

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date:	14 January 2010
Subject:	Adult Social Care Performance Rating
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director Adults and Housing
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Barry MacLeod-Cullinane, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Housing
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 – Annual Performance Assessment of Adult Social Care 2008/9 Letter Appendix 2 – Annual Performance Assessment of Adult Social Care 2008/9-Report

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

Recommendations:

Cabinet to note the outcome of the 2008/09 Adult Social Care Assessment and areas identified as improved and those requiring further development

Reason: (For recommendation)

- 1) To inform Cabinet of significant progress in a key service area.
- 2) In response to request from the Care Quality Commission that the Director of Adult Social Services take the report to Cabinet by 31st January 2010.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introductory paragraph

2.1.1 Since 2001 the Commission for Social Care Inspection has produced star-ratings and assessments of Adult Social Care. These ratings assessed Council performance for the year in question and rated the prospects for future improvement. Within this process Harrow had not changed its rating since the initiation of the system (1* uncertain prospects) and we were classed as a 'priority improvement Council'.

In Oct 2007 a new management team was put in place.

2.1.2 In October last year the social care rating improved to 1* with 'promising' capacity to improve. In November 2008 CSCI advised Harrow that in their opinion, we had a significant way to go to reach 2* or 3 out of 4. Previously both leadership and commissioning had been judged uncertain

2.1.3 The Care Quality Commission was formed in March 2009 by the merger of the Healthcare Commission, Commission for Social Care Inspection and Mental Health Commission. They took over the regulation of Health and Social Care from 1 April 2009.

2.1.4 From April 2009 in line with changes to legislation there was a decision that there would no longer be a star rating for adult social care. Instead the assessment of performance in terms of delivery of outcomes would be graded individually and then aggregated up into an overall graded judgment.

The outcome framework uses the Local Services Inspectorate Forum grades to assess and judge performance in achieving outcomes for people who use services in seven outcome areas.

The judgement for Adult Social Care is integrated into the CAA organisational assessment. The 'leadership' and 'commissioning and use of resources domains are still assessed, but these are not graded, but the evidence is integrated into the overall CAA organisational assessment.

2.2 - 2008/09 Annual Performance Assessment

2.2.1 Harrow's overall grade awarded for delivery of outcomes at 31st March 2009 is rated as

3 – Performing Well.

This is a significant improvement on the Council's judgement in the 18 month period since the service came under new leadership. It is the first change of grading in the 9 years of the rating system. This judgement was based on a scoring mechanism for "performing well" requiring four or more outcomes performing well or excellently where no more than one outcome was performing poorly and outcome 7 (adult safeguarding) was judged as a

minimum of performing adequately. This is an area of continued focus where we strive to be excellent.

2.2.2 CQC found that the Council had significantly improved, stating that *'leadership is strong and there is a clear strategic direction, with a step change in performance. Many more people received a Personal Budget, Direct Payment or Carers Service and people are noticing the differences, particularly people with learning disabilities and carers.* They specifically highlighted the following areas that they felt had delivered considerable improvements:

- Personal Budgets (one of the London and National leaders)
- Carers Services (Highest in London and top 8 Nationally)
- Engagement with Service Users (Most comprehensive consultation in Social Care Mori has ever carried out)
- Shifts from Residential care to support in the community

2.2.3 Appendix 1 identifies the grades awarded to each outcome. Members will note that CQC have assessed the Council as performing well in 4 outcomes and adequate in 3 outcomes. 18 months previously we had all but 1 outcome performing adequately. Leadership and Commissioning assessments have also both improved during this period.

2.2.4 Appendix 2 contains CQC's APA report that sets out areas of progress and areas for improvement.

2.2.5 If the current grading system continued, in order to reach 4/4 or 'Performing Excellently', the Council would need four or more outcomes performing excellently where no outcomes are performing poorly and outcome 7 (adult safeguarding) is scored as "performing well"

2.3 Next Year's Rating

2.3.1 To move from 'Performing Well' to 'Performing Excellently' within one year would prove extremely challenging, but the Council objective is to move all the outcome scores to performing well. This would place us in a strong position to reach Performing Excellently in the future.

2.3.2 The key areas that the Council must improve upon in addition to sustaining the position in some of the outcomes are:

- Market development (including leisure, culture and community services)
- LD employment (LAA NI146)
- Reablement Service
- Auditing and training relating to Safeguarding (partners)
- Quality of External Providers
- Prevention
- Developing implementation plans for our commissioning strategy

The majority of the points above can be delivered by Adults services but LD employment and Market Developments critically requires input and support from other Directorates in the Council.

2.4 Moving Forward

2.4.1 The Transformation Plan “Your future, Our future” has been refreshed in light of the development areas and regulatory returns e.g. Putting People First Milestones. In addition Adults Services is contributing to the Council’s Transformation Plan across a range of areas.

2.5 Financial Implications

2.5.1 CQC continue to report that the Council is a low spender on Learning Disability and Older People’s Services. We have invested further in the LD service during 09/10.

In order to continue to improve the rating of Adult’s Services we have needed to expand some of the service areas. This has placed some pressure on the budget in the current year which is included in the budget monitoring report with implications for 2010-11 which are reflected in the MTFs. These pressures and medium term impacts are very actively managed through tight budget management and efficiency savings.

2.6 Performance Issues

2.6.1 Our ability to reach the LAA targets assists the Council to improve the outcomes rating next year.

The key performance indicators/LAA targets are:

LAA NI130 – Self Directed Support

LAA NI135 – Carers Services

LAA NI 136 – Supporting People to live independently

LAA NI146 – LD employment

2.6.2 The robust management of the Council’s Performance continues to be an essential part in providing evidence for improved outcomes.

Environmental Impact

2.7 Nil

Risk Management Implications

2.8 Risks are identified on the risk register

Corporate Priorities

2.9 Improve support for vulnerable people

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Myfanwy Barrett Chief Financial Officer

Date: 18 December 2009

Name: Hugh Peart Monitoring Officer

Date: 18 December 2009

Section 4 - Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Tom Whiting Assistant Chief Executive

Date: 18 December 2009

Section 5 - Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: Brendon Hills Corporate Director
Community and Environment

Date: 18 December 2009

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Contact: Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director of Adults and Housing, tel: 020 8424 1361

Background Papers: None

Call-In Waived by the
Chairman of Overview
and Scrutiny
Committee

NOT APPLICABLE

** Delete as appropriate*

*(for completion by Democratic
Services staff only)*