single storey building
- Community Centre Resource Building
- Currently closed for Day Centre Activity due to Health & Safety
- Open and used as Community centre Venue for various clubs and groups



Entrance to Henknowle Resource Centre

### LOCATION



View of Henknowle Centre entrance and Car Park

- Located within a Community Setting
- Approximately 1 mile from Town Centre
- Difficult to access by public transport
- Accessible Car park on site

### FACILITIES



Kitchen & Lounge Area



Sports Hall

#### *Facilities include....*

- Large Sports Hall and Pool Table
- Kitchen / Lounge Area
- Quiet Room
- When open the venue is used for Day Centre activity on a Monday and Friday and mainly used as a drop in facility

## Horizons Resource Centre – Peterlee

Feedback from visit on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009 by Cllr Burnip and Stephen Gwillym

### THE BUILDING

- 1950's Multi-storey building
- The inside of the building was very clean with welcoming and relaxed atmosphere
- DDA Compliant
- Multi user property owned by a private company and leased by DCC



### LOCATION

- Located in Town Centre shopping centre
- Good access by Public Transport
- Car Parking adjacent to building

### FACILITIES



*Kitchen*



*Communal Lounge*

*Facilities include....*

- Open 9.30 a.m.-5.30p.m. Monday and Friday; 9.30a.m. – 7.30 p.m. Tuesday and Thursday and Sunday 2.00p.m.-6.00p.m.
- Other support organisations co-located in Lee House including C.A.B, Easington Carers, Easington Substance Misuse Initiative, Victim Support
- Drop in sessions but also used as a base for numerous group activities
- Thriving Art and Digital Photography Group

## **Fenwick Resource Centre – Seaham**

Feedback from visit on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009 by Cllr Burnip and Stephen Gwilym

### **THE BUILDING**

- 1950's multiple-storey building
- The inside of the building was clean with relaxed atmosphere although it is showing signs of wear and tear
- DDA Compliant
- DCC owned premises



### **LOCATION**



- Located in Town Centre close to nearby facilities
- Good access by Public Transport
- Car Parking adjacent to building

### **FACILITIES**



*Kitchen and Pool Table*



*Art Room*

*Facilities include....*

- Open
- Mainly used for drop in sessions with user profile predominately male
- Lounge areas with IT facilities, pool room and Art Room

## **Section Eight -Key Issues**

### **Existing Services**

- 8.1 Members have taken evidence from service users that highlights the significant contribution that day centre based group activities make to improving their mental health and well being. It has also been evident that where relocations have occurred in day centre activity, usage has suffered and service users have experienced a degree of anxiety during and after the change process.
- 8.2 The working group have heard concerns about the way in which service users can re-enter the service if, upon leaving the day service their condition deteriorates to such an extent that they need to reengage with the Mental Health Day Service. Service Managers have indicated that work has been undertaken to provide a network of emergency contact numbers for service users to re-engage with the Community Recovery Team.
- 8.3 There are concerns amongst mental health professionals that the current Day Service does not provide widespread services across County Durham to the extent that some service users' needs are clearly not being met under the current service model.

### **The Consultation Process**

- 8.4 Members have welcomed the opportunity to contribute to the Mental Health Day Services consultation process. During the course of the Light Touch Review process, a number of issues have arisen around the consultation process including:
- The information contained within the Consultation document
  - The extent to which service users have been consulted on the proposals and engaged during the review process
  - The future of the existing day centres and what will supplement these services within the proposed service model
  - How the results of the consultation process will be shared with service users prior to a decision being made on the proposed service changes.
- 8.5 In respect of information contained within the consultation document, there have been concerns regarding the business case for change and the absence of a project plan for implementation. However, it is acknowledged that these can only be drawn up, when the final proposals for improvement have been identified at the conclusion of the process.

- 8.6 Members have heard service users be somewhat critical of the extent of the public consultation exercise, including issues that some service users were not aware that the proposed changes to Mental Health Day services were being consulted upon.
- 8.7 Service users have raised issues regarding the way in which information has been presented to them during the consultation process, indicating that some people were still unclear about what was being proposed and how this would affect the services they currently receive.
- 8.8 There have been initial concerns about the robustness of the consultation exercise particularly given the absence within the consultation document of details of the public and service user consultation meetings including dates, times and venues. This coupled with a perceived lack of publicity regarding the consultation exercise has cast doubts about whether all parties are aware of the proposals.
- 8.9 The follow-up information presented by the Service Directorate at the session on 21<sup>st</sup> July has gone some way to alleviate the aforementioned concerns. However, in view of the fact that both the County Durham Local Involvement Network (LINK) and the Countywide User Forum have expressed their dissatisfaction with one of the Service User Events in particular, there may be an opportunity to address these concerns at a further meeting with that group.
- 8.9 In view of the concerns that have been raised during the course of the Review in respect of the Mental Health Day Service Consultation process, it is essential that lessons are learned about how future consultation processes can be managed to the extent that they are robust and inclusive.

### **Proposed Service Changes**

- 8.10 There has been a strong case made by the County Council's Adults Well-being and Health Day services Unit for a shift towards the tailoring of mental health day service provision to meet service users' needs identified within their Individual Recovery Plan.
- 8.11 Service Users are clearly concerned that the day centre facilities are under threat as part of the proposed service changes and that access to "centre-based" group activities will be lost. During the course of the Review, it has been stressed that where IRP's identify group based activities as contributing to service users' mental health and well-being that these will continue to be provided.

- 8.12 However this may not be based in existing day centres nor provided by DCC's In-house service. Accordingly, there are significant concerns about the risk of stigma or abuse towards service users where they access group based activities within alternative facilities as well as the need for appropriate staff training within such facilities.
- 8.13 Service users want to be involved in the consultation process and also in the implementation of any service changes. They are concerned that the changes may be implemented at such a pace that it could adversely affect some service users' health and well-being. They have sought assurances that no existing facilities would be removed without suitable alternative service provision being identified, in consultation with existing service users.
- 8.14 The proposed Service Model places emphasis on a shift from the in-house provision of day centre activities to the commissioning of such services from the "Third Sector". Concerns have been expressed to members that the relationships between Durham County Council, the NHS Family and the third sector may not be sufficiently developed to allow this shift to take place. As a result, there could be a significant adverse impact on the mental health and well-being of service users.
- 8.15 The proposed service changes make little reference to what will happen to the existing Day Centre facilities in terms of future capital and/or revenue implications. Whilst there have been numerous references to the review being solely based upon the development and improvement of Mental Health Day services and the importance of ensuring service users have access to one-to-one care plan development, it is nevertheless apparent that there will be an impact upon the existing buildings including their future use.
- 8.16 Service users have expressed significant concerns about how they would continue to access Day Services, particularly if they were to be provided in alternative facilities. Any proposed changes within the new Service Model must be risk assessed for transport implications including the cost of such provision.
- 8.17 Finally, Service Users have, as part of the consultation process, expressed a clear desire to be engaged in the assessment of the responses and information received. They are keen to be engaged in how this information is used to shape service improvements arising from the consultation exercise.

## **Section Nine – Response to the Consultation**

- 9.1 The Light Touch Review Working Group have formulated their response to the consultation process around two strands, namely:
- (i) The Case For Change
  - (ii) Service User experience of the Consultation Process,

### **The Case for Change**

- 9.2 The Working Group fully supports the shift in Mental Health Day Service provision to that of a Community Based Recovery Model which utilises 1to1 Individual Recovery Programmes (I.R.P.)
- 9.3 The Working Group acknowledges Service Users' continued desire for a "safe space/place" to be provided which enables individual and group activities so that social engagement can take place, where this is identified in I.R.P's. In supporting this, the Group recommend that the Adults, Well-being and Health directorate engage with service users to develop criteria for such "safe spaces" which would include DDA Compliance, Accessibility and fit for purpose.
- 9.4 The Working Group support the provision of a service-user led facility for group activity supported by Mental Health professionals along the "Clubhouse" Model which exists in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead.
- 9.5 The Working Group agree that there is currently an imbalance within existing Mental Health Day Centres in terms of existing usage levels and the range and quality of activities provided. This reinforces that need for improvements as identified within the consultation document.
- 9.6 The Working Group are pleased that the proposed service improvements are supported by NHS County Durham and the Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust. However, the review has highlighted the need for greater integration between all Mental Health service commissioners and providers when service changes are proposed and consulted upon.
- 9.7 The Working Group believe that the proposals will have an impact upon the staff capacity available to support the Community Recovery Service Model. They seek assurances that prior to any improvements being implemented, staff are fully trained to enable them to undertake their new roles and that staffing levels are sufficiently adequate to support the improved service.

- 9.8 Evidence has suggested that there still remains a degree of stigma attached to service users who access mental health day centres. In order to alleviate this, the Working Group wish to see a fundamental “re-branding” exercise accompany any service improvements developed from this consultation exercise with the emphasis placed upon **service improvements** rather than change.

### **Service User Experience of the Consultation exercise**

- 9.9 The Working Group believe that the consultation exercise has raised questions about how the Council communicates change particularly how Service Units reflect the Corporate approach to communicating change and engaging with service users when undertaking consultation exercises. Lessons need to be learned from the feedback received from those service users, carers and members of the public who have contributed to this consultation exercise. It has also been suggested that the Council work with its NHS Partners to produce a “standardised “ approach to public consultation which is based upon best practice and evolves with learning.
- 9.10 Service users have expressed a desire to be engaged in the process of analysing all responses to the consultation exercise. The Working Group urge the Adults, Well-being and Health directorate to facilitate this.
- 9.11 The Working Group would also support the engagement of Service Users and Carers in the development of new mental health day services arising from this process to demonstrate they will have an input into how their future services are designed and delivered.
- 9.12 The Working Group firmly believes that the pace of implementing service improvements is critical to the continues mental health and well-being of service users. It would therefore seek assurances that any service improvements would be implemented with the full involvement of service users at a pace at which they are comfortable.
- 9.13 In view of the comments received from Service Users, County Durham Local Involvement Network and the County Durham and Darlington Adult Mental Health Forum in respect of the Service User and Carer Consultation event held on 8thJuly2009, the Working Group recommend that this be repeated at the earliest possible opportunity.



## Section Ten – Written Evidence Submissions

10.1 The Working Group have received following written evidence submissions:

### **County Durham LINK**

“County Durham LINK Host staff and a number of LINK members attended the mental health service user event on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009. The feedback is as follows:

The presentation given to service users was very poor -it was difficult to see/read, difficult to understand and resulted in many questions being raised but not answered. In particular a question was raised about what other options had been considered instead of those proposed and the presenter was unable to answer the question. This resulted in a number of service users raising questions about the manager who delivered the presentation and their experience.

The feeling from service users was that a decision has already been made on the proposals and that this wasn't really a consultation as nothing would change as a result of the meeting.

The venue used for this event seemed to be fairly appropriate, although the break out groups were all in the same room so this would have made it very difficult for anyone with a hearing problem. There is also only one fire exit for people in wheel chairs.

A member of the LINK Management Committee attended the public event held on 19<sup>th</sup> May and gave the following feedback:

The event attendance by the public was very poor, around 5. A service user event had been held the day before and this was well attended by over 70.

The presentation was all around day services moving away from fixed buildings and out into the community to be delivered by existing staff. It was to be more accessible to all even in rural areas using local resources. The aim was to get those in the system back into useful employment or activities.

When pointed out that the present system catered for those unable to enter into a progressive system of getting back to employment, which the new system was, Durham County Council were unsure how these people would fit into the proposed system although they were considering how they would be catered for with other agencies. The carers' position was well put as these were very reliant on the resources of the present system to give some respite for them in looking after severely mentally impaired relatives.

The question was asked how many people were in day services now? This was around 250. If the service was to be rolled out and available to more was there enough staff to accommodate this and was the finance there. Both questions were answered by “the situation would be looked at when it happens and resources allocated then”.

The event on 8<sup>th</sup> July for mental health service users was held at the Glebe Centre in Murton which is a very difficult venue to get to if you don't drive. It was facilitated again by Durham County Council. On this occasion, the facilitator was patronising towards the service users and spent over 20 minutes clarifying a previously agreed agenda. This resulted in service users not being given the opportunity to break in to groups and raise additional questions as the time had been taken up by the facilitator. The facilitator also asked the audience to raise their hands if they had any special needs.

The overall feeling from this event was that it was very poor and that it should have been facilitated independently.

County Durham LINK is disappointed with how these events have been arranged and presented and do not feel that the consultation process has been robust enough.”

## Section Eleven – Additional Correspondence Received

11.1 Additional Correspondence in respect of the Light Touch Review of Mental Health Day Services has been received as follows:

- Adults, Well-being and Health directorate – Details of “Third Sector” Mental Health service providers with which DCC have Service Level Agreements
- County Durham and Darlington Adults Mental Health Forum – Letters dated 7<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- Questions and comments from Service Users and Carers at Stanfield House, Stanley and the Cuthbert Resource Centre, Chester-le-Street.
- Formal Consultation Letter prepared by Adults, Well-being and Health directorate on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2009 detailing key consultation events planned – This letter accompanied the consultation document when circulated to all service users.
- The formal Response to the Consultation exercise from the County Durham and Darlington Adult Mental Health Forum

## Section Twelve – Additional Information Required/Outstanding

12.1 The following information has been requested during the course of the Light Touch Review and is currently outstanding:

- Information relating to the current condition of the Mental Health Day Centre building stock.
- Details of the level of client throughput and usage at the Mental Health Day Centres
- The financial Implications of the proposed Community Recovery Service Model – **N.B. It has been acknowledged that this information will not be available until an Improvement Implementation Plan for Mental Health Day Services is produced.**
- Information relating to Councillor visits to Stanfield House, Stanley and The Cuthbert Centre, Chester-le-Street.