

<p align="center">Essex County Council Health Overview Policy & Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) and People and Families Policy and Scrutiny Committee (PAF)</p>
--

This form is a tool that should be compiled at the start of each inquiry to set out clearly the aims and objectives of the committee's involvement in a particular matter and will be completed at the end of the inquiry to confirm what has been achieved. It is an iterative form; and also acts as an audit trail for a review.

WHAT ARE WE LOOKING AT?

Review Topic	Mental Health Services for Young People
Type of Review	Joint Task and Finish Group

WHY ARE WE LOOKING AT THIS?

Rationale for the Review	<p>At its meeting of 10 May 2022, Full Council passed a motion to ask the relevant scrutiny committees to undertake a review of mental health services for young people.</p> <p>This matter falls under the remit of the Health Overview Policy and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) and the People and Families Policy and Scrutiny Committee (PAF). This review will lead by HOSC, and a report will be provided back to Council by the end of 2022.</p> <p>This area links to <i>Everyone's Essex – Our Plan for Levelling Up the County: 2021 – 2025, including Children and Families and Promoting health, care, and wellbeing for all ages.</i></p>
---------------------------------	--

WHAT DO WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE?

Indicators of success	<p>What would you wish to see happen as a result of the review?</p> <p>Scrutiny to report back recommendations on how they feel this issue could be addressed.</p> <p>What value can scrutiny bring to the review?</p> <p>Scrutiny can draw on the experience, knowledge, and insight of councillors. Scrutiny can bring a fresh perspective to the issue and take time to consider the services available for young people needing mental health support.</p> <p>Why do you think the desired outcome is achievable?</p> <p>The review is being properly scoped and is supported by the Cabinet Member and key officers.</p>
------------------------------	--

HOW LONG IS IT GOING TO TAKE?

Timescales	Review to be completed by and reported back to Full Council by the end of 2022
-------------------	--

Provisional Timetable	July 2022 – December 2022
WHAT INFORMATION DO WE NEED?	
Terms of Reference	To review: Mental health services for young people
Key Lines of Enquiry	<p>Understanding the current situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify what services are currently available in Essex relating to mental health support for young people • Identify the services that are currently commissioned by Essex County Council • Whether there is anybody being left behind and what is being done to address this <p>Referral Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The referral pathways currently available and how service users navigate the system and whether there are any pinch points within these <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify how outcomes and successes are measured and whether there is any follow-up to these <p>Healthwatch Essex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand how Healthwatch Essex are engaging with Youth Ambassadors
What primary/new evidence is needed?	TBC
What secondary/ existing information is needed?	What have other councils done? Is there any good practice to draw on from elsewhere?
What briefings and site visits might be relevant?	TBC
Other work being undertaken/Relevant Corporate Links	TBC
What is inside the scope of the review?	North-East London NHS Foundation Trust (NELFT) Essex County Council Healthwatch Essex

What is outside the scope of the review?	TBC
WHO DO WE NEED TO CONTRIBUTE/CONSULT? (INITIAL MEETING TO ESTABLISH THIS)	
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s) and other Member involvement	Cllr John Spence, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care Cllr Beverley Egan, Cabinet Member for Children Services and Early Years
Key Officers	Chris Martin, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Policy (C&F) Emily Oliver, Head of Strategic Commissioning and Policy
Partners and service users	North-East London NHS Foundation Trust (NELFT) Healthwatch Essex
WHAT RESOURCES DO WE NEED?	
Lead Member and Membership	
Co-optees/Other Invites (if any)	
Lead Scrutiny Officer/Other	Richard Buttress, Democratic Services Manager
Expected Member commitment	To be concluded by the end of December 2022
WHAT ARE THE RISKS/CONSTRAINTS?	
Risk analysis (site visits etc.)	Risk management form to be completed if any site visits are included as part of the review
Possible constraints	To be determined, if any
WHAT WILL BE REQUIRED FROM STAKEHOLDERS?	
Internal stakeholders	Their time to attend Task and Finish Group meetings Information and advice Communications for any potential press release following the review
External stakeholders	Potential time commitment of co-optee Their time to attend Task and Finish Group evidence sessions
WHO ARE WE DIRECTING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TO?	
Recommendations to (key decision makers):	This to be compiled during, and following the review
Reporting arrangements	Task and Finish Group final report to be presented to Full Council by the end of December 2022
Follow-up arrangements	Outcomes to also be monitored by the Scrutiny Board.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/NOTES	
Meeting dates (provisional)	TBC

LESSONS LEARNT/SCRUTINY EVALUATION

To be completed in an end of review Workshop* (align to findings of Scrutiny Survey to be attached as an annex). This form should be used in the evaluation of the process adopted by the Scrutiny review Committee/Task and Finish Group and will be used to inform future Scrutiny Reviews.

**Evaluation workshop at the end of the review will typically involve Committee Chairman/T&F chairman, other T&F group members, scrutiny officer, topic proposer and key stakeholders (if applicable)*

DATE OF REVIEW EVALUATION:	
1. Organisation & Planning	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approach used? Proposed and actual start/completion dates: Was the time allocated adequate?	
2. Resourcing	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was officer time/resource adequate for this review?	
3. Evidence sessions/site visits	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
4. Stakeholder and Communications	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
5. Report and Recommendations	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was the purpose of the review achieved? Has there/is there likely to be any influence on service delivery as a consequence of the review?	