

ADULT SOCIAL CARE & HEALTH CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 52

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Adult Social Care Performance Report
Date of Meeting: January 22nd 2009
Report of: Director of Adult Social Care and Housing
Contact Officer: Name: Philip Letchfield Tel: 29-5078
E-mail: Philip.Letchfield@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: No
Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1. Adult Social Care services are performance managed through Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) within an established performance management framework. This includes:
- Inspections of specific services
 - A set of Performance Indicators published annually on a comparative basis (PAF)
 - An Annual self-assessment of performance (Self Assessment Survey)) to be completed by the Council.
 - Regular meetings with CSCI to discuss performance
 - An Annual Meeting to review the previous years performance; the outcome is a formal letter from CSCI summarising the overall performance in Adult Social Care, the Annual Performance Assessment (APA)
 - An overall star rating
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to inform the Meeting of the outcomes from the recent national reporting on Adult Social Care performance for the year 2007-08 by the CSCI and to seek approval for the improvement plan in relation to the Annual Performance Assessment.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the CMM notes the CSCI report
- 2.2 That the CMM approve the Improvement Plan

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 Star Rating

- 3.1.1 The star rating judgement is based on performance against the 7 service outcomes identified in White Paper 'Our Health Our Care Our Say' and two further domains introduced by CSCI, 'Leadership' and 'Commissioning/Use of Resources'.
- 3.1.2 In relation to the 7 service outcomes the Council was judged to be 'good' in relation to delivering 6 of these outcomes and 'excellent' in relation to the delivery of one outcome (Making a Positive Contribution). This is an improvement on the previous years performance when delivery against all 7 outcomes was judged to be 'good'.
- 3.1.3 In relation to Commissioning/Use of Resources the Council was again judged 'excellent'.
- 3.1.4 In relation to Leadership the Council was judged to be 'promising', the judgement had been 'excellent' in the previous year. CSCI have conceded that the Council is a 'strong promising'.
- 3.1.5 The outcome of these various judgements is that the Council has been judged to be 2 Star overall as against 3 Star in the previous two years.
- 3.1.6 The Council has taken the view that this judgement was flawed both in terms of the process and the content and made formal representations to CSCI. Although CSCI accepted some of the Councils evidence base and amended one of its judgements this has not been enough to shift the judgment back up to 3 Star status.
- 3.1.7 The CSCI Performance Summary report is attached at Appendix 1 and identifies the many key strengths that CSCI identified in relation to the Councils performance. It is important to note that a key element in relation to all these judgements is the strong and positive partnership working developed across the Local Health Economy.
- 3.1.8 The Summary also identifies key areas for development and the Council has drafted an improvement plan in relation to these. Appendix 2.

3.2 Performance Assessment Framework

- 3.2.1 The Directorate notes the improved performance in relation to the PAF data set. Improvement targets were achieved in nearly all the key indicators and the pace of improvement was above the national average in these.

Summary

	2006/07	2007/08 plan	2007/08 Out turn	Data source final validated SAS August 2008
Reviews	64%	70%	77%	Improvement 13% in B & H compared to average improvement of 5% in IPF and England.
Direct Payments Per 10,000	54	90	93	72% B&H improvement , compared to 39% for IPF and 50% for England
Timeliness of Assessments	78%	85%	87%	9% improvement, IPF 4% improvement England 3% improvement).
Timeliness of Services	82%	85%	90%	8% B&H improvement, compared to 2% average improvement in IPF/England.
Carers Services	7.5%	10%	11.5%	IPF improved 1.6% : England improved 1.4% : B & H 4%

3.3 National Trends

- 3.3.1 There are no Councils with zero stars, 19 Councils have 1 star status , 75 Councils are 2 star and 56 Councils are three star.
- 3.3.2 Seven Councils improved sufficiently to move out of the Priority for Improvement Councils.
- 3.3.3 Nearly 93% of 3 star Councils were good or excellent across all 7 outcomes.
- 3.3.4 There is some significant regional variation in the ratings.

3.4 Future Performance Management

- 3.4.1 The year 2007-08 was the final year of the star rating system. From 2008-09 performance will still be graded on each of the 7 service outcomes and there will be an ungraded assessment on the two domains which will feed into the Comprehensive Area Assessment.
- 3.4.2 The national regulator will change in April 2009 with the new Care Quality Commission taking on this role.
- 3.4.3 The final performance framework for 2008-09 has yet to be published.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 None

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 Financial Implications:

Adult Social Care performance rating has a major impact on the Councils corporate assessment. The Commissioning/Use of Resources outcome was judged excellent. The improvement plan sets out to reduce the higher than average unit costs within some areas of adult social care. The budget strategies adopted focus on the areas of high unit costs and the implementation of the Value for Money Reviews. Achievement of efficiency savings is monitored throughout the year.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Anne Silley
December 2008*

Date: 29th

5.2 Legal Implications:

The report summarises the recommendations of the 2007-8 CSCI inspection, while drawing attention to perceived flaws in both the process and content in the methodology used by CSCI. Nevertheless, the Improvement Plan sets out how the Council will continue to meet its statutory duties to service users to the best

of its abilities and in particular how it proposes to improve its performance in those areas where similar Councils appear to be achieving better results.

Lawyer Consulted:

Name Hilary Priestley

Date: 05/02 /09

Equalities Implications:

5.3 These are explicit in the CSCI Summary Report

Sustainability Implications:

5.4 None

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 None

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

See improvement plan

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.7 The social care judgement is a key element of the CPA judgement.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

6.1 None

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 It is a requirement of the regulations that the Annual Performance Report is presented in a public meeting of the Council.

7.2 The Improvement Plan is a key document in the national and local performance management of Adult Social Care.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. None

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

