

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Oral Health Promotion

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### Why we consulted?

Over the last four years we have had to make savings of £23m because we've received less money from central government. We have done this by becoming more efficient at what we do, by reducing some of our administrative functions and increasing our income. Throughout this period we have done our best to protect front line services.

We now have to find another £20m over the next four years, with almost £11m to be found in 2016/17. Much of this will come from further efficiencies within the council, but £4.6m will have to come from services that will impact the public.

In order to inform the budget setting process for 2016/17 we published a list of those proposals which would likely have a direct impact on service users, and sought the views from those affected and interested:

- to understand the likely impact
- to identify any measures to reduce their impact
- to explore any possible alternatives

#### Approach

All the proposals were published on the council's website on 3 November 2015 with feedback requested by 14 December 2015. Respondents were directed to a [central index page](#), with a video message from the Chief Executive outlining the background to the exercise.

Information relating to this proposal was linked directly from this index page. This contained more detailed information on what was specifically proposed, information on what we thought the impact might be, as well as what else we had considered in developing and arriving at this proposal. Feedback was then invited through an online form, and through a dedicated email address.

Each individual budget proposal was placed on our [Consultation Portal](#) which automatically notified those registered that an exercise had been launched. Members of the West Berkshire community panel (around 800 people) and local stakeholder charities, representative groups and partner organisations were also emailed directly, notifying them of the exercise and inviting their contributions.

Heads of Service made direct contact with those organisations affected by any of the budget proposals prior to them being made publically available.

A press release was issued on the same date, as well as publicised through Facebook and Twitter.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Oral Health Promotion

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### Background

The Oral Health Promotion service consists of three elements:

1. The Brushing for Life scheme encourages the adoption of oral health promoting behaviours in children, namely brushing with fluoride toothpaste, reducing sugars intake and attending dental check-ups
2. The Smiling for Life scheme is designed to promote good nutrition and oral health in Early Years settings and by Childminders to address poor oral health in 0 to 5 year olds
3. Training of care home staff in oral health promotion for residential, nursing care and special schools

It is proposed to decommission the service with an annual saving of £24,000.

#### Summary of Key Points

There were no responses from individuals to this consultation. There was a response via detailed letter from both the Newbury and District Clinical Commissioning Group and the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust. Both organisations raised concerns regarding the proposed cuts to preventative services such as oral health. The Newbury and District CCG are keen to work with the Council to ensure the best services are available to maintain population health and wellbeing, in the face of current financial constraints.

#### 1. Are you, or anyone you care for, a user of this service?

There were no responses from individuals to this consultation.

#### 2. What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people?

The Newbury and District Clinical Commissioning Group raised concerns regarding proposed cuts to preventative services, including oral health. They stated that prevention is one of the main priorities in the NHS Five Year Forward View and the West Berkshire Health and Wellbeing strategy.

The Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust was concerned that the proposed reduction in oral health services may have an impact for children and their services in terms of having to provide care for dental extractions.

#### 3. Do you feel that this proposal will affect particular individuals more than others, and if so, how do you think we might help with this?

There were no responses to this question.

#### 4. Do you have any suggestions as to how this service might be delivered in a different way? If so, please provide details.

There were no responses to this question.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Oral Health Promotion

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

5. **Is there any way that you, or your organisation, can contribute in helping to alleviate the impact of this proposal? If so, please provide details of how you can help.**

The Newbury and District Clinical Commissioning Group are keen to work with Council partners to ensure the best services are available to maintain the local population health and wellbeing. Individuals from the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust are happy to be part of any further consultation exercise.

6. **Any further comments?**

There were no responses to this question.

### Conclusion

There were no individual responses to this consultation. However, the Newbury and District Clinical Commissioning Group did state that the proposed cuts to preventative services, including oral health, would be of concern given that prevention is one of main priorities both for the NHS Five Year Forward View and the West Berkshire Health and Wellbeing strategy. In addition, the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust raised concerns regarding the impact on their service provision in view of the potential for increased numbers of dental extractions.

**Please note:** *In order to allow everyone who wished the opportunity to contribute, feedback was not sampled. Therefore this wasn't a quantitative, statistically valid exercise. It was neither the premise, purpose, nor within the capability of the exercise, to determine the overall community's level of support, or views on the proposals, with any degree of confidence.*

*The feedback captured therefore should be seen in the context of 'those who responded', rather than reflective of the wider community.*

*All the responses have been provided verbatim as an appendix to this report. Whilst this summary seeks to distil the key, substantive points made, it should also be read in conjunction with the more detailed verbatim comments to ensure a full, rounded perspective of the views and comments are considered.*

Sarah Rayfield  
Speciality Registrar in Public Health  
Public Health and Wellbeing Team  
8 January 2016  
Version 1 (CB)