



ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
5 JUNE 2018

PROVISIONAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2017/18

JOINT REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND
DIRECTOR OF ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to present the Committee with an update of the Adults and Communities Department's performance for the year 2017/18.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

2. The Adults and Communities Department's performance is reported to the Committee in accordance with the Council's corporate performance management arrangements.

Background

3. The metrics detailed in Appendix A of the report are based on the key performance measures of the Adults and Communities Department for 2017/18. These are reviewed through the annual business planning process to reflect the key priorities of the Department and the Council. The structure of Appendix A is aligned with the Vision and Strategy for Adult Social Care 2016-2020, '*Promoting Independence, Supporting Communities*'. This strategic approach is designed to ensure that people get the right level and type of support, at the right time to help prevent, reduce or delay the need for ongoing support, and maximise people's independence. This 'layered' model has been developed to ensure the obligations under the Care Act 2014 are met and Appendix B of the report outlines the four central aspects of the Strategy – Meet, Reduce, Delay, and Meet needs.
4. The Adult Social Care indicators are a combination of national and local measures. At a national level performance is monitored via the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF). The Communities and Wellbeing service area does not have such a formal structure for performance monitoring at a national level. The measures included in this report have therefore been determined as local indicators.
5. Performance figures are classed as provisional at this stage as the source data for the metrics is currently being compiled, with the signed-off version to be published by NHS Digital in the autumn. However, the final performance figures are not expected to vary greatly from those included in this report, and will be presented later in the year alongside national benchmarking.
6. Progress against targets is highlighted using a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) system and Appendix C sets out the description of each category.

Performance Update: April 2017 to March 2018

7. Appendix A includes four key measures to reflect each of the four layers of the Vision and Strategy. Each of these monitors the proportion of new contacts from people requesting support and what the sequels of these requests were. Overall there were 28,100 new contacts during 2017/18, a reduction of over 5,000 on the previous year. Whilst this is a 15% reduction it should be noted that previous years have been high, in part due to recording practice based on a broader interpretation of the definition of a contact. The latest position brings Leicestershire in line with other East Midlands authorities.
8. The proportion of new contacts during 2017/18 resulting in a preventative response such as universal services or signposting was 58%, slightly lower than target bandwidth but similar to the previous year. A further 18% resulted in a response relative to reducing need such as providing equipment or adaptations and 12% resulted in a response relative to delaying need, i.e. the provision of a reablement service that supports people to relearn the skills required to keep them safe and independent at home. Finally, 11% resulted in a long-term service such as a personal budget.
9. The overall number of visitors to heritage sites during 2017/18 was similar to the previous year. The Century Theatre, 1620s House and Garden, Harborough museum and Melton Carnegie museum have all had increased visitors whilst Bosworth Battlefield and Charnwood museum have both seen reductions.
10. There has been a national downward trend in the number of visits to libraries, including those in Leicestershire. As such, the 2017/18 targets (referred to in Appendix A) were agreed with this in mind. During 2017/18 there were 980,000 visits to Leicestershire libraries, just short of the target and lower than the previous year. This reduction was primarily during February and March when the poor weather may have had an effect. Whilst there were fewer visits compared to the previous year, the number of loans were 2% higher during 2017/18.
11. An additional two libraries metrics are included to reflect the priorities around children's loans and e-loans. During 2017/18 more than 590,000 children's loans were made; a 2% increase on the previous year. With regards e-loans, these continue to show a marked increase – over 139,000 during 2017/18 compared to 77,000 during the previous year.
12. The Leicestershire Adult Learning Service (LALS) performance relates to the proportion of learning aims due to be completed in a period successfully achieved. For the academic year 2017/18 the current success rate is 95%, in line with the previous year and on track to surpass the 86% target.
13. Volunteering programmes are a priority for the department in relation to libraries, museums and heritage services. During 2017/18 there were more than 24,000 hours of volunteering, similar to the level during the previous year.
14. The nature of accommodation for people with learning disabilities has a strong impact on their safety, overall quality of life, and reducing social exclusion. One of the ASCOF indicators monitors the proportion of service users aged 18-64 with a learning disability who are in settled accommodation and not in a care home.

Performance in 2017/18 was 80% which met the target and was similar to the previous year.

15. ASCOF 1E measures the proportion of adults with learning disabilities who are receiving long-term services and are in paid employment. There is a strong link between employment and enhanced quality of life, including evidenced benefits for health and wellbeing. Performance in 2017/18 (11%) remained as high as the previous year which was in the top quartile nationally.
16. Reducing delayed transfers of care from hospital is a national priority and monitored through the Better Care Fund (BCF). The national methodology changed for 2017/18 to use the average number of days people have been delayed per month. During 2017-18 there were, on average, 188 days lost per month due to delayed transfers specifically attributable to adult social care. This is 60 days per month less than in 2016/17 and well within the BCF target. Compared to fifteen similar shire authorities Leicestershire's recent performance is ranked second best.
17. During 2017/18, 80% of people who received reablement support had no need for ongoing services following the intervention. This level of performance is similar to last year when it was classed as being in the second highest quartile nationally.
18. A key measure in the BCF is the ASCOF metric which measures the proportion of people discharged from hospital via reablement services who are still living at home 91 days later. Performance is based on discharges between October and December and during 2017/18 the proportion still living at home 91 days later was 86%; similar to last year although slightly short of the target. Performance is monitored through the year on a rolling three-month basis and for seven of these periods performance was above target. Furthermore, there is little difference year-on-year of performance in relation to the October to December period – mid-high 80%, and just below the national top quartile.
19. Avoiding permanent placements in residential or nursing care homes is a good indication of delaying dependency. Research suggests that where possible, people prefer to stay in their own home rather than move into permanent care. During 2017/18 there were 38 admissions, nine more than the previous year. This is higher than the preferred target level although more than likely will remain a better performance than the national average.
20. For people aged 65 or over the number of permanent admissions in 2016/17 was higher than the national average in the third quartile. During 2017/18 the number of admissions increased by a further 56, pushing performance above the target. The increase in admissions needs to be considered against a backdrop of an increasing older population which rose by 2% during the past two years. Despite this, the rate of increased admissions will likely mean performance remains higher than the national average.
21. The County Council remains committed that everyone in receipt of long-term, community-based support should be provided with a personal budget, preferably as a direct payment. During 2016/17, the ASCOF measures relating to service users and carers were all above the national average with the proportion of service users in receipt of a cash payment (55%) in the top quartile. Performance in 2017/18 has

remained similar although a small reduction in service user personal budgets will be due in part to inaccurate data recording rather than actual practice.

22. There were 1,500 safeguarding enquiries completed during 2017/18; 15% more than in the previous year.
23. Developing a safeguarding culture that focuses on the personalised outcomes desired by people with care and support needs who may have been abused is a key operational and strategic goal of the Care Act. Of the 1,500 safeguarding enquiries completed in 2017/18 where an outcome was expressed, 98% were fully or partially achieved.

Conclusion

24. This report provides a summary of provisional year-end performance for 2017/18 and comparison with the previous year.
25. Of the 23 metrics where 2017/18 performance was 'RAG-rated' there were 15, or 65%, which met the target and classed as 'Green'.
26. With two-thirds of metrics meeting the target in 2017/18 overall performance was good. There were areas of excellent performance, such as delayed transfers of care and library issues, particularly children's and e-loans. High levels of performance were also maintained in areas such as employment rates for people with a learning disability, and the use of direct payment by those receiving community services. On the other hand there are clear areas recognised as requiring improvement, primarily in relation to permanent residential or nursing care admissions. For people aged 18-64, the number of admissions, whilst an increase on last year, were very low to begin with. However, the increase, and general high level of admissions of people aged 65 or over is a key concern and will be of particular focus for monitoring next year and beyond.
27. Reporting of performance in 2018/19 is currently being established, taking into account the single outcomes framework (which sets the context for outcome based commissioning and the Council's new Strategic Plan). This will be presented and discussed at the Department's Departmental Management Team on a monthly basis.

Background papers

Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework 2015/16

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/adult-social-care-outcomes-framework-ascof-2015-to-2016>

Leicestershire's Better Care Fund Plan 2016/17 – Delivering our vision and for health and integration

<http://www.healthandcareleicestershire.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/BCF-Plan-Public-summary.pdf>

Leicestershire County Council Strategic Plan 2014-18

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s92330/7%20council%20strategic%20and%20transformation%20appx%201%20strategic.pdf>

Leicestershire County Council Vision and Strategy for Adult Social Care 2016-20
http://corpedrmsapp:8087/Intranet%20File%20Plan/Departmental%20Intranets/Adults%20and%20Communities/2012%20-%2013/Departmental%20Administration/ASC%20Policies%20and%20Procedures/ASC_Strategy_2016-2020_P0358_12.pdf

Department of Health NHS Social Care Interface Dashboard
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-area-performance-metrics-and-ambitions>

Officers to Contact

Jon Wilson, Director of Adults and Communities
 Adults and Communities Department
 Tel: 0116 305 7454
 Email: jon.wilson@leics.gov.uk

Sandy McMillan, Assistant Director (Strategy and Commissioning)
 Adults and Communities Department
 Tel: 0116 305 7320
 Email: sandy.mcmillan@leics.gov.uk

Matt Williams, Business Partner – Business Intelligence Service
 Chief Executive's Department
 Tel: 0116 305 7427
 Email: matt.williams@leics.gov.uk

List of Appendices

- Appendix A - Adults and Communities Department Provisional Performance Dashboard for 2017/18;
- Appendix B – Adult Social Care Strategic Approach;
- Appendix C – Red/ Amber/Green (RAG) Rating - Explanation of Thresholds.

Relevant Impact Assessments

Equality and Human Rights Implications

28. The Adults and Communities Department supports vulnerable people from all diverse communities in Leicestershire. However, there are no specific equal opportunities implications to note as part of this performance report. Data relating to equalities implications of service changes are assessed as part of Equality and Human Rights Impacts Assessments.

Partnership Working and Associated Issues

29. BCF measures and associated actions are overseen and considered by the Integration Executive and Health and Wellbeing Board.

Adults and Communities

Provisional Performance 2017/18

PREVENT NEED

Corporate Strategy	Better Adult Social Care
Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy	Managing the shift to early intervention and prevention

Corporate Priority: Unified prevention offer and Information and Support

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	% of sequels that 'Prevent Need'	Target Band Width	R	↔	59-63%	58% (16.4k out of 28.1k)	58% (18.9k out of 32.7k)	N/A
ASCOF 3D pt 1	% of SUs who find it easy to find information	H	N/A	N/A	70.1%	Due summer 2018	70%	Bottom
ASCOF 3D pt 2	% of carers who find it easy to find information	H	N/A	N/A	N/A	Next survey due 2018/19	63.5%	Third

Corporate Strategy	Leicestershire's Cultural Environment
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Corporate Priority: A Better Place and Visitor Offer

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	Heritage visits	H	G	↔	Maintain 16/17	151.6k	152.3k	N/A
Local	Hours of Volunteering	H	G	↔	Maintain 16/17	24.3k	24.4k	N/A

Corporate Priority: Remodelled Library Service

Measure and Description	Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile
-------------------------	-----	-----	-------------------	-----------------	-------	--------------------

Corporate Priority: Remodelled Library Service

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	Total council funded library visits	H	R	↓	1.0m	0.98m	1.01m	N/A
Local	Total council funded library issues	H	G	↑	1.41m	1.51m	1.48m	N/A
Local	Council funded children's issues	H	G	↑	551.0k	592.8k	580.0k	N/A
Local	E-loans	H	G	↑	100.2k	139.4k	77.1k	N/A
Local	Total community library issues	N/A	For information only			351.7k	388.8k	N/A
Local	Community library children's issues.	N/A	For information only			188.1k	196.9k	N/A

Corporate Strategy

Investment in People – Employment and Skills Support

Corporate Priority: Remodelled Library Service

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	LALS Success Rate	H	G	↔	86%	95% (Academic year 17/18)	96% (Academic year 16/17)	N/A

REDUCE NEED**Corporate Strategy**

Better Adult Social Care

Joint Health and Wellbeing StrategySupporting the ageing population;
Improving services for people with learning disabilities*Corporate Priority: Unified prevention offer and Information and Support*

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
-------------------------	--	-----	-----	-------------------	-----------------	-------	--------------------	--

Corporate Priority: Unified prevention offer and Information and Support

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	% of sequels that 'Reduce Need'	Target Band Width	R	↓	13-17%	18% (5.0k out of 28.1k)	21% (6.9k out of 32.7k)	N/A
ASCOF 1I pt 1	% of SUs who had as much social contact as they would like	H	N/A	N/A	48%	Due summer 2018	46%	Second
ASCOF 1I pt 2	% of carers who had as much social contact as they would like	H	N/A	N/A	N/A	Next survey due 2018/19	31.4%	Third

Corporate Priority: Effective Support for People with Learning Disabilities

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
ASCOF 1G	% of people with LD in settled accommodation	H	G	↔	80%	80.3% (1.2k out of 1.5k)	79.4% (1.2k out of 1.5k)	Second
ASCOF 1E	% of people with LD in employment	H	G	↔	11%	11.2% (0.2k out of 1.5k)	11.1% (0.2k out of 1.5k)	Top

DELAY NEED

Corporate Strategy	Integrating Health and Social Care – Better Care Fund
Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy	Supporting the ageing population

Corporate Priority: Improved Hospital Discharge and Reablement

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	% of sequels that 'Delay Need'	Target Band Width	G	↔	12-16%	12% (3.3k out of 28.1k)	12.2% (4.0k out of 32.7k)	N/A

Corporate Priority: Improved Hospital Discharge and Reablement

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	Delayed transfers of care attributable to ASC-only	L	G	↑	228 Ave days per Mth	188 Ave days/Mth	248 Ave days/Mth	Second
ASCOF 2D	% of people who had no need for ongoing services following reablement	H	G	↔	80%	80.4% (2.4k out of 2.9k)	80.2% (2.7k out of 3.4k)	Second
ASCOF 2B pt 1 <i>*BCF*</i>	Living at home 91 days after hospital discharge and reablement	H	G	↔	87%	86.1% (490 out of 569)	86.5% (378 out of 437)	Second
ASCOF 2A pt 1	Permanent admissions to care (aged 18-64) per 100,000 pop.	L	R	↓	6.1	9.4 (38 admissions)	7.1 (29 adm's)	Top
ASCOF 2A pt 2 <i>*BCF*</i>	Permanent admissions to care (aged 65+) per 100,000 pop.	L	R	↓	630.6	659.7 (920 admissions)	633.5 (864 adm's)	Third

MEET NEED

Corporate Strategy	Better adult social care
Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy	Supporting the ageing population

Corporate Priority: Greater Personalisation of Services

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	% of sequels that 'Meet need'	Target Band Width	R	↓	5-9%	11% (3.0k out of 28.1k)	9.0% (2.9k out of 32.7k)	N/A

Corporate Priority: Greater Personalisation of Services




Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
ASCOF 1C pt 1a	Adults aged 18+ receiving self directed support	H	R	↓	97%	94.1% (4.5k out of 4.8k)	95.5% (4.6k out of 4.8k)	Second
ASCOF 1C pt 2a	Adult aged 18+ receiving direct payments	H	G	↓	45%	53.3% (2.6k out of 4.8k)	55.4% (2.7k out of 4.8k)	Top
ASCOF 1C pt 1b	Carers receiving self directed support	H	G	↔	99%	99.7% (1.5k out of 1.5k)	99.7% (1.6k out of 1.6k)	Second
ASCOF 1C pt 2b	Carers receiving direct payments	H	G	↔	96%	97.0% (1.4k out of 1.5k)	96.7% (1.5k out of 1.6k)	Second

Corporate Priority: Strong Adult Safeguarding

Measure and Description		Aim	RAG	Annual Comparison	Year-end Target	17/18	16/17 and Quartile	
Local	Of safeguarding enquiries where an outcome was expressed, the percentage partially or fully achieved	H	G	↑	85%	97.9% (742 out of 782)	94.2% (481 out of 512)	N/A
ASCOF 4B	% of service users who say that services have made them feel safe	H	N/A	N/A	90%	Due summer 2018	91%	Top

Key to Columns

Measure	ASCOF	A metric within the national performance framework known as Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF)
	Local	A measure defined and calculated for Leicestershire County Council only
Aim	High	The aim of performance is to be high
	Low	The aim of performance is to be low

Annual Comparison		Improvement in performance between 2016/17 and 2017/18.
		Little or no change in performance between 2016/17 and 2017/18
		Performance declined between 2016/17 and 2017/18.

Vision and Strategy for Adult Social Care 2016 – 2020

Prevent need

We will work with our partners to prevent people needing our support. We will do this by providing information and advice so that people can benefit from services, facilities or resources which improve their wellbeing. This service might not be focused on particular health or support needs - but is available for the whole population – for example, green spaces, libraries, adult learning, places of worship, community centres, leisure centres, information and advice services. We will promote better health and wellbeing and work together with families and communities (including local voluntary and community groups).

Reduce need

We will identify those people most at risk of needing support in the future and intervene early if possible to help them to stay well and prevent further need for services. For example we might work with those who have just been diagnosed with dementia, or lost a loved-one, people at risk of isolation, low-level mental health problems, and carers.

Our work will be targeted at people most likely to develop a need, and try to prevent problems from getting worse so that they do not become dependent on support. This might include: information, advice, minor adaptations to housing which can prevent a fall, support and assistance provided at a distance using information and communication technology via telephone or computer.

Delay need

This will focus on support for people who have experienced a crisis or who have an illness or disability, for example, after a fall or a stroke, following an accident or onset of illness. We will try to minimise the effect of disability or deterioration for people with ongoing health conditions, complex needs or caring responsibilities. Our work will include interventions such as reablement, rehabilitation, and recovery from mental health difficulties. We will work together with the individual, their families and communities, health and housing colleagues to ensure people experience the best outcomes through the most cost effective support.

Meeting need

The need for local authority funded social care support will be determined once we have identified and explored what's available to someone within their family and community. People who need our help and have been assessed as eligible for funding, will be supported through a personal budget. The personal budget may be taken as a payment directly to them or can be managed by the council. Wherever possible we will work with people to provide a choice of help which is suitable to meet their outcomes. However, in all cases the council will ensure that the cost of services provides the best value for money. Whilst choice is important in delivering the outcomes that people want, maintaining people's independence and achieving value for money is paramount.

Explanation of RAG Rating

RED	<p>Close monitoring or significant action required. This would normally be triggered by any combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is currently not meeting the target or set to miss the target by a significant amount. • Actions in place are not believed to be enough to bring performance fully back on track before the end of the target or reporting period. • The issue requires further attention or action
AMBER	<p>Light touch monitoring required. This would normally be triggered by any combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is currently not meeting the target or set to miss the target by a narrow margin. • There are a set of actions in place that is expected to result in performance coming closer to meeting the target by the end of the target or reporting period. • May flag associated issues, risks and actions to be addressed to ensure performance progresses.
GREEN	<p>No action required. This would normally be triggered when performance is currently meeting the target or on track to meet the target, no significant issues are being flagged up and actions to progress performance are in place.</p>

The degree to which performance is missing a target is open to debate. A common way of overcoming this is to use a precise percentage threshold between current performance and the target. However, a blanket approach (such as plus or minus 10%) is not appropriate due to the varying ways that metrics are reported. E.g. small numbers, rates per capita, percentages.