BCF 2016/17

Scheme Review West Lancashire

Guidance

- The intention of the review is to tell the story of each scheme's development, delivery and impact.
- Where there is quantitative evidence this should be highlighted.
- Where there is no quantitative evidence this should be explained
- Where qualitative comment is given this represents the LA or CCG's view.
- Each scheme is to have its own review slides completed.
- Any narrative to be kept brief, bulleted if appropriate and original i.e. not copied from scheme description.
- The logic model should reflect the planned and actual . An example logic model is provided separately.

Summary

| Scheme Title | £s in 2016/17 |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| Building the Future Together | 4,967,000 |
| Total | 4,967,000 |

Building for the Future

Original rationale for scheme.

Vision of community services that includes: Single point of Access Care co-ordination MDTs and integrated Neighbourhood Teams Mobile working IT solutions Shared Record and Risk Stratification Clinical councils and co-design Bespoke outcomes framework incorporating patient voice and co-design Integration with out of hospital urgent care, VCFS, NWAS, Social Care, Mental Health and Primary Care with collective accountability across whole system

| Primary prevention | Hospital | Community | Secondary prevention |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| Support to stay safely and happily at home? | Avoidance and discharge? | Support to return home, reablement and recovery.? | Stabilisation, maintenance, rebuilding resilience. Self care? |
| х | x | X | X |

Building the Future Together

Activity during 2016/17

| Scheme element | Planned activity | Actual Activity | Reason for any difference between planned and actual |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Procurement of Model Vision | Procurement of Community Services | Successful bidder mobilisation November 2016 and 'Go Live' May 2017 | N/A |
| Rapid Response Team (CERT) | Continue activities to step patients down and wrap care around people to enable them to stay at home | CERT successful in step down and Step up. Worked with Social Care provider to provide support within 2hr and prevent admissions | Some capacity issues due to long term sickness within the Team. |
| MOFD meetings at Trust | Multidisciplinary meeting to discuss all patients fit for discharge | MDT meetings held every week | Reviewing all patients takes time, decided to reduce list to longest delayed patients. |

Building For the Future

| Barriers / Challenges to successful delivery | Managed by |
|--|---|
| Interdependency with S&F CCG procurement | Moved 'go live' date to 1 st May to enable incumbent work with two new providers and transition |
| Risks | Managed by |
| Political interest due to move of services from incumbent to independent provider. | Communications strategy |
| Due diligence information incomplete | CCG support to incumbent |
| Premises/lease transfers | CCG Estates Manager co- ordinating transfer |

Building for the Future

| | Alignment with High Impact Change Model of Transfers of Care | Yes= X | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-----------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Early discharge planning. | | | | |
| 2 | Systems to monitor patient flow. | x | | | |
| 3 | Multi-disciplinary/multi-agency discharge teams, including the voluntary and community sector. | Х | | | |
| 4 | Home first/discharge to assess. | х | | | |
| 5 | Seven-day service. x | | | | |
| 6 | Trusted assessors. | x | | | |
| 7 | Focus on choice. | | | | |
| 8 | Enhancing health in care homes. | | | | |
| Alignr | ment with Plans | | | | |
| Urgent and Emergency Care | | | | | |
| A&E Delivery Board | | | | | |
| Opera | Operational plan (s) | | | | |
| Other | | х | | | |

Building For The Future

| Estimated impact | A reduction of? | Details | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| NELs | - 10.42% | The model includes existing services which will be enhanced from 2017/18 onwards, however these services have been impacting NELs already. For Example AVS and CERT | | | | |
| DTOC | Local estimated WL figures – DTOC <8 patients per month | Although the number of DTOC patients continues to be small for West Lancashire, there was an increase in the length of delays for some patients. There were issues discharging from intermediate care and short term packages onto long term packages of care. CERT capacity was also stretched which impacted ability to step patients down to intermediate care or home. The SPA and move to Care co-ordination should improve discharge in future years. | | | | |
| Residential Admissions | | This data is not available at Wets Lancashire Level. | | | | |
| Effectiveness of reablement services | | | | | | |
| How will future impact measured? | | | | | | |
| Impact will be measured from 2017/18 by: Reduction NELs Reduction in admissions for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Bed Days Reduction in Excess Bed Days for patients over 60 years. | | | | | | |
| PROMs will be developed through the I | ife of the 5 year | contract | | | | |

Scheme logic model

| Inputs | Activities | Outputs | Outcomes | Impact |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Risk Stratification | Develop one patient record Set up monitoring of at risk patients Link to Care co- ordination and Urgent Care | Identifying at risk patients Shared records | Patients managed at Home Pro-active care not reactive Better management of at risk groups | Admission avoidance Better patient experience |
| SPA | Response centre set up Care navigation set up Signposting Referral routes Processes | One number and one referral route for all community services | Clarity and simplicity for referrers One point of contact Co-ordinated response | Admission avoidance Better patient experience Better experience for stakeholders Simplified access to care services |
| Care Co-ordination | Develop care co- ordination hub | Resource allocation Multi-disciplinary input Rapid intervention for deteriorating patients Planned discharge processes | Patients managed at Home Pro-active care not reactive Better management of at risk groups | Admission avoidance Better patient experience |
| Integrated Neighbourhoods | Set up locality teams Determine role of Specialist nursing teams Set up MDTs | Management of at risk patients Joined up care/seamless care | Patients managed at Home Pro-active care not reactive Better management of at risk groups | Admission avoidance Better patient experience |

Learning from delivery of the scheme

| Learning | How shared and who with ? |
|--|---|
| Procurement experience learning shared with other CCGs | C&SR CCG and Liverpool CCG |
| CERT management and in-reach to Intermediate Care beds helps to avoid admission and manage patients back to community | Internal and with other CCGs who have approached CCG for Learning |

Qualitative assessment summary 1–10 where 1 is "not at all" and 10 is "to a great extent".

| | Is working as planned and delivering on outcomes | Represents value for money in the long term | Builds long term capacity for integration locally; enables new models of health and social care | Evidently supports people effectively, improving patients /service user satisfaction | Has buy in from all stakeholders and workforce: Frontline staff and political, clinical, managerial leaders | Reflects a truly whole system approach | Supports shift towards prevention/ early help and community support/ self -help | Total / 70 |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|---------------|
| Building for the future | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 65 |

Summary

| Scheme Title | Retain ? X | Expand? X | Cease ? X | £s in 2016/17 | £s in 2017/18 |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Building for the future | X | | | 4,967,000 | 5,056,000 |
| Total | | | | 4,967,000 | 4,967,000 |