

4 September 2012		ITEM 7
Health & Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee		
Adult Social Care Performance Monitoring Report		
Report of: Roger Harris – Head of Commissioning		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: No	
Accountable Head of Service: Roger Harris – Head of Commissioning, Les Billingham – Head of Adult Social Care		
Accountable Director: Jo Olsson – Director of People’s Services		
This report is Public		
Purpose of Report: To outline to Scrutiny Committee the new performance framework arrangements for adult social care and to report on the provisional performance of adult social care for 2011-12 and the first quarter of 2012/13.		

1. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.1 Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the report

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Since 2011, and the abolition of the Care Quality Commission (CQC) Annual Performance Assessment, there have been a number of changes made to the performance framework for adult social care. The key elements of the new approach to assessing and reporting on adult social care performance are set out in the Department of Health publication: ‘Transparency in Outcomes: A Framework for Quality in Adult Social Care’ (March 2011) and are summarised in the following section.

Adult social care performance for 2011-12 and quarter one 2012-13 are based on the new indicators from the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF).

3. THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

3.1 The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF)

The ASCOF is the new national framework of performance outcome measures for adult social care. The first full year of collection was 2011-12. The new framework has been introduced in place of the previous set of National Indicators.

The purpose of the ASCOF is to place a stronger emphasis on measuring the achievement of better quality outcomes for local people using adult social care; to support the development of Local Accounts (see section 3.3 below) by authorities and to enable benchmarking and comparison across councils.

The ASCOF is based around the following four outcome themes. Thurrock has adopted these outcome themes for our internal performance management and reporting.

1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs
2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support
3. Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care and support
4. Safeguarding people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from harm

3.2 Survey for Users of Adult Social Care and Carers

All local authorities who provide adult social care services are required to undertake an annual User Survey for adult social care. The format and questions are nationally set and the survey aims to provide a basis for benchmarked data on the experiences of users of adult social care services. Data from the survey informs six of the performance indicators in the ASCOF.

From 2012-13 there will also be a requirement to undertake a bi-annual Carers Survey which aims to capture the views and experiences of carers on the support they receive.

3.3 Local Accounts

The Department of Health have asked all local authorities who provide adult social care services to produce an annual report (known as a Local Account). This is a mandatory requirement for 2012-13 as part of the Adult Social Care performance framework.

Our Local Account will focus on our internal performance, the quality of services and the difference we are making to people's lives, the challenges and pressures we face and our future priorities and plans to address these.

In keeping with the broad aims of the new performance framework the Local Account will also aim to strengthen our local accountability and transparency to local people as a meaningful and accessible means of reporting on our performance.

Thurrock is currently developing its Local Account and we aim to publish by the end of this calendar year. The publication process will include engagement with our service users, carers and other stakeholders.

Health and Well-Being Scrutiny Committee are invited to consider and comment on the draft Local Account at its meeting in October / November.

3.4 A Sector-led Approach to Improvement and Performance (SLI)

Central to the new approach to assessing and reporting on the performance of adult social care is the emphasis on local authorities being accountable for their own performance and improvement. This is known as sector-led improvement (SLI).

The responsibility of developing the approach to SLI has been devolved to regions working closely with the Towards Excellence in Adult Social Care National Programme Board. Through the Eastern Region Improvement and Performance Group, authorities have been working to introduce its approach to SLI. While the final model is yet to be agreed, the following elements are emerging:

- Annual self-assessment and review
- Production and review of annual Local Accounts
- Good practice and service development events based on agreed priorities
- Shared regional performance indicators with in-year benchmarking







Thurrock has taken an active role in the development of this approach and will pilot the self-assessment model alongside Southend, Cambridgeshire and Norfolk during quarter two of this year. The self-assessment will also be used to support the development of our Local Account.

4. ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE 2011-12

2011-12 was the first full year of reporting on the new ASCOF performance outcome indicators. Comparative data is available for 14 of the 17 indicators in the ASCOF framework.

4.1 Performance headlines

The table below compares Thurrock's performance for 2011-12 against the national and our statistical nearest neighbour averages.

Compared to National Average	No of KPIs	Compared to Statistical Nearest Neighbours	No of KPIs
 Better	7 (50%)	 Better	8 (57%)
 Same	2 (14%)	 Same	2 (14%)
 Worse	5 (36%)	 Worse	4 (29%)

Compared to the national average Thurrock performs better on seven (50%) indicators and worse on five (36%). Compared to our statistical nearest neighbours Thurrock performs better on eight (57%) indicators and worse on four (29%) indicators.

Appendix two presents a more detailed table setting out Thurrock's performance for 2011-12 compared to national and our statistical nearest neighbours.

The inclusion in this report of provisional 2011-12 performance data is subject to a number of caveats. The data has been released by the Department of Health Information Centre under strict restrictions as to its use. At the time of writing the data remains unvalidated and is restricted in its use to management information purposes only. Final validated data will be published by the Information Centre in September 2012. The data presented in this report may therefore be subject to change as a result of validations.

5. ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE QUARTER ONE 2012-13

5.1 Adult Social Care Corporate Scorecard Indicators

Adult social care has four indicators in the council’s corporate balanced scorecard which is monitored on a monthly basis and reviewed at Directors Board and Cabinet.

Quarter one performance for these indicators is good overall and is summarised in the table below.

Indicator	11-12	Target	12-13 Q1	DoT	RAG
1C - % of social care clients receiving self-directed support	42%	60%	39%	↔	A
2A - Permanent admissions to residential care per 100,000 population (18+)	153	145	28	↑	G
2C - Achieving independence for older people through rehab/intermediate care	91%	91%	95%	↑	G
4B - % of clients who report that services / support help them feel safe and secure	82%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The current performance for indicator 1C % of social care clients receiving self-directed support is amber. As at the end of quarter one 39% of social care clients are receiving self-directed support. This means that performance has stabilised and is no longer improving at a rate sufficient to reach the year end target of 60%.

A performance improvement plan has therefore been put in place for this indicator and the service is confident that this will deliver the improvements needed to ensure the indicator meets the stretch and challenging year-end target of 60%.

Indicator 4B is currently shown as not applicable as this is an annually collected indicator and part of the ASCOF performance framework. The next survey is due for February 2013 with results reported in April 2013.

5.2 Adult Social Care Service Performance Scorecard

In addition to the national ASCOF performance framework, adult social care monitors a range of other ‘local’ performance indicators as part of our performance management arrangements. These indicators are aligned with the four outcome

themes described above and aim to enable the service to review progress against the key objectives within our Service Plan.







Performance is reviewed monthly at the Service Performance Group and quarterly at the People Services Directorate Management Team. The full scorecard for quarter one 2012-13 can be made available should members wish to see this.

5.2.1 Performance headlines

Overall performance for quarter one is good with the majority of indicators improving on the 2011-12 outturns and on track to meet their 2012-13 targets.

Of the 31 indicators that are comparable at the end of quarter one, 24 (77%) are meeting target. Five indicators (16%) are not meeting target.

Of the 33 indicators that are comparable at the end of quarter one, 18 (55%) are performing better than the 2011-12 outturn. Seven (21%) are performing worse than the 2011-12 outturn.

Performance against target	No of KPIs	Direction of travel compared to 2011-12	No of KPIs
 Met target	23 (72%)	 Better	19 (56%)
 Within tolerance	3 (9%)	 Same	7 (20%)
 Did not meet target	6 (19%)	 Worse	8 (24%)

5.3 Quality of care in external providers

Adult Social Care has a well established and robust approach to the monitoring of performance, risk and contract compliance within its externally provided residential and domiciliary support. This includes the regular monitoring and audit of providers based on a risk-proportionate approach with the focus on those providers for whom there are identified concerns.

Monitoring visits consist of unannounced, announced and out of hours visits. All providers are subject to at least an annual visit. Action plans to address identified issues are monitored in conjunction with the provider and, where necessary, the Care Quality Commission (CQC).

Currently only one provider is giving cause for concern sufficient to restricted services from us.

6. CONSULTATION (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

This report has been agreed with colleagues in the Corporate Performance team.

7. IMPACT ON CORPORATE POLICIES, PRIORITIES, PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT

The pressures faced by Adult Social are recognised within the Community Strategy and the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The three corporate balance scorecard indicators are reported to Directors Board and Cabinet on a monthly basis and the corporate risk for adult social care is reported to Directors Board and Cabinet quarterly.

8. IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mike Jones**
 Telephone and email: **01375.652772**
mjones @thurrock.gov.uk

The financial implications are covered within the body of the report

8.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Roger Harris**
 Telephone and email: **01375.652192**
rharris@thurrock.gov.uk

There are no specific legal issues arising from the report as this is just for members information and so no formal legal referral was felt necessary

8.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Roger Harris**
 Telephone and email: **01375.652192**
rharris@thurrock.gov.uk

There are no specific diversity issues arising from this report as this is just for members information.

8.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental

None.

Report Author Contact Details:

Name: Roger Harris
Telephone: 01375.652192
E-mail: rharris@thurrock.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Adult Social Care Performance Outcomes Framework (ASCOF): 2011-12 Outturns

Ref	Indicator	Thurrock 2010-11	Thurrock 2011-12	National Average 2011-12	Performance compared to National	Stat Neighbours Avg. 2011-12	Performance compared to Stat. Neigh
Outcome 1: Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs							
1A	% of social care users with reported good quality of life	18.6	18.4	18.7	S	18	S
1B	% of social care users who have control over their daily life	74.7	74.1	75.1	W	74.7	S
1C	% of social care clients receiving self directed support	35	42.1	43	S	40	G
1D	% of carers who report good quality of life	-	-	-	-	-	-
1E	% adults with LD in settled employment	5	3.6	7.2	W	6.4	W
1F	% adults receiving secondary mental health services in employment	13.8	11	8	G	6	G
1G	% adults with LD in settled accommodation	57	49	70.2	W	75.7	W
1H	% adults receiving secondary mental health services in settled accommodation	89	92	57.8	G	58	G
Outcome 2: Delaying and reducing the need for care and support							
2A	Permanent admissions to residential care per 100,000 population 65+	-	537.1	707.1	G	756.6	G
2B	Achieving independence for older people through rehab/intermediate care	-	92	82.6	G	82.7	G
2C	Delayed transfers of care per 100,000 population 18+	7.1	5.3	9.8	G	7.1	G
Outcome 3: Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care and support							
3A	% overall satisfaction of people who use social care services	59	61	62.8	W	63	W
3B	% overall satisfaction of carers who use social care services	-	-	-	-	-	-
3C	% of carers who feel included in discussion about the person they care for	-	-	-	-	-	-
3D	% of service users who find it easy to access information and advice	77.3	76.3	73.9	G	74.2	G
Outcome 4: Safeguarding people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from harm							
4A	% of service users who feel safe	64	60.3	63.8	W	65	W
4B	% of service users whose support/services make them feel safe and secure	85.5	82.5	75.3	G	74.2	G

Source: NASCIS, 2011-12 ASCOF Data.

Notes: Data is for restricted usage for internal management purposes only in line with NASCIS terms and conditions

Key: G(Green) = Better W(Worse) = Worse S(Amber) = Same/Inline