



AGENDA

ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 4 July 2007 at 10.00 am

Ask for: Theresa Grayell

Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone

Telephone 01622 694277

Tea/Coffee will be available 30 minutes before the meeting

Membership (15)

Conservative (10): Mr M C Dance (Chairman), Mrs A D Allen, Mr M J Angell,
Mr J Curwood, Mr C Hibberd, Mr D A Hirst, Mr R E King,
Mr P W A Lake, Mr M J Northey and Mr C T Wells

Labour (4): Ms C J Cribbon, Mrs E Green, Mrs M Newell and
Mrs E D Rowbotham

Liberal Democrat (1): Mr S J G Koowaree

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

The Committee has the option of breaking for lunch and continuing its business afterwards, if the weight of business dictates. The timing of the meeting will be determined on the day by the Chairman. All timings shown on this agenda are approximate.

Item No

A.COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- A1 Membership - to report that Ms C J Cribbon has joint the Committee in place of Mr L Christie
- A2 Substitutes
- A3 Election of Vice-Chairman
- A4 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2007 (Pages 1 - 8)
- A5 Declarations of Interest
- A6 Chairman's Announcements
- A7 Director's Update - Supporting Update

PRESENTATION

Whole System Demonstrator – *brief presentation by Oliver Mills, Managing Director, KASS, and Anne Tidmarsh, Head of Adult Services, East Kent*

B. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- B1 Kent Adult Social Services Performance - Year Ending March 2007 (including the Kent Agreement) (Pages 9 - 16)
- B2 Equality Strategy (Pages 17 - 20)
- B3 CPA - Corporate Assessment Briefing (Pages 21 - 34)

C. SELECT COMMITTEE WORK

- C1 Update on Select Committee Work (Pages 35 - 36)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Stuart Ballard
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002

Tuesday, 26 June 2007

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers may be inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ADULT SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Adult Services Policy Overview Committee held at Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 24 April 2007.

PRESENT: Mr M C Dance (Chairman), Mr L Christie (Vice Chairman), Mrs A D Allen, Mr M J Angell, Mr C Hibberd, Mr D A Hirst, Mr R E King, Mr S J G Koowaree, Mr P W A Lake, Mr T A Maddison (substitute for Mrs E Green), Mrs M Newell, Mr M J Northey and Mr R J E Parker (substitute for Mrs E D Rowbotham).

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs T Dean, Mr C J Law, Mr K G Lynes (Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services) and Mr D Smyth.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr O Mills, Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services; Miss C Highwood, Assistant Director, Resources; and Miss T A Grayell, Democratic Services Officer.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

7. Minutes
(Item A2)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2007 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

8. Mrs Margaret Featherstone

Members expressed their immense sadness at the recent sudden death of Mrs Margaret Featherstone, County Council Member for Maidstone North East, who had served for many years on the former Social Care and Community Health and Social Services Committees. The Committee stood for a moment in silence as a mark of respect, and it was agreed that the Chairman send a letter of condolence to Margaret's family on behalf of the Committee. Mrs Dean thanked Members for the many kind tributes which had been paid to Margaret.

9. Chairman's Announcements
(Item A3)

(1) The Chairman announced that the Directorate had changed its name to Kent Adult Social Services and that, accordingly, the name of the Cabinet portfolio had also changed to Adult Social Services.

(2) It was expected that the Committee would be renamed to reflect the other changes but this had yet to be confirmed. Members of the Committee would be notified when a change in name was formally agreed.

10. Presentation – Learning Disability Day Centres: Modernisation

(Presentation by Margaret Howard, Director of Commissioning and Provision, West Kent)

(Mrs T Dean, Mr C J Law and Mr D Smyth were present for this item)

(The slides used in the presentation are attached to these Minutes at Appendix 1)

(1) Mrs Howard explained that the changes to day centre services currently being embarked upon had arisen from a report made in 1999 which identified a number of key aims for change, and she explained how those changes were being put into practice. Initiatives included innovative projects such as a canteen and a garden centre run by people with learning disabilities.

(2) Arising from the presentation and discussion, the key elements the exercise needed to identify were identified as follows:-

- (i) a need for full consultation and public involvement;
- (ii) to identify and respect the wishes and needs of people with learning disabilities about what services they wanted. The presentation included two video clips showing people with learning disabilities talking about their favourite activities and their understanding of the person centred planning approach to service delivery;
- (iii) to ensure that change was undertaken gradually and steadily, with ongoing assessment of its impact to see what was working best and what needed to be done differently next time, or in the next area;
- (iv) to continue ongoing consultation with those affected, all through the process;
- (v) to implement change at a local level and respect that geographical areas across the county, and each community concerned, will have different issues and needs;
- (vi) to offer a choice of service;
- (vii) to address transport and accessibility issues; and
- (viii) to continue to redress parents' need for respite care.

(3) Mrs Howard answered a number of questions from Members and, in discussion, Members offered the following comments and suggestions on the way forward:-

- (i) engaging a consortium of a variety of partners would help in offering a mixed economy and the widest possible choice of service;
- (ii) using Local Boards would be a good way to inform all KCC Members of the changes and engage them in the process in their local area;
- (iii) integrating people with learning disabilities into the mainstream leisure activities was important, and was what many people with learning disabilities said they wanted, but it was also important to educate others in the community to help them to understand and accept the needs and presence of people with learning disabilities;

- (iv) the 12 strategic partnerships presently established across Kent could be used to help move forward the programme of modernisation; and
- (v) KCC should make optimum use of its influence to drive forward innovative change.

(4) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the contents of the very thorough presentation be noted, with thanks, and a similar presentation be used when engaging other audiences in the change process; and
- (b) points arising from discussion, and suggestions put forward by Members, be taken into account when planning change.

11. Active Lives

(Item B1 – Report by Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services)

(Ms D Exall, Head of Performance and Planning, was in attendance for this item)

(1) Ms Exall presented the final draft of the Active Lives document for Members' comment and endorsement before publication. The final draft of the document had been prepared following consultation with this Committee in July 2006 and with partners and service users, and had already had the benefit of input and good feedback from service users.

(2) In discussion, Members praised the clarity and user-friendly style of the document, its large clear typeface, the glossary of terms and the transport section, and asked that these be retained in the final version. Members were pleased that the document emphasised the importance of providing information and guidance in cases where financial assistance could not be given.

(3) Members also highlighted a few changes they wished to see made to the final document before publication, along with some concerns about its use:-

- (i) the text needed to be precise, leaving no room for misinterpretation or for its meaning to be twisted;
- (ii) aspirations in the document were fine, but practical delivery and implementation of them was most important; and
- (iii) Members expressed concern about the practicality of the suggestions in the document of adding any workload to GPs and the need for close liaison with the NHS to meet the aims of the document around discharge planning.

Ms Exall offered to prepare and share with Members a follow up document which would set out action points and a way of measuring their success, and Members welcomed this suggestion.

(4) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the final Active Lives document be welcomed, and the comments on its contents, set out above, be taken into account before publication;

- (b) a follow-up document be prepared and shared with Members, which will set out the implementation plans and a way of monitoring their progress; and
- (c) a letter of thanks for the work undertaken be sent from the Committee to the editorial team of the Active Lives document.

12. Kent Adult Social Services Annual Plan 2007/08

(Item B2 – Report by Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services)

(Mr N Sherlock, Public Improvement and Performance Manager, was in attendance for this and the following item)

- (1) Mr Sherlock explained that Members were being given the chance to see and comment on an earlier draft of the Annual Plan than had previously been possible, due to the Committee's timetable.
- (2) Members welcomed this early opportunity, and the document itself, and commented on the innovative and forward-looking initiatives being pioneered by Kent Adult Social Services, such as the involvement of public and service users in the selection process when engaging senior managers.
- (3) RESOLVED that the first draft of the Kent Adult Social Services Annual Plan be welcomed, and its content noted.

13. Risk Management – Revised Directorate Risk Register

(Item B3 – Report by Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services)

- (1) Mr Sherlock explained that this was the first time Members had been able to see the Directorate's risk register as a separate document outside the Medium Term Financial Plan and presented as a series of scored items.
- (2) RESOLVED that the content of the report be noted.

14. Consultation on Changes to Charging for Home Care and Other Non-Residential Services (Domiciliary Care)

(Item B4 – Report by Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services and Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services)

(Mrs T Dean was present for this and the following item. Mrs M Silvertan and Mr M Thomas-Sam, Policy Managers, were in attendance for this item)

- (1) Mr Mills introduced the item and emphasised the importance of the Committee being able to see the proposals before they went out to public consultation. He pointed out that when the time came for the Cabinet Member to take a decision on this issue, it would be open to scrutiny in the usual way. He explained that the proposed changes were in line with the Government's Fairer Charging Policy guidance. Copies of the letter and questionnaire to be used in consultation, and examples of how the proposed charges would be applied to a variety of cases, were tabled.
- (2) Mr Lynes added that proposing a change to the County's charging policy had been a very difficult decision to take and that he and the Directorate were determined to avoid changing the eligibility criteria as there was no way back from such a change. He emphasised that an increase in costs was inevitable and he was seeking to minimise its impact. Mr Mills explained that, in making the proposed changes, the Directorate would guard against recipients of care withdrawing from services if they were unable to cover the

costs, and assured Members that cases would be examined individually to ensure that appropriate care was still being received by those who needed it.

(3) The content of the report and the tabled documents were debated at length, with many concerns being shared across the chamber. In debate, Members raised the following points:-

- A 30% increase was unacceptable and should be reconsidered. It simply could not be placed in one lump and must be staggered.
- How much notice would be taken of comments arising from consultation? Had the timetable (up to September 2007) allowed sufficient time for consultation to be properly carried out? If consultation showed problems, would the proposals be changed?
- The £15 year-on-year increase was difficult to grasp, and the paperwork tabled did not make clear how the increase was to be applied. Mr Mills explained that around 3,000 service users do not pay anything at the moment and will continue to pay nothing unless their income increased. However, people who pay towards the cost of their services would be affected. The typical increase would be less than £15 per week. The approved policy would apply to new users taking up services.
- this explanation did not seem to match some of the consultation paperwork and there appeared to be discrepancies between different consultation documents.
- Some Members were not sure that they had correctly grasped the way the increase in the charge was to be made at the time of the original budget discussion and were concerned that their original decision may have been based on a misconception. Members were also unclear about what would happen at the end of year 3. Mr Mills offered to meet with each party group to explain the system in more detail if needed. He explained that there would be a cap in place to limit any increase to £15 per week in September 2007 for people who are affected. The maximum cap of £15 per week would be kept in place for next year if, following the usual re-assessment in April 2008, any further increase was more than £15 per week (on top of the charge from September 2007). The cap would be in place for one more year if, following the usual re-assessment in April 2009, any further increase was more than £15 per week (on top of the charge from April 2008). From April 2010, this cap would stop and everyone who had- been assessed as having to pay towards the cost of their home care services would pay their full assessed charge.
- Members expressed great displeasure at having the consultation material tabled as they had not been able to read and consider it fully before debate. This did not aid Members' understanding of what was a very complex issue.
- the approach set out in the consultation literature was wrong, and needed further work before it could be issued.

- (a) the questionnaire could usefully include references to the KASS team whose role was to help clients realise and claim their full benefit entitlement to help their overall financial situation.
- (b) the examples of how the proposed increases would apply to users in a range of circumstances (circulated on pink paper) could usefully be included in the consultation letter.
- (c) the letter to accompany the questionnaire and examples was not well worded, giving the impression that the proposals were cross-party. It should say "KCC" instead of "Elected Members".

(4) Mr Mills explained that the Government's Fairer Charging Policy guidance allowed local authorities scope to decide the percentage of a person's available income (after certain deductions) to take into account to work out the charge, so charging systems varied across the country. Unfortunately, this made it very difficult to compare 'like with like' when comparing Kent's scheme to other local authorities' schemes, as each had to be looked at within its own context.

(5) Members acknowledged that other local authorities were known to take account of 95% or 100% of a client's disposable income when assessing their eligibility for a care package, meaning that only those with care needs classified as "critical" received care. Kent had been very careful to avoid that, and still upheld the policy of providing preventative care services.

(6) Mr L Christie proposed, seconded by Mrs M Newell, that the report not be "noted" as recommended but that the proposal to change the charging mechanism be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration, and a further report be brought back to this Committee.

Lost, 5 votes to 7

(7) RESOLVED that the report and tabled information be noted and that Members' concerns about the proposed changes and comments made on the consultation material, set out above, be taken into account.

15. The Supporting People Programme

(Item B5 – Report by Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services)

Mr T A Maddison declared a non-pecuniary interest as Chairman of a Housing Association and Trustee of an Alms House Charity both of which housed tenants who benefited from the Supporting People Programme.

Mrs M Newell declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of an organisation which receives funding from the Supporting People Programme.

(1) Mr Mills introduced the item and explained that the consultation period for the County Council's older persons' strategy had been extended by one month from the end of April to 1 June 2007.

(2) Mrs Dean said that, although she understood the reasons for the proposals, she was angry that the consultation process on changes to the live-in wardens and alarms issues had been started without the knowledge and involvement of KCC Members

representing the areas most concerned. Some public consultation meetings had already taken place without KCC Members having had a chance to attend and contribute. Mrs Dean had managed to find and attend one or two meetings but she and others would have wanted to take part in earlier meetings if they have been able to.

(3) Mr Christie shared many of Mrs Dean's concerns, as the Dartford and Gravesham area also contained several sheltered housing developments.

(4) Mrs Dean pointed out that the consultation process and the proposal itself had given rise to a number of other concerns among local residents, which had become apparent at the meetings she had attended:-

- Many elderly people currently occupying sheltered housing had sold their own properties and taken up sheltered housing places because the accommodation had the benefit of a live-in warden. They now felt very let down by the proposal to remove the warden.
- Many people viewed the removal of the warden and alarm system as a risk to the security of their premises.
- The consultation process itself was not easy for the residents concerned to understand and the proposals were not presented as clearly as they could be or in a way which would assist residents' understanding.
- Information on the proposals for live-in wardens and alarms presented to residents at public meetings seem to differ between meetings.

As a result of these, there was much confusion and distress amongst the communities which would be affected.

(5) Mr Mills addressed the issues raised in debate and undertook to supply a fuller explanation of the background to the issues in writing to all Members of the Committee. He explained that the consultation process had been undertaken and directed by the Supporting People Commissioning Body rather than the County Council, and regretted that KCC Members had not been kept informed. The six-monthly updates, recommended in the report, would raise Members' awareness of future developments.

(6) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the content of the report be noted, and the concerns of Members, set out above, be taken into account;
- (b) an email response by Mr Mills to the points set out above be sent to all Members of the Committee; and
- (c) the Supporting People team provide the Adult Services Policy Overview Committee with an updated report on the progress of the Supporting People programme twice yearly.

16. Update on Select Committee Work
(Item C1 – Report by Overview and Scrutiny Manager)

(1) RESOLVED that it be noted that:-

- (a) the Transitional Arrangements Select Committee report 'Transition to a Positive Future' was welcomed and supported by the Cabinet Member and KASS and CFE Directorate colleagues on 12 April 2007, and will be considered by the full Cabinet on 14 May 2007;
- (b) a 12 month update report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Gypsy and Travellers Sites Select Committee will be submitted to the July 2007 meeting of this Committee, after first being considered at a meeting of the re-convened Select Committee; and
- (c) work on the Carers in Kent topic review, promoted by this Committee, will commence shortly and continue through the summer

By: Oliver Mills – Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services

To: Adult Social Services Policy Overview Committee – 4 July 2007

Subject: ADULT SERVICES PERFORMANCE – YEAR ENDING
MARCH 2007

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: A report on end of year performance for adult services.

Introduction

1. This report updates the Policy Overview Committee on Adult Services performance, for the year 2006-2007. Results for all Local Authorities will be published in November 2007.
2. The Adult Social Services Directorate has a statutory duty to provide performance information to the Department of Health on an annual basis. A wealth of information is provided via a number of statutory data returns, which produce 25 performance indicators. In addition, the Self-Assessment Statement which has this year replaced the Delivery and Improvement Statement (DIS) provides information about all aspects of our approach to strategic management, policy, service management, planning and customer care across all client groups. Regular meetings with the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) also provide the opportunity for discussion about the issues the Directorate faces and our plans to improve performance.
3. The 25 performance indicators are an important part of performance assessment framework, although not the whole story as explained above. They are assessed by CSCI and form part of the annual assessment cycle, which culminates in the Annual Review Meeting with the CSCI Business Relationship Manager and the Regional Director. This process is finalised with the publication of the star rating for each Local Authority in November.
4. Following the publication of the White Paper 'Our Health Our Care Our Say', CSCI is developing a revised performance framework which will better reflect the current themes, and an increasing focus on outcomes. We can therefore expect that the performance framework will evolve rapidly over the next few years. We welcome this, as some of the existing indicators are seriously flawed, and there needs to be a much greater emphasis on measuring the impact of services on individuals. This report, however, focuses on Kent's performance against the current 25 indicators.

Current Performance Bandings

5. The results for the 25 performance indicators are each given a rating or a “banding”. CSCI sets out the banding framework for each performance indicator as follows:

- Band 5 – OPTIMUM Performance
- Band 4 – GOOD performance
- Band 3 – ACCEPTABLE performance
- Band 2 – Ask Questions about performance
- Band 1 – Investigate urgently

Kent’s performance results for 2006-2007 compared to 2005-2006

6. Kent Adult Services Directorate is recognised for its excellent performance culture. CSCI have frequently acknowledged that Kent’s priority is not to just increase performance indicator results, but to ensure that the focus is on improved outcomes for people. The Directorate’s approach to performance management is well embedded and is managed through dedicated staff. CSCI have also acknowledged that where there appears to be poorer performance for some indicators (details below), there are good reasons or explanations as to why this is. This shows that in these areas, it is the performance indicator itself that is at fault, and not the way in which we support the people of Kent.

7. At present we have 20 indicators for 2006-2007 that are directly comparable with 2005-2006. We are still awaiting some information from CSCI for one indicator and we have not yet completed the unit cost indicators. These are due back to the Department of Health at the end of July. Our results are attached (Appendix A). Of the information currently available the results are as follows:

	2005/06	2006/07
BAND 1	0	0
BAND 2	3	2
BAND 3	4	4
BAND 4	6	6
BAND 5	7	8
CSCI not banded	1	1
TOTAL	20	20

8. Over two thirds of our performance indicators were rated as good or optimum. This included some excellent improvements in:

- Providing equipment and adaptations more quickly to service users.
- Significant increases in the take up of Direct Payments
- Providing more services within four weeks of assessment to all service users
- Reducing the number of older people being admitted to permanent residential and nursing care.
- Supporting people with a disability or mental health need to live at home.

The Band 2 indicators

9. Although Band 2 indicators are 'ask questions about performance', both definitions for Kent's Band 2 indicators have flaws in their design so that they do not actually indicate poor performance, which CSCI inspectors accept.

Older People helped to live at home

10. Within Kent, over 20,000 older people are helped to live at home, whether through a direct payment, homecare, or support from a *voluntary organisation* such as Age Concern.

11. Wherever possible, people are enabled to retain their independence by accessing either one or a combination of these services.

12. Within Kent, a large amount of funding is given to the voluntary sector to provide this type of preventative service, which is a critical part of our 'Promoting Independence' strategy.

13. The definition for this performance indicator, as provided by the Department of health, is very out of date, and does not allow us to count anybody supported through the voluntary sector unless referred by a care manager. Because of this, we are unable to count all of the people we support to live independently within this indicator, and so it does not reflect of our performance accurately.

Ethnicity

14. The way in which CSCI scores each Local Authority for ethnicity does not reflect accurately the reality of our support. CSCI has a scoring structure for this indicator, which look at how well we support people from an ethnic minority, in terms of them accessing Adult Services and being provided with a service, compared with the Kent population as a whole.

15. Understandably, if a Local Authority appears to be providing proportionately less support to people from an ethnic minority, they are penalised with a low band scoring (Band 2). This may seem reasonable, but in Kent, the position is different as we are supporting proportionately **more** people from an ethnic minority background compared with the general population. We are aware from our data that people from ethnic minorities are more likely to live in areas of social deprivation, to have poorer health, to have lower income, and thus are more likely to be eligible for social services support. We are not discriminating in favour of people from ethnic minorities, but ensuring that they are able to access support that they need. Perversely, therefore, we appear penalised by being scored as band 2 for this indicator.

16. This raises questions on the way the indicator is defined for CSCI. They have acknowledged that Kent should not reduce its support for people from ethnic minorities and will need to reassess their banding for these indicators.

Kent Agreement (Local Area Agreement)

17. Attached (Appendix B) is an update report of the Outcome 18 'To promote independent living for all', which was recently presented to the Government Office of the South East (GOSE) having been agreed by the Public Service Report. The report shows we continue to make progress in working towards the target. There continue to be problems in identifying the data for the Performance Indicator 'Emergency acute bed days people aged 75 or over'. This is fully covered in the body of the GOSE report, as are the other issues in regard to Outcome 18.

Conclusion

18. Kent has demonstrated some further improvements on a range of indicators over the last year, despite coping with demographic and budget pressures, as well as uncertainly within the health economy. This is on top of annual high performance as evidenced by 3 Star rating over the last five years. There will be ongoing budget pressures in 07-08 as in previous years and these will need to be managed alongside performance improvement.

Recommendation

19. Members are asked to NOTE, and are invited to COMMENT on, the Directorate's performance over the last year.

Steph Abbott
Performance Monitoring Manager
Ext. 1796

Performance Results for 2006-07

PAF REF	PAF indicator	FINAL END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE	Band
C72	Admissions to residential care for older people	72	5
C73	Admissions to residential care people aged 18-64	1.88	4
D37	Single rooms	94	4
C29	Helped to live at home - PD	5.4	5
C30	Helped to live at home - LD	3.1	5
C31	Helped to live at home - MH	3.8	5
C32	Helped to live at home - OP	75.1	2
D55	Acceptable waiting times - Assessments	94.5	5
D56	Acceptable Waiting times - Care Packages	97.1	5
E47	Ethnicity assessment	1.86	3
E48	Ethncity - Care Packages	1.1	2
D39	Care Plans	98	4
D40	Reviews	86	3
C51	Direct Payments	131	4
C62	Services for Carer	27	5
D41	Delayed transfers of care	38	4
C28	Intensive home care	11.01	3
E82	Assessments of adults and older people leading to servi	67.4	Not banded
D59	Practice learning	8.6	3
D54	Equipment and adaptations delivered within 7 days	92	5






The Kent Agreement - March 2007

Outcome 18

To promote independent living for all

Lead Partner: KCC Adult Services

Accountable Manager: Oliver Mills

Independent living	Baseline (2004/05)	Year 1 (2005/06)	Year 2 (2006/07)	Status (2006/07)	Target (2007/08)
People aged 65 and over helped to live at home (includes KCC funded Voluntary and Community sector)	92.0	93	96		95
Admissions to residential/nursing care per 10,000 population aged 65 or over (PAF C26)	81.3	74.2	72		74.2
Unscheduled use hospital beds	(2003/04)	(2005/06)	(2006/07)	(2003/04)	(2007/08)
Emergency acute bed days people aged 75 or over. LPSA 11	465,677	Not available	Not available		462,908
Vulnerable adults	(Jan 05)	(2005/06)	(2006/07)	(2006/07)	(2007/08)
Adults in permanent residential/nursing placements. LPSA 9.1	1,920	1,891	1,852		1,704
Supporting People	(2004/05)	(2005/06)	(2006/07)	(2006/07)	(2005-07)
Supporting people clients completing move into independence. LPSA 9.2	1,635	2,053	2,483		5,337

Progress to Date

The performance information on unscheduled use of hospital beds has not been updated since the publication of the 2003/04 data. This is due to disparities between the national HES data and the local data. The problem is not limited to Kent it is being experienced by several other authorities, which we have reported directly to the DoH as a matter of concern. Work continues with the Strategic Health Authority/ PCTs to explain the variance. The SHA are confident that the local data is robust and are currently unable to explain the difference as both come from the same source.

Publication of 2005/06 data was expected in February 2007 following an extensive cleaning process by the DH. This process has taken longer than expected.

The performance on the vulnerable adults target for adults in permanent residential/ nursing placements was given amber status in the mid year report. This is due to the performance figures demonstrating a decline in numbers but not by enough of a decline to be on track to achieve the target. There is a concern that we will struggle to achieve this target. Many of those within this cohort who remain in residential care are unlikely to have their needs met elsewhere. Furthermore, the trend with this group of complex needs is expected to increase over the years.

The Supporting People target was show as green status as it is on track to achieving the 2005-2007 target. This demonstrates that this target is well over half way to achieving the 2005-07 target. We will continue to monitor the performance to achieve the overall target. Following the strategic review of Floating Support services in Kent, its recommendations have now been implemented. This has led to a re-distribution of services across Kent resulting in more equitable provision.

The Supporting People Strategic Review of Short Term Accommodation Based services was completed in January 2006. The recommendations within the review were accepted by the Commissioning Body and will

be implemented over the coming year. They include a local connection/reconnection policy and a move-on strategy.

Additional housing stock is required to ensure throughput from supported housing.

Progress towards achievement of the target has remained good throughout 06/07 and it is predicted that the target will be exceeded for the year

Telecare

KCC's aim with its Telecare Project is to develop Telecare services which are available to people as part of their care package, if they are users of Kent Adult Social Services. We also want to make sure Telecare is available privately to people who may not be eligible for Adult Social Services, at an affordable cost.

- Current number of service users: 610
- New developments to enable service user and carer feedback to be better used to inform future service development.
- Development of plans for an in-depth evaluation exercise of the dementia project in Gravesham, to be implemented shortly following approval by the Research Governance Board.
- Shared exercise with PFI Extra Care Housing team to establish technical specification for 340 units of Extra Care Housing in Kent.
- Progress made on the development of a joint Strategy with Supporting People, including work on a joint specification for community alarms and Telecare services. This includes constructive work with District Councils and Housing providers to establish links and shared objectives.
- A final Telecare Strategy will be developed Summer 2007. This will lead to a procurement exercise for installation and monitoring services.
- Participation in a bid by Kent Adult Social Services and key partners (including PCTs) for the Long Term Condition Whole System Demonstrator. The work undertaken for this Bid has been extremely productive irrespective of whether or not the Bid is successful. And is directly contributing to the development of the ongoing Telecare Strategy, including clarifying links with Telehealth, across the health and social care system.

Consultation with Care Managers and Occupational Therapists has established that significant savings can be made by using Telecare to help support people in their own homes, including delaying admissions to residential care. We know from consultation with service users and carers that satisfaction levels are very high.

However, it is clear from experience on the ground that these benefits can only be achieved in the context of targeted, person-centred interventions, delivered following a proper assessment of need many cases choose to take a Telecare-only package offered as part of a wider package of care and support. However, this is not always the case and these lessons will strongly inform the new Strategy.

Telehealth

The roll out of TeleHealth is continuing with up to 186 clients currently using TeleHealth monitoring with 31 more clients in the system. The delivery models are now more clearly defined and we are beginning to understand their different impacts. Early indications are that as a patient centred and targeted intervention, TeleHealth is not only improving health outcomes for patients but is also realising efficiencies and savings for the health economy.

Brighter Futures for Older People Programme

This 'Invest to Save' budget funded programme supports older people living in their own homes in the districts of Ashford, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Tonbridge & Malling and Tunbridge Wells. The programme is delivered via a range of volunteer services designed to reduce avoidable admissions into hospital or long-term care, as well as keeping older people healthy, promoting social inclusion and independence and producing other benefits to the volunteers and their communities.

Six out of the seven funded projects are fully operational, with the seventh project partly operational. Over 150 volunteers are working within the seven projects and well over 500 older people have been supported to date. The Brighter Futures Group (BFG) services, amongst which are postural stability classes; befriending; transport; assisted shopping and information / sign-posting, are proving very popular and work is underway in some areas in Kent where BFG services are not currently operating to seek funding to start such services. The formal evaluation that is being carried out by the London School of Economics is underway.

On 1 November 2006 a celebration event was held to raise awareness of the BFG; share good practice and ideas about preventative services for older people; consider future sustainability of the BFG services and how they could be extended across Kent: to thank volunteers and celebrate the success of the Brighter Futures Group to date.

Direct Payments

Staff are now more actively involved in promoting direct payments and we have continued to see a significant increase in take-up during the year. The Kent Direct Payment Scheme continues to provide a quality service to individuals who choose to employ personal assistants. The scheme has developed some excellent DVDs as a training resource, these give real examples of how direct payments have been used to improve the quality of an individual's life. These examples are also available on the Kent Direct Payment Web-site. Currently 60% of direct payment recipients choose to employ staff and many people who initially used agencies are transferring to the employment option.

The Kent Card was officially launched in March and we are working with providers to encourage them to accept visa payments. We currently have 20 people testing the card and working to identify other areas in the County Council that can use the product. The Kent Card will reduce bureaucracy around direct payments and will also be the tool used to deliver individual budgets. Many other local authorities have shown an interest in this product and we are supporting RBS at a London event in early June that interested authorities can attend.

Risks and Constraints

Due to a change in the way that preserved rights clients are counted, from 1st April they become part of the Older People performance line. We need to be aware that this has occurred so they can be excluded from the calculations conducted to monitor the People aged 65 and over helped to live at home.

The other risk is that the new computer system that is being implemented to record all client information (SWIFT) needs to be fully functional with all the migration completed. Without the new system working fully performance information cannot be produced to complete the statutory returns or to provide monitoring information for LAA and Towards 2010

Future Actions

Adult Services view these activities as core business with policy and initiatives already in place to support implementation. We also aim to:

- Continue to implement the action plan to increase the uptake of direct payments.
- Continue to focus on the reduction of residential/nursing placements and develop community based preventative services to enable people to be supported within their own communities.
- Integrate the work of IF into mainstream joint working with the NHS
- Work with the new PCTs and SHA to develop activities to help deliver the Outcomes of the Kent Agreement.
- Work with the Health Service to improve access to information, particularly in regard to Emergency Admissions

Future Updates

- Operational Management Team (OMT) – Monthly updates
- Senior Management Team (SMT) – As part of the Financial and Risk Management Process reported quarterly
- OPUS and the Locality Groups – a regular standing item on these agendas to review performance on reduction of the use of hospital beds
- Healthy Communities and Older People's Block – quarterly meetings for the lead officers.

By: Oliver Mills – Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services
To: Adult Social Services Policy Overview Committee - 4 July 2007
Subject: EQUALITY STRATEGY
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report presents Kent County Council's Equality Strategy, which was approved by Cabinet on 16 April 2007.

The Strategy* sets out how the Council will promote equality and community cohesion and tackle unfair discrimination in Kent.

The Strategy is the product of extensive data analysis and consultation. Work will be ongoing over the next six months to undertake further engagement work on the Strategy with Members (through POCs), service users and employees, to explore issues highlighted through consultation, identify appropriate responses and take forward key actions. This will inform a review at the end of the year.

Introduction

1. The Council has a statutory obligation to produce Disability and Race equality schemes, which it already has in place. From 30 April this year, it was also required to publish a Gender Equality Scheme. Following discussion at the Strategic Equalities Group in November last year, it was agreed to amalgamate these three documents, to:
 - Address multiple issues more effectively
 - Ensure that the Council's approach to equality is consistent and integrated across the organisation
 - Make sure that we are not duplicating information.
2. The Strategy aims to support continuous improvement in service delivery across all areas of the Council, with a greater focus on meeting the needs of diverse service users. It is underpinned by a commitment to achieving best value for available resources, working in partnership and encouraging more people to have their say locally to influence decisions which affect them and their community.

About the Strategy

3. The Equality Strategy brings together the Council's Disability, Gender and Race Equality schemes, and focuses primarily on these three areas. It spells out what Disability, Gender and Race equality mean for those who live, work in and visit Kent, and the priorities to be tackled in each area. It also deals with

community cohesion, poverty, deprivation, and the cross-cutting issues of age, faith, and sexual orientation. In doing so it summarises specific initiatives being delivered across the Council to tackle these issues, such as reducing teenage pregnancy, migration, and work on the Equality Standard for Local Government.

4. The Disability priorities and actions remain identical to those contained in the Disability Equality Scheme 2006/09, which was the product of extensive involvement work with disabled people last year. Similarly, the priorities and actions identified in relation to Race reflect those set out in Year Three of the current Race Equality Scheme 2005/08.

The five priority outcomes

5. The Strategy identifies five priority outcomes, which support the Council's Equality and Diversity Policy Statement:
 - Equal and inclusive services and information for all, regardless of age, disability, gender, faith, race or sexual orientation.
 - Creative opportunities for participation and involvement in service planning and decision-making.
 - Work with our partners to ensure the county's most vulnerable groups feel safe and free from harassment, and can report incidents in the knowledge that issues will be handled sensitively and effectively.
 - Enhance the quality of our intelligence and monitoring systems, to ensure we can target disadvantage in the county where action is most needed and best reflects effective use of resources.
 - Maintain our reputation as an excellent employer, promoting a culture where the Council recruits on merit, diversity is valued, and where employees are proactive in anticipating the needs of service users.
6. The five priority outcomes are underpinned by a range of priorities that relate specifically to Age, Disability, Gender, Faith, Race and Sexual Orientation. These have been identified to address specific need within the county and the Council, and gaps in understanding or service provision. They are supported by a series of robust action plans, which set out a phased approach to achieving the five outcomes. The Council's Strategic Equalities Group will monitor performance against the action plans.

How the Strategy was developed

7. The Council's agreed Disability and Race Equality Schemes form the basis of the Equality Strategy, together with supplementary statistical information. This includes:
 - Census data
 - National research
 - Directorate Management Data.

8. The Strategy also draws upon a wide range of recent consultation data with both service users and employees, including:
 - Consultation on the existing Race Equality Scheme 2005/08
 - Engagement with over 400 disabled people on the Disability Equality Scheme 2006/09
 - Residents satisfaction and Best Value survey data
 - Two gender focus groups and two mini depth interview sessions involving 76 men and women in total from across the county, reflecting a range of different life stages and demographics
 - An employee questionnaire made available on KNet.

The role of the Strategy in delivering the agenda of KASS Directorate

9. Members will be aware that equalities are integral to the provision of person-centred services and our staffing policies and practices.
10. The Strategy has been produced involving the Adult Social Services Directorate Equalities Group and this forum will shortly be holding an Action Planning workshop to ensure that this Strategy is implemented effectively. This work will then be signed off by the Strategic Management Team and disseminated throughout the Directorate.
11. The Strategy provides key actions which will contribute to KCCs stated commitment to achieve Level 3 of the Equalities Standard for Local Government by March 2008.
12. As part of this process it is necessary to conduct Equality Impact Assessments on all of our policies, practices and procedures. To date 92% of the 240 policies identified within the Directorate for impact assessments have been assessed, leading to small but significant improvements to ensure our services are inclusive and accessible.
13. The Directorate welcomes the Equality Strategy which brings together actions and provides a strategic approach in the delivery of equalities on a day to day basis. It also provides a useful direction to respond to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment, Commission for Social Care Inspection and other audits.

Next steps

14. The Strategy is currently being considered by all Policy and Overview Committees. In addition, further engagement work is taking place over the next six months on the document with service users and employees, to explore issues in greater detail and reflect ongoing work in Directorates on equality impact assessments. This work will feed into a formal review of the Strategy at the end of the year.

15. Although the Strategy is already shorter in length than the existing Race Equality Scheme, a summary version will be produced and made available for ease of access.

For consideration

Members views are sought on the following:

- (a) Does the Strategy have a clear direction of travel?
- (b) Does the Equality Strategy capture the main issues?
- (c) What are its strengths/weaknesses?
- (d) What other issues might inform development work over the next six months and the end of year review?
- (e) How can the Strategy maximise its impact to improve quality of life for everyone in Kent?

Jo Richardson

Inclusive Services Policy Manager
01622 221851

Background documents: KCC's Disability Equality Scheme 2006/09
KCC's Race Equality Scheme 2005/08

* A copy of the Strategy and Summary Action Plans are attached for Members of the Policy Overview Committee. Further copies are available electronically via the following link:

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/publications/council-and-democracy/equality-strategy.htm>

By: Alex King, Deputy Leader of the Council
To: Adult Social Services Policy Overview Committee – 4 July 2007
Subject: CPA CORPORATE ASSESSMENT
Classification: Unrestricted

SUMMARY

KCC's corporate assessment inspection is due in early 2008. This report sets out details of the corporate assessment process, work undertaken so far and actions that need to be taken to prepare KCC for this major element of the CPA framework.

FOR INFORMATION

1. INTRODUCTION

KCC's corporate assessment is scheduled to take place in 2007/08 and will be one of the most important inspections of the authority in the last few years. The score we receive will influence whether we retain our future Four Star status.

Our last corporate assessment and inspection was in 2002. Since then the assessment framework has been revised and become a far harder test and from 2005 all authorities are being inspected under this new methodology. The expectation is that therefore it will be harder to retain our current score of four out of four for this block which has been a major factor in obtaining and maintaining our Excellent/Four Star authority status since 2002.

The score we receive for the corporate assessment we will keep, as it will not be run again as part of the current CPA process. If we are less than a Four Star authority at the end of the CPA regime in 2008/09 this could well affect the amount of regulation and inspection we can expect to receive under the post CPA methodology. Our performance against the corporate assessment block is therefore important.

Running concurrently alongside the corporate assessment will be the Joint Area Review (JAR) covering children and young peoples' services. The score we receive for this will also be important as it will dictate the score for that CPA block, and again we will not have a further JAR as part of the current CPA process.

2. OBJECTIVES OF CORPORATE ASSESSMENT

Corporate assessment is a major part of the Audit Commission's CPA framework. It focuses on the importance of a sound corporate 'engine' to drive good services. It measures how effectively the council is working corporately, and with its partners, to improve services and deliver improved outcomes for local people.

As part of the revisions to the corporate assessment framework that took place in 2005 there is now greater emphasis on:

- improved outcomes for users

- meeting the needs of diverse communities and users
- community engagement
- increased emphasis on community leadership, partnership working and value for money.

In addition, we will particularly need to demonstrate how our understanding of Kent is translated into ambitions and priorities for the community). We will also need to demonstrate how the capacity and performance management of KCC is being applied to deliver improved outcomes for the people of Kent.

3. FRAMEWORK

Corporate assessment uses key lines of enquiry (KLOE) to provide a framework through which to gather and assess evidence about how effectively the council is working. The corporate assessment KLOE measures:

- how well councils understand their local communities and neighbourhoods
- how this understanding of local people and places translates into councils' ambitions and priorities
- their capacity to deliver these
- what councils are achieving.

A key change underpinning this emphasis is the introduction of shared priorities in the 'Achievement' theme. The council's management of the cross-cutting issues inherent in the delivery of the shared priorities, and the link to local priorities will provide an important focus for the corporate assessment. It will examine how we balance national policy objectives against local priorities and will assess our achievements against these priorities and plans.

The framework of the corporate assessment KLOE is set out for your reference in Appendix 1.

4. TIMING

Both the JAR and corporate assessment inspections will be held w/c 28 January and 8 February 2008.

5. SELF-ASSESSMENT

Authorities complete a self-assessment at the start of the corporate assessment process about six weeks prior to the inspection. The self-assessment is the principal reference point for the corporate assessment. The information and evidence it provides will be used to help inform judgements made by the assessment team and decisions regarding the scope and focus of their on-site fieldwork.

The self-assessment will be used as evidence of the extent of KCC's self-awareness of its current position in terms of its local context and its capacity to deliver improved outcomes for local people. It should therefore demonstrate a clear understanding of the challenges and opportunities KCC faces and a realistic evaluation of its strengths and weakness. In illustrating the current position, we may wish to highlight how we have addressed weaknesses or delivered improvement. In evaluating what we have done or what has improved we should demonstrate what has changed in terms of outcomes for the community and the difference our council is making to local places and local people.

6. INSPECTION AND REPORTING

The team undertaking the corporate assessment/inspection will comprise of a:

- Team leader(s)
- Inspector
- Link inspector (with JAR team)
- Peer officer
- Peer member
- Project support officer.

The team leader for the JAR will be from OfSTED or CSCI and will have their own team.

An inspector analysis week will take place in Kent from 7-11 January 2008 which will be mainly a document review and there will be feedback to us afterwards. The week can include a tour by the inspection team and the possibility of talking to selected individuals. The inspection team will then finalise the list of interviewees for the actual inspection.

The inspection itself lasts two weeks although the inspectors are not on site every day. Formal feedback will be given during that period.

During the inspection the team will talk to a wide variety of individuals and groups inside and outside of the authority and they will hold focus groups with members, executive, staff and partners etc. They will also conduct an online 'survey' of stakeholders to gain their views.

The report will be written following the inspection and will be submitted for a national consistency check to look at how well it fits with other reports. We will then be sent a draft and have a couple of weeks to comment before the final report is issued. A final feedback session will then follow.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Members are asked to NOTE the report.

Janice Hill
Performance Manager
01622 221981

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 – Corporate Assessment Key Lines of Enquiry
- Appendix 2 – KASS response
- Appendix 3 – KASS Project Plan

APPENDIX 1 - Corporate Assessment Key Lines of Enquiry

The corporate assessment Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE) provides a framework to assess the council against five themes arranged under three headline questions set out below:

1. What is the council, together with its partners, trying to achieve?

Theme 1	<p>Ambition for the community</p> <p>1.1 Are there clear and challenging ambitions for the area and its communities? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ambitions for the community address the underlying needs of the area and its communities • ambitions are shared amongst partner organisations and understood by staff and the local community • ambitions are challenging but realistic – underpinned by prioritisation, capacity and performance management <p>1.2 Are ambitions based on a shared understanding amongst the council and partner organisations of local needs? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data collection and analysis needs are agreed between councils and partner organisations and information is shared openly between them • councils and partner organisations work together to assess changes in statutory responsibilities, to analyse demographic characteristics and trends, to consider the findings of performance monitoring, to identify gaps and shortfalls in provision, and councils and partner organisations work together to assess the likely availability of resources • service users, staff and other stakeholders, including voluntary and community and private sector organisations, are encouraged to give their views and supported where necessary in doing so; measures are taken within this to involve black and minority ethnic groups and other groups at risk of disadvantage • consultation recognises the range and complexity of service user needs and makes provision for choice <p>1.3 Does the council with its partners provide leadership across the community and ensure effective partnership working? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the council demonstrates community leadership through its ability to work in partnership with the statutory, community, voluntary, business and private sectors to add value and deliver against its ambitions and priorities • councillors and officers are willing to make difficult decisions about what are and are not local ambitions • the council is effective in ensuring that partnership working is productive and sustainable and that accountability in partnerships is clear and robust
----------------	---

<p>Theme 2</p>	<p>Prioritisation</p> <p>2.1 Are there clear and robust priorities within the ambitions for the area? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • priorities reflect the findings of needs assessment • priorities have regard to national and local policy frameworks • the priorities address the needs of black and minority ethnic groups and other groups at risk of disadvantage, and promote good race relations • service users, councillors, staff and other stakeholders understand key strategic objectives <p>2.2 Is there a robust strategy to deliver the priorities? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • corporate, service and financial strategies are linked within a deliverable framework • there are clear and agreed targets for improvement which are outcome-based and challenging but realistic • there is shared understanding amongst partner organisations of the duties, frameworks, and priorities governing each other's work • resources allocated within and between partner organisations are managed, reviewed and revised in line with priorities <p>2.3 Is robust action taken to deliver the strategy? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the links between action plans and the delivery of strategic priorities are clear and demonstrate the extent to which the council targets resources or shifts resources away from non-priority areas • service users, staff and other stakeholders are encouraged to contribute to action planning • action plans address the needs of black and minority ethnic groups and other groups at risk of disadvantage • action plans include sufficient detail of the action proposed to enable stakeholders to assess its fitness for purpose • difficult decisions are taken where necessary and focus is sustained
-----------------------	--

2. What is the capacity of the council, including its work with partners, to deliver what it is trying to achieve?

<p>Theme 3</p>	<p>Capacity</p> <p>3.1 Is there clear accountability and decision making to support service delivery and continuous improvement? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the roles and responsibilities of officers and councillors for taking decisions are clear • decision-making processes are transparent and result in relevant actions; and decisions are made in time for action to be taken to meet priorities • reviewing risks and opportunities is a continuing strand of planning, delivering and reviewing services • there are protocols and procedures for conflict resolution within and between partner organisations • councillors and officers work effectively within the ethical framework <p>3.2 Is capacity used effectively and developed to deliver ambitions and priorities? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a clear and sustained focus on value for money • staff recruitment, retention and development activities are designed to ensure current and future needs are met • workforce planning is undertaken as a collaborative exercise by all partner organisations including voluntary and community organisations • the council ensures projects are properly resourced and rigorously managed • there is a strategic approach to partnering, procurement and commissioning services which takes account of the capacity of voluntary, community and private sector organisations • users and other stakeholders are able to access services which meet their diverse needs • staff are encouraged to be flexible and innovatory in meeting service needs <p>3.3 Does the council, with its partners, have the capacity it needs to achieve change and deliver its priorities? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the capacity of councillors, management, staff, and organisational development is sufficient to ensure clear leadership and support the achievement of priorities; • existing financial capacity is sufficient to achieve the council's objectives, sustain performance, and promote improvement; and financial management arrangements are secure • ICT resources and e-government are used to support delivery of priorities and greater choice for service users • the council works with partnerships to enhance its financial and other capacity so as to achieve its ambitions and priorities • full account is taken of diversity, user focus and human rights issues in decision making and achieving outcomes • the council, with its partners, has the capacity to respond flexibly to changing circumstances and emerging challenges
-----------------------	--

<p>Theme 4</p>	<p>Performance management</p> <p>4.1 Is there a consistent, rigorous and open approach to performance management? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • councils and partner organisations individually and collectively review performance within a culture of open debate and constructive challenge • the level of involvement of councillors and senior officers in performance review is consistent with their roles and responsibilities and reflects the importance for individuals and communities of meeting target standards and/or action milestones • review cycles reflect risk and the time needed to take necessary remedial action • resource management is integrated with performance management to support a sustained focus on priority issues • there is a well publicised, user-friendly and supportive system for service users and staff to submit complaints or grievances, or representations about service performance • the council and its partners invite external evaluation where this may add materially to their own internal processes • managers and staff focus on performance and use performance management as an integral part of how they work <p>4.2 Do the council and partner organisations know how well they and each other are performing against planned outcomes? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providers work together to develop and consider relevant performance information, including trends over time and comparisons with both similar areas and the national picture • data collection and analysis includes reference to the needs of black and minority ethnic groups and other groups at risk of disadvantage, and geographic areas • providers work together to compare and evaluate processes, costs and outcomes with those of similar providers • service users, staff and other stakeholders, including voluntary and community organisations, contribute to performance review and are informed about its outcomes <p>4.3 Is knowledge about performance used to drive continuous improvement in outcomes? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • targets for improvement are set in line with priorities, performance and satisfaction levels are monitored and analysed, and under-performance is identified and addressed • the council uses performance management to co-ordinate service delivery to communities and users • actual or likely difficulties with carrying out action plans in line with priorities are raised by partners at an early stage • user complaints and staff complaints and grievances are used to inform service development • providers use performance review, inspection findings and independent reviews in developing priorities and improving value for money
-----------------------	---

3. What has been achieved?

Theme 5	<p>Achievement is assessed by examining how well councils are delivering local priorities and outcomes across five sub-themes. These are based on the 'shared priorities' agreed by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's central and local government partnership. The five 'shared priority' sub-themes are given (in bold text) after the summary of achievement below:</p> <p>Summary of achievement</p> <p>5.1 What progress has the council made in delivering its priorities and improving quality of life for local people? This assesses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• improvements are being developed, implemented and delivered in partnerships to sustain current and future improvement in national, shared priorities. The improvements are in line with local need and local priorities• the council is working in partnership to improve areas local people say are important to their communities. Improvements are contributing to wider community outcomes and national, shared priorities to create a more sustainable, safe, cohesive and healthy community, and improved outcomes for children, young people and older people• the council is improving access to services, and quality of life for all its citizens and local communities including those at risk of disadvantage <p>Sustainable communities and transport</p> <p>5.2 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions to develop sustainable communities, integrating economic, social and environmental issues? This assesses evidence that the council, with its partners, co-ordinates its work on economic development, the housing market, the environment and transport to improve quality of life and deliver a more sustainable future all its communities by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• promoting and supporting a sustainable local economy, helping secure jobs and wealth• addressing the area's housing requirements and housing needs• delivering a quality environment now and promoting and supporting sustainable lifestyles to ensure environmental quality for future generations; and• using the transport system, and where applicable the planning system, to increase the opportunities for all sectors of the local community have to access work and important services without need for a car <p>Safer and stronger communities</p> <p>5.3 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions for building safer and stronger communities? This assesses evidence that the council contributes to successful outcomes through effective partnership working to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• reduce and prevent crime and fear of crime• reduce anti-social behaviour (ASB)• reduce the impact of drug and alcohol misuse on communities, individuals and their families• reduce accidents and make people feel safer
----------------	---

- be well prepared for internal or external emergency situations
- build stronger communities

Healthier communities

5.4 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions for the promotion of healthier communities and the narrowing of health inequalities?

This assesses evidence that the council, with its partners, is achieving real and measurable improvements in the health and well-being of local people, notably, that

- the health of all the communities the council serves is improving as a direct result of the activities of the council
- the council is reducing health inequalities and the gap in life expectancy between its diverse communities

the council is improving access to services for those most at risk of disadvantage

Older people

5.5 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions to promote and support the independence and well-being of older people?

This assesses evidence that the council is working with its partners, and with older people, to

- develop a strategic approach to older people that goes beyond health and social care and covers the areas that older people say are most important
- undertake meaningful engagement with older people and their representative groups on all aspects of the strategic approach and service provision
- deliver a comprehensive, co-ordinated range of services to older people

Children and young people

Normally, when the Joint Area Review (JAR) and corporate assessment are happening at the same time, the description and judgement of the council's and its partners' contribution to the quality of outcomes for children and young people will be summarised from the JAR report. In the exceptional circumstances where the two processes do not take place at the same time, the Ofsted/CSCI annual performance assessment for children and young peoples' services will form the basis of this section of the report.

Kent Adult Social Services Response to the forthcoming Corporate Assessment

The Directorate has been fully engaged in the preparation for the Corporate Assessment at the end of this year as outlined in the main report. The Directorate has taken the lead on the ‘ Achievement theme’ of older people. Briefly outlined below is a summary of this work.

Action Already Taken

1. **Fully participated in the ‘dry run’ of the KLOE from which the following issues were identified as needing more work / evidence.**
 - **Public / Community Engagement**
 - Services and Outcomes for people from **black and minority ethnic groups and other groups at risk of disadvantage** (Audit Commission definition)
 - **Partnerships** – Health, Vol. Sector, Other Agencies etc
 - **Championing Older People** –not just those receiving social care
 - **Most importantly** we will need to ensure that we maintain our current rating through our **Annual Assessment** process with CSCI.
2. The Directorate has identified a small Steering Group. A project plan has been developed and the Steering Group will lead on more detailed action plans to address the issues identified above.
3. Flowing from the Active Lives work we are currently engaged in a widespread engagement with the public and our partners in developing a **strategy** which addresses the issues faced by all **older people** in Kent and not just those who receive our services. Intelligence from other Local Authorities and the Audit Commission suggests that this will be viewed as a positive measure.
4. The Strategic Management Team is fully engaged in the process and is briefed about progress on a regular basis.
5. We are also working closely with all Directorates’ in KCC to ensure that there is a seamless approach to cross cutting issues. For example Transition Planning.

Action leading up to the Inspection

The following areas will be focussed on in the run up to the Inspection

1. Implementation of the project plan and action plans to address the issues noted above.
2. Focus on the ensuring that we are fully prepared for the Annual Review Meeting with CSCI. It is likely that the Audit Commission will use the outcome of this process to identify areas to focus on in relation to the Directorate
3. Preparation of staff. This has already begun but will be intensified from September as the Inspection draws nearer. Given that the Directorate has not had a major inspection since the Joint Review in 2001 there is a distinct possibility that some part of the Directorate will be a part of the Inspectors ‘fieldwork’
4. The continued development of the older people’s strategy and Commissioning Strategies with Health
5. Continue to work with other Directorates and Performance Management Group to ensure that there is a co-ordinated and seamless approach to the Inspection.

Corporate Assessment Kent Adult Social Services Project Plan

Initial Phase			
Timeframe	Task	Outcome	Lead / Co-ordination
March 2007	Draft KLOE submitted Input from Area's / HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Begin identifying strengths & weaknesses Within Directorate - initial discussions to prepare for Inspection 	NS / DE – SMT Corporate Performance Management Group
April 2007	Analysis of KLOE	<p>Following Areas identified for particular focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ARM / SAS – need to maintain current performance in CSCI assessment ▪ Public / Comm. Engagement ▪ Services to BME & other disadvantaged groups ▪ Partnerships ▪ Older People – x cutting theme – over50! - Agreed to continue work of Active Lives by developing older people strategy 	SMT / CPMG / AMT's
April 2007	Visit from Audit Commission	Confirmed the above themes needing particular attention	
May 2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentation of Corporate Assessment in range of forums (Policy Update, AMT's, Planners, further discussions in SMT 2. Focus on SAS 3. Joint Commissioning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness raising / confirmation of 'areas of focus' and beginning to outline action plans to address these 2. Vital to ensure SAS is of good standard in preparation for ARM pathway for joint Commissioning Strategy w. Health 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NS / DE /SMT 2. Across Directorate
June 2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Older People Strategy Workshops (4 Workshops) Corporate Assessment Steering Group identified 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of strategy w. public involved 2. Lead Group to focus on action plan 	NS / DE
June 2007	Look at other LA's responses to CA – particularly in relation to issues identified above	Learn lessons from others	NS/ DE

Preparation & Evidence Gathering

Timeframe	Task	Outcome	Lead / Co-ordination
July	Outline programme for CA to ASPOC	To kep members updated & engaged	NS / CPMG
June – July 2007	Preparation of more detailed work , e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition of partnerships ▪ Briefing notes for managers 	Foundations for inspection put in place	NS/ DE -
June – July 2007	Steering Group to develop more detailed Action plans to focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public / Comm. Engagement ▪ Services to BME & other disadvantaged groups ▪ Partnerships ▪ Older People 	Identify relevant people & actions to work on this areas in the lead up to the inspection	Steering Group
July – Aug 2007	Older People Strategy workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draw out themes ▪ Begin looking at engaging groups not fully represented in workshops 	Ensuring that we have a strategy that is owned across all groups & Agencies	NS / DE
July – Aug 2007	Preparation for ARM – ARM /CA workshop – gathering of evidence ARM – which will be adapted for	Prepared for ARM – essential for good CPA result	Lead PPQ – across Directorate.
July – Aug 2007	Plan communication strategy for staff, public & partner agencies – where appropriate	Ensure we communicate the importance of CA – particularly with our staff group – <i>reminder no inspection since Joint Review</i>	
On – going	Reporting to SMT	Full engagement of SMT	NS
On – going	Feeding in Performance Network	Arena where KCC issues are co-ordinated	DE/ NS
End of Aug	Review of current position / project plan	To ensure that necessary action to keep plan on track can be taken at an earlier enough stage to have an impact.	Steering Group / SMT

Lead In to Inspection			
Timeframe	Task	Outcome	Lead / Co-ordination
Sept 2007	Annual Review Meeting (11/9/07)	Essential to get 3 stars to maintain current CPA Rating	Lead PPQ – across Directorate.
Sept – Oct 2007	Gathering of evidence and analysis – particularly in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public / Comm. Engagement ▪ Services to BME & other disadvantaged groups ▪ Partnerships ▪ Older People 	Need to have covered these areas as adequately as possible - as outlined in action plans developed in earlier phase	NS / DE & Steering Group
Sept – Oct	Draw together messages from Older People Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present it to SMT 	Have a pathway for strategy to be implemented – does not necessarily need to be before inspection as long as there is clear timetable	NS/ DE
Sept – Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring together evidence / analysis on a KCC wide level ▪ Draft first self assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring in Supporting evidence from other Directorates in regard to Older People theme ▪ Evidence from KASS to support other Themes / JAR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NS / DE ▪ CPMG / Performance Network ▪ SMT / CCOG
Sept – onwards	Regular communication with staff public etc as identified by Communication strategy	Ensure staff / Partners etc. are fully updated and aware of their role should they be involved in inspection	Steering Group/ SMT / AMT /District Managers – Heads of.
November 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refining of self Assessment ▪ Tasks that result as part of the self assessment drafting process ▪ First meeting w.. Inspector 	Final preparations	ALL
December 2007	Submission of Self Assessment	As result of the self assessment some idea about possible areas which Inspectors will focus on	KCC
Jan 2008	Final Preparation for Inspection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supporting units / staff who are likely to be visited ▪ last minute info / enquiries from inspectors 	Last minute preparation before site inspection	Steering Group / SMT / AMT's etc.

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Overview and Scrutiny Manager
To: Adult Social Services Policy Overview Committee – 4 July 2007
Subject: **UPDATE ON SELECT COMMITTEE WORK**
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report updates Members on current Select Committee activity and future work arising from it.

Select Committee: Carers in Kent

1. (1) The membership of this Select Committee is now complete, and has elected Mr L Christie as Chairman. The Committee's evidence-gathering hearings will take place in July and August, with the final report being shared with the Cabinet Member on 6 November, considered by the Cabinet on 3 December and full County Council on 13 December 2007.

(2) An update on the progress of the Select Committee will be presented to the next meeting of this Committee.

Select Committee: Transitional Arrangements

2. (1) The Select Committee's final report and recommendations were considered by the full Cabinet at its meeting on 14 May 2007, being presented by Mr K G Lynes with Mr A H T Bowles (Chairman), Mr T A Maddison and Mr S J G Koowaree representing the Select Committee.

(2) Mr Lynes proposed that an Informal Member Group undertake a piece of focussed work around some of the key issues raised by the Select Committee, reporting initially to Dr T R Robinson and himself, and its findings be included as part of the overall report on the issue to the full County Council in Autumn 2007. This proposal was supported by the Leader and agreed by the Cabinet.

(3) The Managing Director of Kent Adult Social Services welcomed the report and its recommendations. He explained that an Executive Board of key partners had been established to develop an action plan to build on the work and recommendations of the Select Committee. The Managing Director of Children, Families and Education supported all that had been said and suggested that the report be formally referred to the Connexions Board and the Learning and Skills Council.

(4) An update on the progress of the Select Committee's recommendations and the work of the Informal Member Group will be presented to the next meeting of this Committee.

Select Committee: Gypsy and Traveller Sites

3. (1) The Select Committee on Gypsy and Traveller Sites, chaired by Mr J B O Fullarton, re-convened on 31 May 2007 to consider a report by the Managing Director of Kent Adult Social Services on progress made against each of its recommendations since the publication of its final report in May 2006. A copy of the officers' report is attached as Appendix 1, together with a copy of the minutes of the 31 May meeting as Appendix 2.

(2) The Select Committee resolved to meet again in late November 2007 to review progress against those recommendations on which it has not been possible to make any progress thus far. The outcome of this further meeting will be reported to this Committee.

Recommendations

Members are asked to note:-

- (a) that the Carers in Kent Select Committee will hold its evidence-gathering hearings in July and August, with the final report being shared with the Cabinet Member on 6 November, considered by the Cabinet on 3 December and full County Council on 13 December 2007.
- (b) that the report of the Transitional Arrangements Select Committee, 'Transition to a Positive Future', was warmly welcomed and supported by the Cabinet on 14 May 2007, and that an Informal Member Group will undertake a piece of focussed work around some of the key issues raised by the Select Committee, to be reported to the full County Council in Autumn 2007; and
- (c) that the Select Committee on Gypsy and Traveller Sites re-convened on 31 May 2007 to receive a report from officers on progress made against each of its recommendations, and will meet again in late November 2007 to review progress against those recommendations on which it had not been possible to make any progress thus far.

Theresa Grayell
Democratic Services Officer

Tel No: 01622 694277
e-mail: theresa.grayell@kent.gov.uk

Background Information: *Nil*