

Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission

Final 2015/16 ASCOF Data

Date: 24th January 2017

Lead Director: Steven Forbes



Leicester
City Council

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Adam Archer
- Author contact details: (454) 4133
- Report version: 1

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report presents information on Leicester's own and comparative performance against measures in the Adult Social Care Outcome Framework (ASCOF), the national performance regime for Adult Social Care, for the financial year 2015/16.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission are recommended to note the contents of this report and makes comment on the contents.

3. Report

- 3.1 Significant changes were introduced in ASCOF in 2014/15 following the zero based review of statutory collections. A number of definitions were amended to fit the new data collections. In addition, a new ASCOF measure (2D) was introduced in 2014/15. This has had some impact on the comparability of time series data. The only significant issue with the ASCOF indicators 2015/16 relates to a change in the data source for the two mental health indicators (1F and 1H). As a consequence, only data for the first eight months of the year has been used to calculate the ASCOF score. It should also be noted that the carers' survey is only undertaken every two years, the survey was not carried out in 2015/16 and as such there is no data for measures 1D, 1I (part2), 3B, 3C and 3dD (part2).
- 3.2 The overall picture for ASC performance in 2015/16 is encouraging, with 71% of targets met and 68% of measures showing improvement from 2014/15. Equally our comparative position has been positive, with 64% of measures improving in the England rankings.
- 3.3 Based on the data key achievements for the year include:
- Users Survey data - We have met our targets, and showed improvement on last year's results for six of the seven ASCOF measures derived from the survey. The one measure not to meet its target was only 0.4% short. Equally our national ranking for six of the seven improved.
 - ASCOF 1C (parts 1a, 1b, 2a and 2b) – Service users and carers receiving self-directed support. Targets have been met or exceeded for all four elements of this measure and we are in the top quartile for performance in England.
 - ASCOF 1F and 1H – Performance is above target for these measures relating to people with MH being in paid employment and living independently in settled accommodation.
 - ASCOF 2Aii – The BCF target for older people being admitted on a permanent basis to

residential or nursing care has been met, and we have moved from the third to the second performance quartile for England.

- ASCOF 2B (part 1) – proportion of older people at home 91 days after hospital discharge following reablement support has met the BCF target and we have moved from the third to the first quartile for England.
- ASCOF 2C (parts 1 & 2) - Both elements of the delayed discharge measures have shown significant improvement from last year and have met the BCF target (based on NHS rather than ASCOF definition). Our national performance for part 1 has seen a move from the fourth to the first quartile.

3.4 Based on the data, areas of concern include:

- ASCOF 1E – The proportion of adults with LD in paid employment failed to meet our target and shows a year on year deterioration in performance since 2012/13. However, our performance remains in the second quartile for England.
- ASCOF 2Ai – The number and rate of admissions to residential or nursing care for the working age population increased markedly (although the actual numbers are small) over the year and we failed to meet our target. We also dropped from the second to the third quartile for England. We have noted a number of people aged 55 - 65 who enter care as a result of physical health issues but who die shortly afterwards, indicating an end of life pathway rather than premature admission to care.
- ASCOF 2B (part 2) – While we see improvement in the percentage of service users still at home 91 days after reablement following a hospital discharge, the number of people entering / completing reablement after hospital discharge has fallen. This was the result of planned action agreed after targets had been set to ensure that only those discharged patients likely to benefit from reablement would be accepted, with a more appropriate pathway identified for those unlikely to benefit.
- ASCOF 2D – The outcomes of reablement (reported here for the second year) have fallen. It must be noted that reablement services vary significantly between councils; some have no access criteria and provide services to everyone that has a potential need including low level needs. Others, including Leicester are targeted at people with a level of need that, if unaddressed, would likely require the council to provide ongoing services. Against this target we are in the bottom quartile for England for this measure, although, our performance in terms of reaching ‘full independence’ or having reduced needs are improving. However it should be noted that in Leicester many people (550 +per month) are supported by the Integrated Crisis Response Service rather than reablement support, and 75% are fully independent following this.

3.5 A summary of performance in 2015/16 is presented below:

Performance where comparison to 2014/15 can be made	Better	15 (68%)
	Same	3 (14%)
	Worse	4 (18%)
Performance for measures where a target was set	Target met	12 (71%)
	Within tolerance	2 (11%)
	Target missed	3 (18%)
Performance in England rankings	Better	14 (64%)
	Same	3 (14%)
	Worse	5 (23%)

4. Financial, legal and other implications

4.1 Financial implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

Martin Judson, Head of Finance. Ext. 374101

4.2 Legal implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from the contents of this report.

Pretty Patel, Head of Law, Social Care & Safeguarding, Tel 0116 454 1457.

4.3 Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

There are no climate change and carbon reduction implications arising from this report.

Duncan Bell, Senior Environmental Consultant. Ext. 37 2249

4.4 Equalities Implications

The Framework measures the success of the adult social care system in delivering personalised care that promotes people's independence, and ensures that people have a positive experience of their care and support. The indicators that have shown a decrease, are the protected characteristics of disability and age as defined by the Equality Act 2010, these will need to be monitored on an ongoing basis by the relevant services.

Sukhi Biring, Equalities Officer. Ext. 374175

4.5 Other Implications

There are no other issues identified.

5. Background information and other papers: None

6. Summary of appendices:

Appendix 1 - ASCOF 2015/16 - Leicester Performance against Targets

Appendix 2 - ASCOF 2015/16 - Leicester Time Series

Appendix 3 - ASCOF 2015/16 - Benchmarking England

Appendix 4 - ASCOF 2015/16 - Benchmarking England, East Midlands and Family Group

Appendix 5 - ASCOF 2015/16 - Leicester Performance by Quartile

Adult Social Care Performance: 2015/16

Adult Social Care Outcome Framework – Leicester Against Targets

Indicator	2015/16 Actual	2015/16 Target	Rating
1A: Social care-related quality of life.	18.1	> 17.9	Green
1B: Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life.	70.5%	> 67.1%	Green
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving self-directed support as at snapshot date.	98.7%	95%	Green
1Cib: Carers receiving self- directed support in the year.	100%	Not set	White
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving direct payments as at snapshot date.	44.4%	40%	Green
1Ciib: Carers receiving direct payments for support direct to carer.	100%	Not set	White
1D: Carer reported quality of life.	No carers survey	N/A	White
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment.	5.2%	7.5%	Red
1F: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment.	2.9%	2.5%	Green
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family.	71.8%	72%	0.2% short of target
1H: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support.	62.3%	40%	Green
1I: Proportion of people who use services and their carers who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like.	SU - 37.2%	> 35.6%	Green
	No carers survey	N/A	White
2Ai: Adults aged 18-64 whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care, per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	16.3	13.8	Red
2Aii: Older people aged 65+ whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care per 100,000 pop (Low is good).	644.1	684.1	Green
2Bi: Proportion of older people (65 +) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services.	91.5%	90%	Green
2Bii: Proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital.	200 people in reablement (3.1%)	280 people in reablement	Red
2Ci: Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	6.0	Target set by health	Green
2Cii: Delayed transfers of care from hospital attributable to ASC and/or NHS per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)	1.7	Target set by health	Green
2D: The outcomes of short-term services – sequel to service	60.5%	Not set	White
3A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support.	61.7%	> 56.9%	Green
3B: Overall satisfaction of carers with social services.	No carers survey	N/A	White
3C: Proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussion about the person they care for.	No carers survey	N/A	White
3D: The proportion of service users and their carers who find it easy to find information about services.	SU – 61.7%	> 62.0%	0.3% short of target
	No carers survey	N/A	White
4A: The proportion of service users who feel safe.	60.8%	> 58.3%	Green
4B: The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure.	80.7%	> 75.4%	Green

Adult Social Care Performance: 2015/16

Adult Social Care Outcome Framework – Leicester Time Series

Indicator	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
1A: Social care-related quality of life.	18.3	18.3	17.9	18.1
1B: Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life.	70.2%	71.5%	67.1%	70.5%
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving self-directed support as at snapshot date.	--	-	96.2%	98.7%
1Cib: Carers receiving self- directed support in the year.	-	-	100%	100%
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving direct payments as at snapshot date.	-	-	41.3%	44.4%
1Ciib: Carers receiving direct payments for support direct to carer.	-	-	100%	100%
1D: Carer reported quality of life.	7.1	No carers survey	7.2	No carers survey
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment.	8.8%	7.7%	6.9%	5.2%
1F: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment.	3.0%	2.2%	1.8%	2.9%
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family.	71.8%	67.4%	69.8%	71.8%
1H: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support.	32.2%	34.1%	35.8%	62.3%
1I: Proportion of people who use services and their carers who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like.	-	SU - 39%	SU - 35.6%	SU - 37.2%
	-	No carers survey	c - 31.9%	No carers survey
2Ai: Adults aged 18-64 whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care, per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	13.9	12.6	13.5	16.3
2Aii: Older people aged 65+ whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care per 100,000 pop (Low is good).	735.3	750.9	734.1	644.1
2Bi: Proportion of older people (65 +) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services.	83.1%	86.9%	84.3	91.5%
2Bii: Proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital.	3.9%	4.0%	3.6%	3.1%
2Ci: Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	11.4	15.9	13.0	6.0
2Cii: Delayed transfers of care from hospital attributable to ASC and/or NHS per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)	4.1	5.3	4.3	1.7
2D: The outcomes of short-term services – sequel to service	-	-	63.0%	60.5%
3A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support.	67.1%	62.2%	56.9%	61.7%
3B: Overall satisfaction of carers with social services.	37.9%	No carers survey	37.7%	No carers survey
3C: Proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussion about the person they care for.	63.5%	No carers survey	68.5%	No carers survey
3D: The proportion of service users and their carers who find it easy to find information about services.	SU - 64.6%	SU - 70.4%	SU - 62.0%	SU - 61.7%
	c - 52.5%	No carers survey	c - 55.5%	No carers survey
4A: The proportion of service users who feel safe.	61.1%	61.6%	58.3%	60.8%
4B: The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure.	74.8%	79.7%	75.4%	80.7%

Adult Social Care Performance: 2015/16

Adult Social Care Outcome Framework – Benchmarking (England)

Indicator	Leicester 2015/16	2015/16 Benchmarking		
		England Average	England Ranking	England Rank DoT
1A: Social care-related quality of life.	18.1	19.1	147/150	↑
1B: Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life.	70.5%	76.5%	138/150	↑
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving self-directed support as at snapshot date.	98.7%	86.9%	31/152	↑
1Cib: Carers receiving self-directed support in the year.	100%	77.7%	=1/152	↔
1Ciaa: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving direct payments as at snapshot date.	44.4%	28.1%	8/152	↑
1Cibb: Carers receiving direct payments for support direct to carer.	100%	67.4%	=1/152	↔
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment.	5.2%	5.8%	85/152	↓
1F: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment.	2.9%	6.7%	141/148	↑
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family.	71.8%	75.4%	98/152	↓
1H: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support.	62.3%	58.6%	90/152	↑
1I: Proportion of people who use services who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like.	37.2%	45.4%	142/150	↑
2Ai: Adults aged 18-64 whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care, per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	16.3	13.3	111/152	↓
2Aii: Older people aged 65+ whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care per 100,000 pop (Low is good).	644.1	628.2	82/152	↑
2Bi: Proportion of older people (65 +) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services.	91.5%	82.7%	19/152	↑
2Bii: Proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital.	3.1%	2.9%	72/152	↓
2Ci: Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	6.0	12.3	34/152	↑
2Cii: Delayed transfers of care from hospital attributable to ASC and/or NHS per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)	1.7	4.8	37/152	↑
2D: The outcomes of short-term services – sequel to service	60.5%	75.8%	129/152	↓
3A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support.	61.7%	64.4%	104/150	↑
3D: The proportion of service users who find it easy to find information about services.	61.7%	73.5%	150/150	↔
4A: The proportion of service users who feel safe.	60.8%	69.0%	144/150	↑
4B: The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure.	80.7%	85.5%	117/150	↑



14



3



5

Adult Social Care Performance: 2015/16

Adult Social Care Outcome Framework – Benchmarking (England, CIPFA Nearest Neighbour Model and East Midlands)

Indicator	Leicester 2015/16	2015/16 Benchmarking		
		England Ranking	CIPFA Ranking	East Mids. Ranking
1A: Social care-related quality of life.	18.1	147/150	16/16	9/9
1B: Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life.	70.5%	138/150	15/16	9/9
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving self-directed support as at snapshot date.	98.7%	31/152	4/16	5/9
1Cib: Carers receiving self- directed support in the year.	100%	=1/152	1/15	1/9
1Ciaa: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving direct payments as at snapshot date.	44.4%	8/152	1/16	3/9
1Ciib: Carers receiving direct payments for support direct to carer.	100%	=1/152	1/15	1/9
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment.	5.2%	85/152	6/16	3/9
1F: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment.	2.9%	141/148	13/16	8/9
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family.	71.8%	98/152	15/16	7/9
1H: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support.	62.3%	90/152	10/16	6/9
1I: Proportion of people who use services who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like.	37.2%	142/150	15/16	9/9
2Ai: Adults aged 18-64 whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care, per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	16.3	111/152	12/16	9/9
2Aii: Older people aged 65+ whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential/nursing care per 100,000 pop (Low is good).	644.1	82/152	6/16	7/9
2Bi: Proportion of older people (65 +) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services.	91.5%	19/152	1/16	2/9
2Bii: Proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital.	3.1%	72/152	6/16	2/9
2Ci: Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 pop (Low is good)	6.0	34/152	5/16	1/9
2Cii: Delayed transfers of care from hospital attributable to ASC and/or NHS per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)	1.7	37/152	6/16	2/9
2D: The outcomes of short-term services – sequel to service	60.5%	129/152	13/16	8/9
3A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support.	61.7%	104/150	12/16	6/9
3D: The proportion of service users who find it easy to find information about services.	61.7%	150/150	16/16	9/9
4A: The proportion of service users who feel safe.	60.8%	144/150	15/16	8/9
4B: The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure.	80.7%	117/150	13/16	8/9

Adult Social Care Performance: 2015/16

Adult Social Care Outcome Framework – England Quartiles

Indicator	Leicester's position against England Quartiles 2014/15				Leicester's position against England Quartiles 2015/16			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1A: Social care-related quality of life.								
1B: Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life.								
1Cia: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving self-directed support as at snapshot date								
1Cib: Carers receiving self-directed support in the year								
1Ciaa: Service Users aged 18 or over receiving direct payments as at snapshot date								
1Ciab: Carers receiving direct payments for support direct to carer								
1D: Carer reported quality of life.								
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment.								
1F: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment.								
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family.								
1H: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support.								
1I: Proportion of people who use services and their carers who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like.								
2Ai: Adults aged 18-64 admitted on a permanent basis to residential or nursing care (per 100,000 pop.) (Low is good)								
2Aii: Older people aged 65 or over admitted on a permanent basis in the year to residential or nursing care per 100,000 pop. (Low is good).								
2Bi: Proportion of older people (65 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation services.								
2Bii: Proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital.								
2Ci: Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)								
2Cii: Delayed transfers of care from hospital attributable to adult social care and/or the NHS per 100,000 pop. (Low is good)								
2D: The outcomes of short-term services – sequel to service								
3A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support								
3B: Overall satisfaction of carers with social services.								
3C: Proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussion about the person they care for.								
3D: The proportion of service users and carers who find it easy to find information about services.								
4A: The proportion of people who use services who feel safe.								
4B: The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure.								