

Committee: **Scrutiny Committee for Social Services and Health**

Date: **17 March 2005**

By: **Chairman of the Social Services and Health BVPI project board**

Title of report: **Best Value Performance Indicator Targets for 2005-2006**

Purpose of report: **To update the Committee on findings relating to specific BVPI targets for 2005-2006 and recommend further action**

RECOMMENDATIONS – that the Committee:

(1) approves the recommendations relating to targets for BVPIs 58, 195 and 196; and

(2) agrees to reconvene the board later in the year to consider interim reports on performance against the targets and report back to the November meeting of the Social Services and Health Scrutiny Committee.

1. Introduction

1.1 Member involvement in challenging performance is vital both to improve services and to improve accountability for the County Council's results. Both members and officers found the Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) review board sessions, held in 2004, to be informative in identifying and examining areas of poor performance.

1.2 A further key area where direct member involvement can be of benefit to service improvement is in BVPI target setting. The most recent Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) highlighted the setting of targets as an area to be addressed. Accordingly, each scrutiny committee has re-established a Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) board to:

- review a selection of BVPIs to help ensure that targets are sufficiently ambitious;
- “stretch” the department, being mindful of the key priorities of the Council and the available resources; and
- ensure that these targets are supported by robust action plans and monitoring arrangements.

1.3 The BVPI board set up by the Social Services and Health Scrutiny Committee comprises Councillors McPherson, Webb (Chairman) and Whetstone and met on 24 February 2005 to consider the targets for selected BVPIs.

1.4 To assist with the process, performance “front sheets” were used summarising the relevant information on each BVPI target and advice and detailed background information was provided at the board meetings by managers and scrutiny lead officers.

2. Review of Social Services and Health BVPI targets

2.1 The board scrutinised the targets set for the following BVPIs and set out below is a summary of the board's findings and recommendations :

(a) BVPI 58 – The percentage of people receiving a statement of their needs and how they will be met;

2.2 The board received the following information about target setting for this BVPI:

- This performance indicator aims to give an indication of how many service users are involved in planning their care packages. Service users are consulted on their detailed social care assessments/statements of need and, once the assessment is completed and agreed, they are given a summary to retain. The statement of need records, which are kept both on paper and in electronic format, should, therefore, show that all service users, aged 18 years and over, have been consulted and have an understanding of their care packages.
- It is likely that there is some under-recording because of the current two stage process of keeping both paper and electronic records. The department will be carrying out a case file audit to check the accuracy of current recording. The eventual introduction of the electronic social care record system (currently being piloted in one or two areas) will help to streamline the process and give a more accurate reflection of performance on this BVPI. However, much of the work behind this indicator (ie statements for people with mental health problems and learning disabilities) involves integrated teams with health and the difficulties of linking IT systems mean that it will be some time before it can be guaranteed that 100% of statements of needs are recorded.
- Consideration is being given to the production of a clear guide as to what constitutes a statement of need so that there is a common understanding amongst everyone involved and problems are pre-empted.
- The performance figures for earlier years were not accurate and the target set for 2003/04 was unrealistically high. The actual outturn for 2003/04 is a more accurate reflection of performance and the result of better recording. The target of 85% for 2004/05 is regarded as realistic and should be achievable.
- Following the meeting of the board, guidance was received from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister stating that this measure has been deleted as a BVPI because it does not measure outcomes. However, it is believed it will remain as a Department of Health PAF indicator for 2005/06 and therefore accurate record keeping will continue to be important.

2.3 Recommendations

- A. That all front sheets should include:
- a clear statement/guidance note setting out, very simply, exactly what the BVPI aims to measure.
 - direction of travel
- B. That the Acting Head of Community Services discuss the importance of accurate recording at the Joint Consultative Committee
- C. The department should consider improvements to the current processes eg ensuring that using Care First is made as straightforward as possible for staff recording statements of need; clarification of the wording in the statements and summaries and having one entry system for submitting the information electronically.

(b) BVPI 195 – Acceptable waiting time for assessment;

(c) BVPI 196 – Acceptable waiting time for care packages

2.4 The board received the following information about target setting for these BVPIs:

- Both BVPIs are fairly new and the targets have been set with the benefit of only one year's experience. It is proving difficult to obtain the appropriate information from the system. Whilst it is reasonable to measure the speed of assessment and delivery of care packages, the outcomes do not, of course, measure quality or satisfaction.
- Both BVPIs are also influenced heavily by financial and staffing resources, with BVPI 196 in particular, being susceptible to ever increasing demands, so scope for improvement is limited.

BVPI 195

- The target waiting time for assessment is 48 hours. To be able to respond to all referrals within this time would require an increase in the numbers of social workers and assessment staff. Introduction of a single assessment process will help, but ultimately requires mainstreaming across health and social care and the achievement of a satisfactory IT solution.
- Internal departmental target response times for older people and vulnerable adults are based on the perceived urgency of the situation eg level 5 is a 48 hour response, level 4 is within five working days, and level 2 and 3 referrals are responded to within 28 days.
- Financial resources continue to be an issue: vacancy control is in place so staffing levels are not necessarily at 100%. All vacancies are considered and prioritised by the departmental management team. If essential, relief staff are employed.
- The BVPI targets, with an increase of 5% year on year, are ambitious and should be reviewed. The Contact Centre will begin operation in 2005/06 and, as the single assessment process will have been in place for a year, more detailed information will be available.

2.5 Recommendation

A. The department should review the targets for 2005/06 and 2006/07 to ensure they are realistic in terms of performance and in the light of the budget restrictions and the difficulties outlined above.

BVPI 196

- 2003/04 was the first year for this BVPI. With the benefit of experience, a more realistic, albeit lower, target of 63% has now been set for 2004/05.
- The indicator stipulates a timescale of 28 days for the completion of assessments to the provision of all services in a care package. As these might relate to home care, day care or long term residential or nursing care it is not always feasible or desirable to achieve that timescale and at the same time ensure the long term needs and wishes of clients are met. In addition, capacity issues in respect of long term nursing care and home care mean that, even were budget not an issue, it would not be possible to achieve solutions for all clients within 28 days.

Recommendation

A. The department should report to the Scrutiny Committee with total numbers measured by

this BVPI and an accurate breakdown by type of care package of the percentages and numbers of clients.

B. All front sheets should show specific numbers as well as percentages of service users

3. **Future meetings of the project board**

3.1 The BVPI project board currently meets twice a year – in February to examine target setting, and in July to scrutinise performance. The board considered that it would be useful to meet again in approximately six months time to consider interim performance reports on all the BVPIs in the light of the budget and other constraints discussed at this meeting.

Recommendation

A That the new scrutiny committee, formed after the election, is recommended to set up a further meeting of the project board to scrutinise interim performance, in addition to the planned meetings in February and July.

COUNCILLOR TREVOR WEBB

Chairman, Social Services and Health BVPI project board

Contact Officer: Mary Hayler, Scrutiny Lead Officer (Tel: 01273 481796)

Local Member(s): All

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:
BVPI performance information

Background Information about Best Value Performance Indicators in the context of performance management at East Sussex County Council

Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) were introduced in 1997 as part of plans for local government modernisation. While BVPI results are annual, the complete life-cycle of a BVPI covers a two year period from consultation on the definition to the use of audited data.

Lifecycle of a BVPI

- The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) sets BVPI definitions after consultation with local authorities and publishes statutory guidance by March.
- The ODPM set national targets in the Government's priority areas and set out which BVPI targets are to be determined locally.
- Local authorities are then required to set targets for BVPIs (that are not new or nationally set) for the next three years.
- BVPI data is collected as per the definition between April and March.
- Chief Officers' Management Team, Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and County Council monitor data quarterly against those BVPIs in the Council Plan and in the Public Service Agreement and request detailed performance reports to enable them to tackle performance issues at an early stage.
- By June, outturn BVPI data and audit trails are put together and outturns are published in the Council Plan together with three-year targets
- The Internal Audit team check our compliance with definitions on BVPIs identified as 'high risk'. Departments carry out a self assessment of compliance with the definition and performance against targets to determine which BVPIs are high risk. Internal Audit also take into account those identified by the Audit Commission as high risk and that have previously been 'qualified' because the data reported was not considered to be robust.
- Audit Commission carry out an external audit of data between July and September. This verification of results enables auditors to check that data has been calculated according to the set definition and enables local authorities to compare results nationwide. If the Audit Commission have doubts about our data then they may place a 'reservation' on a result. Through a process of moderation this reservation may be lifted if the auditor is satisfied or the reservation may result in a 'qualification' which means that our data does not meet the definition and will be automatically placed in the bottom quartile. Final audited results are published in December and quartile positions for the previous financial year's data are determined. The quartile positions are published in a compendium to allow national comparison of service provision. In setting targets, we need to have regard to our duty to achieve continuous improvement.

BVPIs in the context of the Council Plan

The Council Plan is the high level business plan for the County Council that sets out the key priorities for the coming year. It has been developed in line with the reconciling policy and resources process and sets out targets, actions and measures to be achieved. It is supported by departmental, unit, team and individual plans. The measures in the Council Plan include BVPIs and also local indicators that are monitored quarterly by exception report at Chief Officers' Management Team, Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and County Council.

BVPIs in the context of the Public Service Agreement

The local Public Service Agreement (PSA) is between East Sussex County Council and the Government and is supported by East Sussex Strategic Partnership. The PSA covers the period April 2003 to March 2006. The Government has paid the partnership pump priming money to achieve enhanced targets. If the enhanced targets are achieved, the partnership will receive a performance reward grant.

There are 13 Public Service Agreement targets, 12 of which are clearly labelled in the Council Plan under the appropriate portfolio and another, referred to as the 'cost effectiveness' target, which is made up of 26 separate sub-targets. Performance measures are a mix of BVPIs and local indicators. The PSA is monitored quarterly by Chief Officers Management Team, Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and County Council.

BVPIs in the context of Comprehensive Performance Assessment

There is a national Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) framework for all local authorities incorporating judgements about core services and council ability to improve. In December 2003, East Sussex County Council was judged as 'Good'.

All BVPIs that contributed to the CPA December 2003 score are shown in the Council Plan and listed below. Receiving a qualification or not submitting a BVPI result has a detrimental impact on BVPIs that contribute to our CPA score. BVPIs where no information is returned, are scored at zero percentile; qualification results in a score of 25th percentile, ie lower quartile. Once BVPI results have been audited they contribute to the refresh of the CPA score in December.

Service	No. of BVPIs	Definition	BVPI No.	Raw Scores 2002/03	Percentile Dec 03	Average percentile	Overall score 1 = poor 4 = good
Planning	2	% major applications within deadline	109a	46%	not provided	43%	2
Planning		% satisfied with planning service	111	77%	43%		
Transport	6	Condition principal roads	96	1.35%	86.0%	45%	2
Transport		Condition non-principal roads	097a	53.4%	1%*		
Transport		Road safety - killed/injured	99	68.00%	90.0%		
Transport		satisfied - public transport info	103	48%	45%		
Transport		satisfied - bus services	104u	44%	33%		
Transport		% crossings/disabled facilities	165	58.6	18%		
Waste	4	waste recycled/composted	082a+b	19.7%	100.0%	67%	4
Waste		% waste landfilled	082d	78%	85%		
Waste		kg waste/head	084	517.91	46%		
Waste		satisfied civic amenity sites	090C	71%	37%		
People	8	women in senior management	011a	35.14%	68%	52%	3
People		ethnic employees in senior mgt / pop	11b/17b	21.28%	54%		
People		sickness absence	012	9.23	41%		
People		early retirements	014	0.56%	29%		
People		ill health retirements	015	0.22%	91%		
People		disabled employees/popln	016a/b	1.20%	25%*		
People		ethnic employees/poln	017	73.89%	78%		
People		% buildings with disabled access	156	7.95%	34%		
Financial Admin	1	% invoices paid in 30 days	008	79.80%	23%	23%	1
Libraries	3	users who found books	118a	51%	4%	38%	2
Libraries		users who found info	118b	78%	69%		
Libraries		Satisfaction with libraries	119b	69%	42%		

There is a new CPA framework proposed for 2005 which will focus more on community leadership, financial management, value for money and procurement.

For further information, contact Charlotte Thackray, Strategic Performance Manager (01273 482122).