

Subject:	Shadow Health & Wellbeing Board (SHWB) In-Year Review/Peer Review		
Date of Meeting:	30 May 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, People		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Giles Rossington	Tel: 29-1038
	Email:	Giles.rossington@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 As part of the process of learning during the shadow year of HWB development (2012/13), officers supporting the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board (SHWB) intend to commission an in-year review of the effectiveness of shadow HWB arrangements.
- 1.2 SHWB members have expressed an interest in aspects of this review process, including posing questions about the timing of the review and the type of review to be undertaken. This paper therefore addresses these issues and proposes a preferred option for the review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Health and Wellbeing Board:

Agrees the preferred option outlined in this report for an in-year review of the effectiveness of the shadow HWB (summarised at point 3.11 of this report).

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 **Timing.** The Health & Social Care Act (2012) requires all relevant local authorities to have a Health & Wellbeing Board in place by April 2013, and the Department of Health has strongly encouraged authorities to have shadow arrangements in place from April 2012. Having a shadow year offers the opportunity to test the effectiveness of local HWB arrangements, and if necessary alter them prior to April 2013.

- 3.2 In an ideal scenario, an in-year review would typically be held towards the end of the shadow year in order to draw on as much experience of operating the arrangements in question as possible. However, this is likely to pose problems in terms of the HWB work programme for 2012/13. Although strictly speaking the shadow HWB has no decision-making powers, the Board's Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) will inform real commissioning decisions in the current financial year and in 2013/14. Agreeing the JHWS is *the* core HWB activity and it is therefore important that any in-year review process feeds into the JHWS decision-making. A review which took place after the JHWS had been agreed could clearly not influence this year's JHWS and would therefore potentially represent a significant lost opportunity, not just in terms of 2012/13 but 2013/14 also.
- 3.3 There is therefore a compelling argument for holding an in-year review at such a time that its findings can be used to influence the JHWS. However, for the JHWS to be effective it in turn needs to influence city council and NHS commissioning decisions for 2013/14 – there is little chance that the JHWS priority outcomes will be achieved if they are not reflected in city commissioning plans for the coming year. For the city council, the timetable for setting a budget for 2013/14 requires options for spending and savings plans to be available by September 2012 in order to publish a budget update and savings report in late November/early December and a final budget in late February/early March. We can therefore realistically agree the JHWS for 2013/14 no later than September 2012, which would require any in-year review to take place over summer 2012.
- 3.4 Holding an in-year review in the summer of the municipal year in question might appear to risk wasting learning opportunities from the greater part of the year. However, in this instance this is unlikely to generally be the case since:
- The formal establishment of a local SHWB on 01 April 2012 was preceded by more than a year's preparatory and engagement work which has informed the SHWB Terms of Reference and work planning around the JSNA and JHWS processes and pathways. In essence therefore, in-year review of the SHWB will seek to map all activity to date (across around 18 months of development), not just the formal activities of the Board from 01 April 2012. Viewed in this context, a summer review does not appear particularly unbalanced.
 - Decisions not to seek early adopter status for the SHWB and to delay the publication of the JSNA until spring 2012, have meant that the JHWS pathway for 2013-14 has had to be truncated, resulting in work which would naturally be spread across the year being concentrated in the early months of the 2012-13 municipal year. Therefore, whilst a summer review would be early in terms of the SHWB meetings schedule for 2012-13, it would not be particularly early in terms of the substantive work of the SHWB for this year, which, in contrast to succeeding years, is very much concentrated in the early months of operation.

- 3.5 This would also fit with the timetable for reviewing the Council's new constitutional arrangements. Although it would be possible to alter the Terms of Reference of the SHWB at another point (by taking a report to Policy & Resources Committee and Full Council), it is clearly desirable to use the constitutional review process to manage as many changes as possible in a coordinated way.
- 3.6 At the shadow HWB pre-meeting, the idea was mooted of having an additional shadow board meeting in the summer. Although this would be possible, it is unclear what the business of this meeting would be. In practical terms it would not be feasible to move forward agreeing the JHWS scheduled for the September shadow HWB meeting, as officers require as much time as possible to work up detailed business cases for the draft priorities to be presented at the September 2012 Board meeting. This work could not feasibly be undertaken in time for a meeting in, say, July. It is therefore unclear whether adding a SHWB meeting would add any value to the development of a local HWB.
- 3.7 **Type of Review.** There are several options for the type of in-year review we might choose. These range from an in-house review to the use of external consultants. The option that officers have thus far pursued in detail is that of a peer-review, facilitated by an external partner. Peer review (e.g. gauging our HWB preparations against those of another local authority at a comparable stage of development) has several advantages: it allows us to compare ourselves against a real organisation, facing similar obstacles, rather than against a more or less abstract 'model' of good practice; it enables SHWB members to share learning with their direct counterparts in another area: not just elected members, but also public representatives, CCGs and chief officers; in pragmatic terms, it also means that we can share any costs with our peer-partner. Any costs that do arise will be met from the existing budgets controlled by the chief officer members of the SHWB: there is no requirement for additional funding.
- 3.8 Other types of review have their advantages, but also considerable drawbacks. An in-house review would potentially be the cheapest option, but it is unclear whether we have the necessary expertise to conduct an effective review of such a novel initiative. An external consultant might provide expertise, but inevitably at a high cost. Using an organisation such as the Local Government Association (LGA) to facilitate review might be a possibility, but LGA plans to offer such a services are still at a nascent stage of development.

- 3.9 Officers have identified an external partner to facilitate the in-year review should SHWB members agree. That partner, OPM (Office for Public Management), is a mutual company specialising in working with central and local government and 3rd sector organisations. OPM is being employed to assist in the development of a number of HWBs, largely in the London area. OPM has identified a peer-review partner for Brighton & Hove: Wandsworth. Whilst perhaps not an obvious partner in ideological terms, Wandsworth is a reasonable comparator in terms of size, demographics, and crucially, HWB development. If this option were to be chosen, the plan, broadly speaking, would be to bring members of both shadow HWBs together in July to share experiences and discuss their expectations of the HWB. In tandem with this, officers would meet to have detailed discussions about HWB planning, putting together a JHWS etc. The results of this process would then be collated and analysed by OPM and used to inform the further development of the HWB in both areas.
- 3.10 Endorsement of the preferred option of facilitated peer review in summer 2012 would not preclude further *internal* assessment of the effectiveness of the shadow HWB arrangements at a later point in the year (for instance using the Good Governance Institute's Board Assurance Toolkit for HWBs). It should therefore be possible to use both early stage peer review and later stage internal review to inform, as thoroughly as possible, the development of a robust model for the statutory HWB.
- 3.11 In summary, therefore, the preferred in-year review option is for an externally-facilitated peer review to take place in time for result findings to feed in to the process of setting this year's JHWS (i.e. to report by September 2012).

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 No formal consultation was undertaken in preparing this report.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The proposed timing of the review will enable the JHWS to feed into the developing budget strategy for 2013/14 and 2014/15

Finance Officer Consulted: Anne Silley
18/05/12

Date:

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert

Date: 15/05/12

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 In-year review of the SHWB will include focus on equalities groups – seeking assurance that robust arrangements are in place for reflecting the views of all city communities and that the draft Joint Health & wellbeing Strategy takes into account equalities issues, as well as the core HWB duty to seek to reduce health inequalities.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 None identified.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 None identified.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 In-year review of the operation of the SHWB is intended to mitigate the risks inherent in developing a statutory HWB by identifying areas where working practices could be more effective. The peer review approach identified as the preferred option offers particular benefits in that it reviews our approach against that of a real comparator authority rather than a theoretical model of best practice.
- 5.7 Although 2012-13 is a shadow year for HWBs, in-year HWB decisions about the JHWS will impact upon city council and CCG/PCT commissioning plans for 2013-14. It is therefore incumbent upon the SHWB that its initial JHWS is as effective as possible. To the degree that an in-year review can help mitigate these risks, it will need to be timed to inform the publication of the JHWS: that is, to report by September 2012.
- 5.8 There is a risk that, in holding an in-year review at a relatively early point in the year, the opportunity is missed to learn from activity throughout the shadow year. However, this could be mitigated by internal learning, and is relatively speaking, a lower order of risk than those relating to the fitness-for-purpose of the JHWS.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.9 The core business of the SHWB is to ensure that key city public health issues are effectively addressed and that reducing health inequalities is prioritised. An in-year review could be a useful tool in assuring that these aims are being met.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 The SHWB brings together the city council, healthcare commissioners and representatives of city residents in order to undertake high level planning for city health, public health and adult and children's social care services. The SHWB seeks to improve efficiency and offer better value for money by encouraging better partnership working in key areas via the city JHWS. An effective JHWS supports council and partner priorities to reduce health inequalities and improve the health of city residents. An in-year review process which maximises the

efficacy of the JHWS will therefore support the corporate and citywide health priorities.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

None

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

None