

Report to: OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

Date: 3rd MARCH, 2008

Subject: COMMISSIONING FOR SOCIAL CARE INSPECTION
(CSCI) ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT 2006/7

Report of: DIRECTOR OF ADULT SERVICES

Contact officer: BERNARD WALKER Tel: 01942-827780 (EXT: 2780)

Purpose / summary: This report responds to questions raised at the Committee on 14th January 2008 in respect of the CSCI Performance Assessment Framework.

Alternative options considered and reason for selecting the one recommended: None

Recommendation / decision: That the Committee note the Report.

Key Decision: This report does not involve a key decision. The decision made as a result of this report will be published within **48 hours** and cannot be actioned until **seven working days** have elapsed, i.e. before

Risks / Implications:

Financial:	None
Staffing:	None
Policy:	None
Equal Opportunities - Has a Diversity Impact Assessment been conducted?	Not Applicable
Wards affected:	All

Property Implications – Does the proposal involve a reduction, addition or change to the Council’s asset base or its occupation?

No

If yes, have the property implications been agreed with the Corporate Property Officer?

Does this proposal have significant implications for the Council and the local population?

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

Does this proposal involve a new policy or procedure or significant changes to an existing policy or procedure?

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

Has the Director of Legal and Property Services confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council’s Constitution?

Yes / ~~No~~ *

Has the Director of Finance and IT confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council’s budget?

Yes / ~~No~~ *

Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council?

~~Yes~~ / No *

* delete which applicable

For Cabinet reports only :

Categorisation of the report:	X
Discussion leading to a decision	
Monitoring	
Sharing for corporate understanding	

	X
Discussion	
Decision	
Information	X

Tracking/Process:

	Consultation	Ward Members	Partners
Panel	Overview & Scrutiny	Cabinet	Council
	3 rd March, 2008		

Proper Officer Bernard Walker

Date 15th February, 2008

1. **BACKGROUND**

1.1 **Raising the bar for high performing Councils**

The first set of social services star ratings were published in 2002 by the Department of Health. Star ratings were calculated using all the evidence available on a Council, but in the early days had a focus on how well a Council performed on the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) indicators. A fairly small set of PAF indicators were introduced in 1998, in response to *Modernising Social Services White Paper*, and over time, grew in number to reflect the changing policy agenda to cover a broad range of services provided by Councils.

1.2 When the second set of PAF indicators were published in 2000, Social Services Department's were judged on how well they had performed on each indicator by achieving a score (commonly known as 'blobs') within a band ranging from one (investigate urgently) to five (very good). This scoring system was introduced to enable PI's to be presented in a way that was easier to understand, and for Councils, and the Social Services Inspectorate (now CSCI) to compare their performance both with each other, and over time.

1.3 Despite the framework being established to enable comparisons over time, a number of these indicators have had their bands changed over recent years to make it more challenging to achieve a good level of performance. Two good examples of this are the high profile PI's on Direct Payments (PAF C51) and also acceptable waiting times for assessment (D55). The tables below show how improved performance is required to achieve a satisfactory level:

PAF C51 – Direct Payments per 100,000 of population (age standardised)

	1 blob	2 blobs	3 blobs	4 blobs	5 blobs
2006/07	0 < 15	15 < 30	30 < 90	90 < 150	150+
2007/08	0 < 60	60 < 90	90 < 120	120 < 150	150+

PAF D55 – New assessments completed in 28 days

	1 blob	2 blobs	3 blobs	4 blobs	5 blobs
2004/05	0 < 55	55 < 65	65 < 75	75 < 85	85 < 100
2005/06	0 < 60	60 < 70	70 < 80	80 < 90	90 < 100
2006/07	0 < 70	70 < 80	80 < 85	85 < 90	90 < 100

The amended bands for PAF D55 saw a reduction in the number of Councils scoring four or five blobs from 80 in 2005/06 to 72 in 2006/07.

A number of PI's have thresholds set, whereby a Council must achieve an acceptable level of performance to ensure that a restriction is not placed upon their star rating. These thresholds also change, providing an extra challenge to ensure a high star rating is achieved. The thresholds for PAF D55 are shown below.

Restrictions on Star Rating and D55 Performance

	Limited to	
	One Star	Two Stars
2004/05	< 45	< 55
2005/06	< 50	< 60
2006/07	< 60	< 70

The tightening of restrictions on this indicator alone for 2006/07 led to three Councils only achieving a one star rating.

- 1.4 Revised bandings for indicators and tighter thresholds restricting star ratings make it harder each year to achieve consistently high performance. Over the last five years, only 8 councils have managed to maintain a three star performance.