

Agenda item:

Committee:	Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee
Date:	22 September 2005
By:	Chairman of the BVPI Project Board
Title of report:	Scrutiny of departmental performance in Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) Indicators
Purpose of report:	To update the Committee on findings relating to specific PAFs and recommend further action

RECOMMENDATIONS –

The scrutiny committee is recommended to accept and note the report from the project board. Further discussion by the project board to consider future BVPI targets should take place in January 2006

1. Introduction

1.1 A project board was established in June 2005 to review the performance of service areas within the remit of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee. Judgement on how well the services areas are doing was measured through an examination of the PAFs within its remit.

1.2 To assist with the process, performance ‘front sheets’ were used summarising the relevant information on each PAF. These highlighted such things as performance in East Sussex against its targets and comparison with other local authorities.

1.3 The project board comprised of Councillor Barry Taylor (Chairman), Councillor Sylvia Tidy and Councillor Olive Woodall. The Board were supported with information provided by the Performance Manager from Adult Social Care, the acting Corporate Performance Manager and the Scrutiny Lead Officer.

1.4 The scrutiny board met twice and focussed their questioning on areas of performance looking in particular at whether selected PAFs;

- showed poor performance against targets;
- showed either actual performance or targets in the lower quartile compared to other local authorities;
- critically affect the Council’s overall CPA score.

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 The scrutiny committee is recommended to accept and note the report from the project board. Further discussion by the project board to consider future BVPI targets should take place in January 2006.

Councillor Barry Taylor, Chairman of the Project Board.
Board members: Councillors Sylvia Tidy and Olive Woodall

Contact officer: Roger Howarth, Scrutiny & Best Value Co-ordinator
Tel: 01273 481327. email: roger.howarth@eastsussex.gov.uk

Appendix A - Outcome of the Boards review of Performance Assessment Framework Indicators

Outcome of the Boards review of Performance Assessment Framework Indicators.

1.0 The Board was presented with a list of the PAF indicators within the Adult Social Care Department. From this list several indicators which were causing concern in terms of performance or recording were highlighted for specific investigation.

At their initial meeting the Project Board examined the following PAFs and noted the subsequent points:

C30 Adults with learning disabilities helped to live at home (per 1,000 population aged 18 to 64)

Changes in the definition of this indicator over the last couple of years had resulted in the target being revised up and down. Performance over the last year had dropped and it was recognised that significant activity would be required to improve performance.

Agreed – indicator to be monitored as part of the standard quarter monitoring report.

C62 Carers Services

This was a new indicator and it was recognised that in terms of monitoring there could be some difficulties for practitioners in determining who should be counted as a beneficiary, ie the client or the carer

Agreed – indicator to be monitored as part of the standard quarter monitoring report.

D54 Percentage of items of equipment and adaptations delivered within 7 working days

Performance had improved significantly over the last couple of years but still fell short when compared to other local authorities.

The Board asked to look at benchmarking information on other local authorities and the suppliers they used. They also asked that consideration be given to revising this target upwards.

D55 Acceptable waiting times for assessments

Performance had dropped since last year and it was now in the Audit Commission 'investigate urgently' banding.

It was noted that there were issues around the complex recording required and the service standards in terms of practice, ie if the risk involved was lower

than critical. If it was found that clients in the lower risk categories were pulling down performance it might be that a shift in policy was required.

Members asked for further information on action being taken to address the issues raised.

E50 Assessments of adults and older people leading to provision of service

Performance was decreasing and the indicator had been highlighted this year by the Inspectorate. The target of 28% for 2005/06 had been set on the basis of the anticipated outturn for 2004/05 which, in the event, had been better than expected

The Board requested a report back as their next meeting regarding what actions were being taken to improve performance.

2.0 At their subsequent meeting the Board sought clarification on the points previously raised:

D54 Percentage of items of equipment and adaptations delivered within 7 working days

It had been difficult to find comparative information from other Local Authorities and the information that was provided had to be done so anonymously. ESCC was one of the lower performance authorities with regard to this target, but it was recognised that:

- Performance was continuing to improve, currently at 73%
- The ESCC contract with Nottingham Rehab Services had begun later than other authorities and it was therefore felt that our performance would continue to rise as the contract bedded in

The Board also noted that it would never be possible to reach 100% with this target as there would always be some items that would not be held in stock or had to be specifically made for the client, which meant that they would not be available within the 7 day target.

Members were informed that the contractor did carry out customer satisfaction surveys once equipment had been supplied. Generally the issues raised related to communication issues around agreed delivery times and incorrect/substitute items being delivered, rather than delays in delivery.

Agreed - this target did not need to be revisited unless there was a downturn in the current trend.

D55 Acceptable waiting times for assessments (Clients aged 65+ only)

This indicator represented the average of two calculations: the speed of response from first referral to the time of assessment; and the time taken from

the initial contact to the end of the assessment. It was the latter which was currently pulling down performance.

To meet these concerns a Social Care Direct (SCD) Team had been established to deal solely with all initial contacts/referrals. This meant that (as with call centres) one telephone number would be in operation, although the style and approach would be much more customer focussed. As a result, the whole process would be speeded up and it was anticipated that performance on this PAF indicator should show improvements over the next three months.

The recording process across the physical disability teams will also be reviewed. Currently an assessment may pass between an Occupational Therapy Assistant and an Occupational Therapist and the way in which this is recorded lengthens the time between the initial contact and completion of assessment.

Agreed - this indicator would be considered through the standard quarter monitoring report received by the Scrutiny Committee in March to consider if the work of the SCD Team had improved performance.

E50 Assessments of adults and older people leading to provision of service

Concern had been raised with regard to the 70% of people who had had an assessment but not received a service as a result of this. The breakdown of figures indicated that:

- 26% had resulted in no further action being taken
- 38% had resulted in the cases being closed
- 28% had resulted in their cases being kept open, but with no additional provision being made
- 21% of the clients assessed had an outcome reason of 'Self Funding'

It was anticipated that the new Social Care Direct (SCD) Team process would obviate unnecessary assessments because better information would be elicited at that initial stage and the appropriate advice given.

Agreed - this indicator would be considered through the standard quarter monitoring report received by the Scrutiny Committee in March to consider if the work of the SCD Team had improved performance.

3.0 The Board asked that the list of the Adult Social Care Performance Assessment Framework Indicators be updated to indicate which PAFs were also Best Value Performance Indicators and Key Threshold Indicators (KTIs)

4.0 The Board noted that the following PAFs had been removed from the Adult Social Care list:

- PAF B13 (unit cost of residential and nursing care for older people) -

experience had shown that it was difficult to compare like for like in respect of residential and nursing care costs

- PAF E61 (number of assessments of new clients aged 65 or over, per 1000 population aged 65 or over) – little added value was to be obtained by monitoring the numbers of assessments of clients aged 65 or over

The Project Board.
September 2005