

# Mental Health Investment Fund

Page 89

Draft

Funding Applications and Investment Criteria.

# Introduction

## Purpose

The purpose of this paper is ask to Members to review and consider the proposed governance and principles for investment of the Mental Health Investment Fund as recommended by Officers of Surrey County Council Adult Social Care, Surrey County Council Children's Services, Surrey Heartlands ICS and other key stakeholders including Surrey and Borders Partnership Trust, Surrey Coalition, Surrey Children's Alliance and Surrey Mental Health Alliance.

## Context

- Page 90
- Surrey County Council made a commitment in its 2022/23 budget to invest an additional £7.9m in Mental Health (MH) service provision. This as a key area of focus, particularly given the unprecedented impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on mental health and emotional wellbeing.
  - The £7.9m is equivalent to the 1% increase in Council tax.. This £7.9m is made up of £1.4m of increased MH expenditure within service budgets and a **new £6.5m transformation investment** to encourage match funding from partners, including the health sector.
    - The £1.4m increased MH expenditure in service budgets was spread as follows:
      - £0.7m ASC MH care packages.
      - £0.3m ASC MH contracts & grants and MH staffing.
      - £0.3m MH services in Children, Families and Learning
      - £0.1m Public Health MH services
  - In addition to that Surrey Heartlands CCG agreed to pay a match funding contribution to SCC at 2021/22 year end of £4m which the Council received and has transferred to reserves to be draw down against agreed MH investments. **As such, the total amount available for investment is £10.5m.**



# Proposed Criteria & Principles

## Purpose

- Targeted funding for Early Intervention and Prevention.
- To support recovery and maintenance e.g. helping people back into employment, independent living.
- To support for example those experiencing family crisis or breakdown; impact of bereavement; ending of a relationship; homelessness, eviction or a period of insecure housing; moving to a new area and losing a support network; loneliness and social isolation; unemployment or loss of a job; poverty or problems with benefits; increasing use of drugs or alcohol and exposure to stress from other sources.
- To reduce demand on statutory services.
- To reduce long term costs the system will face in the future.
- To promote innovation for example use of technology, or peer support, or a series of interventions around a particular vulnerable group and that allows organisations to be creative in how they responded.
- To support the implementation of Surrey County Council Commissioning intentions, NHS Long term Plan and Health and Wellbeing Strategy Priorities.

Page 91

## Scope

- All Age Mental Health Services and Learning Disability and Autism.
- Those disproportionately affected by mental ill health e.g. BAME and other hard to reach groups and or marginalised groups.
- Primarily for VCSE however applications will be considered from existing partnerships including those with statutory agencies thus creating opportunities for matched funding.
- Multi-year projects recognising that benefits realisation may not always be immediate.
- To address any current funding gaps based on a systemwide understanding of current services.
- Increased appetite for risk - innovation versus transformation and recognition that investment into innovative service development may not always deliver the results required.

# Proposed Criteria & Principles

- **Finance**

- No upper limit per application to be set however each application must demonstrate high value impact.
- Applications should demonstrate how investments will deliver long term benefits for Surrey residents.
- Funding will be held in a dedicated reserve and only drawn down once investments have been approved through the agreed governance.
- As such there is no expectation that the full value of the fund will be spent in the first year.
- Successful applicants will sign up to an agreed delivery plan for their approved investment. Progress in delivery of these plans must be reported through the agreed governance process including benefits realisation. If a bidder fails to deliver the agreed milestones then their investment may be curtailed or in the worst case a bidder could even be requested to repay the investment if they completely fail to deliver the agreed objectives.

Page 92

- **How**

- By working with and through and with charitable partner organisations such as the Community Foundation for Surrey, or through direct application from larger voluntary organisations with access to charitable funds.
- By harnessing capacity such as through local communities through charities, the voluntary sector and local communities and work places.
- By promoting and enabling choice, control and independence.
- By attracting matched and charitable funding where possible.
- Through development of evidence building as well as evidence led service development.



# Proposed Governance

A new governance framework will be established, it will ensure that:

- There is Members contribution to deciding how it is spent.
- It will frame and guide without being prescriptive based on the criteria and principles agreed.
- Applications for funding requests are considered by a multi-stakeholder committee.
- Decision making is timely and effective.
- It will be agile with a clear audit trail of how funding is invested ensuring transparency.
- Flexible, simple and as streamlined as possible.
- Evaluation of new projects is undertaken with preference for consideration of the LOGIC model.
- Learning from other areas will be considered in its development such as the investment of COMF that considers nine criteria: summary of request; amount required to invest; who is accountable; timescales; what other funding has been invested; evaluation and sustainability.

# Discussion & next steps

Feedback from the HWB and Adults and Health Select Committee will be used to help shape final proposals for the Mental Health Investment Fund which will then be presented in a report to SCC Cabinet (and/or potentially Committees in Common).

- Democratic Services have advised governance arrangements of the fund to be taken for approval via either SCC Cabinet or Committees in Common to consider and approve the criteria, principles and governance arrangements of the fund.
- It would depend if the final decision making is planned to sit with members or with officers as we would need to seek a delegation to either a member or sub-group of Cabinet members such as CiC or an officer and not both. In terms of putting a delegation in place this would sit with the Leader and Cabinet for approval.
- If the decision making for this fund sat with CiC then it would cover the key decision part as this group has the authority to take decisions over £1m.
- Members are asked to consider and discuss the proposed approach in particularly:
  - How they would like to contribute to, and or be represented on the Mental Health Investment Fund Oversight Group, and future decision making with regard to Mental Health investment?; and
  - How they would like to be informed of outcomes through the agreed evaluation of individual projects?