

Box 1: Implications for future policy and practice

The study findings suggest a need for:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear strategic vision and leadership to ensure the success of the integrated model
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of the challenges of implementing transformational public health services and promoting collaboration in hostile economic conditions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity about the aims and intended outcomes of commissioning an integrated lifestyle service in the context of a need to tackle health inequalities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing on learning from existing research and practice with targeted groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investing time and resources in supporting change management processes with new and existing staff, to build coherence, ensure buy-in, shared values, feasibility and complementarity between all elements, and enhance 'fit' with existing services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A workforce that is sufficiently trained to implement an integrated service effectively and ensure the transition to new staffing roles and structures is managed appropriately
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient time built into the mobilisation and set-up time of the new service, especially across provider organisations, to ensure teams are working towards a shared vision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciation of the complexities of multiple providers delivering an integrated service, and commissioning and provider responsibilities being managed in the same organisation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of meaningful, co-produced and robust performance management systems linked to a shared understanding of what the service is aiming to achieve and what success looks like
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared performance indicators across providers to ensure fully integrated working, and quality assurance measures to ensure the outcomes of the model can easily be reviewed as a whole
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of effective tools to capture change over time and measure outcomes valued by communities themselves (e.g. gaining a sense of belonging, expanding social networks, building self-belief, etc)

Figure 1: Live Well Gateshead



Figure 2: Overview of the WFL service model



Highlights for Public Health:

- Single-issue lifestyle services have made little impact on health inequalities
- Evidence is limited on the practicalities of developing, commissioning and implementing integrated services which address multiple health and wellbeing issues simultaneously
- Adverse structural and contextual factors risk destabilising these fledgling services
- Progress has been undermined by ongoing austerity and cuts to public health budgets
- Commissioners require robust, timely evidence of impact that takes into account the particular needs of the target communities

Title: “It’s not a quick fix” Structural and contextual issues that affect implementation of integrated health and wellbeing services: a qualitative study from North East England

Authors: Mandy Cheetham^{1,2}, postdoctoral research associate (BSc Hons, PGDiploma, PhD) m.cheetham@tees.ac.uk

Shelina Visram^{2,3}, senior lecturer in public policy and health (BA Hons, MPH, PhD, PGCert) shelina.visram@durham.ac.uk

Rosemary Rushmer^{1,2}, professor in knowledge exchange and public health (BA Hons, PGCert, PhD) R.Rushmer@tees.ac.uk

Graeme Greig⁴, senior public health specialist (MSc Health Science, MSc Applied Positive Psychology)⁷ graeme.greig@durham.gov.uk

Emma Gibson⁵, public health programme lead (BA Hons, MSc) EmmaGibson@gateshead.gov.uk

Behnam Khazaeli⁵, service manager – Health and Social Care Commissioning and Quality Assurance (BSc, MSc) BehnamKhazaeli@gateshead.gov.uk

Alice Wiseman⁵, director of public health (BA Hons, PGCE, QTS, MPH) AliceWiseman@gateshead.gov.uk

Affiliations: ¹School of Health and Social Care, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, TS1 3BA, UK

²Fuse (UKCRC Centre for Translational Research in Public Health), Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE2 4AX, UK

³School of Medicine, Pharmacy and Health, Durham University Queen’s Campus, Stockton-on-Tees, TS17 6BH, UK

⁴Durham County Council, County Hall, Durham, DH1 5UZ

⁵Gateshead Council, Public Health Team, Civic Centre, Gateshead, NE8 1HH

Corresponding author:

Address: Dr Mandy Cheetham, School of Health and Social Care, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, TS1 3BA, UK

Email: m.cheetham@tees.ac.uk

Telephone: +44 (0)1642 345611

Fax: +44 (0)1642 342983

Word count = 3031 words

Table 1: Participant characteristics

Characteristics		Live Well Gateshead	Wellbeing for Life
Gender	Female	6	5
	Male	3	2
Role	Commissioner	2	1
	Provider	5	6
	Elected member	2	0
Employer	Local authority	7	2
	NHS Foundation Trust	2	2
	Third sector organisation	0	3
Total		9	7