

Children and young people's mental health crisis guidance

CCG self-assessment overview

July 2017

Supported by and delivering for:

With Public Health England





SUPPORTED BY

London's NHS organisations include all of London's CCGs, NHS England and Health Education England

Overview

- Healthy London Partnership published <u>Children and Young People's Mental Health Crisis Guidance</u> in October 2016.
- CCGs are asked to complete self-assessment template:
- Rag rate (Red, Amber, Green) their current position against 7 recommendations in the guidance.

KeyGreenRecommendation is metRedRecommendation is not met and to date no plans are in place that will help meet itAmberPlans in place to meet and working toward achievements of the recommendation

- Provide comment against the recommendations including barriers to implementation, support required and action plan in place to meet/maintain compliance.
- Responses from all 32 CCGs in London received. Two STP area responses.
- For ease of presentation responses split into STP areas.
- Range of rag rating across CCGs in each STP areas recorded.

Self-assessment responses

| Recommendation 1: Meeting previously defined standards: | NWL | NCL | NEL | SWL | SEL |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Implementation of London MH Crisis Commissioning Guide with a focus on CYP in line with HLP CYP Acute Care Standards | | | | | |
| Baseline audit undertaken against the guide/standards | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2: A Safety and Coping Plan for all CYP: | | | | | |
| A written plan which has been produced with the child or young person and their parents/carers and shared with them to create | | | | | |
| a child, young person or family-held record | | | | | |
| The safety and coping plan has been developed and is readily accessible when needed electronically | | | | | |
| Recommendation 3: Working towards a 24/7 service | | | | | |
| - In hours | | | | | |
| - 7 days a week | | | | | |
| - Every evening | | | | | |
| Pathways for CYP requiring further inpatient physical or mental health care have been jointly developed and include protocols | | | | | |
| for managing delays in admission/transfer to specialist beds | | | | | |
| Pathway is consistent with the all-hours pathway in HLP CYP Mental Health guidance | | | | | |

Summary of responses

1. New crisis care pathway/service specification being developed in NWL. An extended hours nurse led service proposal developed for implementation across NCL. UEC Network Vanguard/Crisis pilot and working towards a 24/7 crisis/home treatment team across NEL.

Barriers – Awaiting national guidance. Implementing a new model across an STP is a significant undertaking. Differing resource pressures across CCGs. Recruitment to additional posts.

2. Safety and Coping Plans (SCP) are operational across trusts but are not used consistently for every known CYP with a mental health condition. Some examples of electronic SCP on trust patient electronic systems but they are not accessible by other mental health system partners.

Barriers – Difficulties with current IT systems, interoperability and information sharing governance. Resource available to review plans.

3. Lots of variation in availability of services although SWL reported they are fully compliant in this area. NCL plan for an extended hours nurse led service in evenings, weekends and bank holidays. Three CCGs in NEL reported a 7 day and out of hours crisis care system in place and three other CCGs report gaps in 7 days and OOH service. A real difference in SEL opening times which could lead to confusion: One CCG reports an in hours service 9am-5pm with free crisis support line available 24/7. One CCG reports in hours as 8am-7pm. One CCG reports in hours as 8am-10pm (7 days) and SpR rota (9pm-8am). Three CCGs have an out of hours service 7 days a week. One CCG has a core service 9am-10pm weekdays/Saturdays (on call psychiatrist will come to hospital at other times).

Barriers – Clinicians on out of hours rota may have limited paediatric experience. Significant resource required to extend services and pilots have shown little need for full OOH crisis only service. Consistency of approach across providers. Finding inpatients beds.

Self-assessment responses

| Recommendation 4: Effective governance | NWL | NCL | NEL | SWL | SEL |
|---|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----|
| Reports to Health and Wellbeing Boards and CCGs | | | | | |
| Local assurance through CAMHS transformation planning oversight groups | | | | | |
| Activity analysis including reports from the Mental Health Services Data Set | | | | | |
| Collecting data on waiting times and delays for assessment, treatment and transfer | | | | | |
| Monitoring of non-adherence to follow-up appointments following an episode of crisis care | | | | | |
| Defining the role of the Multiagency Safeguarding Hub | | | | | |
| Exception reporting and serious incidents | | | | | |
| Experience and voice of CYP and their families/carers via friends and family and participation groups or by other methods | | | | | |
| Assessment of the effectiveness of safety and coping plans through clinical audit | | | | | |
| Incorporation into local Mental Health Crisis Care Concordat structures | | | | | |
| Recommendation 5: Sign-off and publish clear local guidelines | | | | | |
| A clear, accessible guideline developed for each interaction between an acute hospital, mental health provider trust and local authority that are providing care for CYP who present in crisis up until their 18th birthday | | | | | |
| Recommendation 6: Education and training | | | | | |
| All staff who engage with CYP receive the necessary education/training to provide safe and effective clinical and emotional | | | | | |
| care, including training for mental health staff in increasing physcial health skills and vice versa | | | | | |
| Local training needs analysis has been undertaken by providers | | | | | |
| Recommendation 7: Health Based Place of Safety (specifically for CYP on a s136 pathway) | | | | | |
| Identification of an adequate/accessible HBPoS for CYP who present in crisis to police & brought to healthcare facility on s136 | | | v | | |

Summary of responses

4. Most CCGs reported a robust governance structure but there are some notable gaps in particular in relation to monitoring of nonadherence to follow-up, experience and voice of CYP and families and assessment of the effectiveness of SCPs. One CCG did report that Trust had listened to feedback on friends and family test and installed iPads in waiting areas.

Barriers – Access to data on MHSDS, data quality and gaps (Tier 4) and limited capacity of trusts to audit.

5. Some CCGs already achieved this recommendation whereas others working towards.

Barriers – Current infrastructure makes developing an accessible guideline for every interaction challenging.

6. Lots of example provided of training in place, planned or being piloted. Some examples of physical health staff being trained in mental health but no examples of mental health staff being trained in physical health.

7. Variability in availability of HBPoS for CYP across London. SWL, NWL and individual CCGs have clearly identified/defined HBPoS whilst other CCGs reported the HBPoS as being the local A&E.

Barriers – Availability of approved mental health professionals with CYP experience, capacity/layout of A&E and insufficient resource.

Next steps

Support commissioners/providers implement the Healthy London Partnership Children and Young People's Mental Health Crisis Care guidance recommendations:

- Develop and roll out of a pan-London safety and coping plan (physical and electronic) for CYP.
- Establish and run a peer review process against Healthy London Partnership guidance and national crisis care guidance with a focus on the children and young people mental health crisis pathway.
- Support development of credible delivery plans for local pathways including crisis and section136 as part of Local Transformation Plan process.
- Develop an education/ training programme for all clinical staff who engage with CYP (funding dependent).

This programme of work will be overseen by the Healthy London Partnership Children and Young People's Mental Health Crisis Steering Group and Healthy London Partnrship's Children and Young People's Mental Health Implementation Group.