
By: Angela Slaven, Director, Youth and Community Support Services.

To: Supporting People in Kent Commissioning Body

Date: 20 January 2011

Subject: Performance Management in 2011/12 and 2012/13

Classification: Unrestricted

Recommendations

The Commissioning Body of the Kent Supporting People Programme is asked to agree that the Supporting People Team works with key stakeholders, providers and service users to develop

1. a payment by results model across all services for implementation post April 2012
2. a performance management framework which secures value for money and outcomes that meet the needs of commissioners and service users.

Summary This report sets out a proposal to the commissioning body to refine our management of performance within the Kent Supporting Programme. This will need to be developed within the context of the continued expectations of the Communities and Local Government Department in relation to performance and those of key stakeholders providers and service users

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Communities and Local Government introduced a performance management framework for the Supporting People Programme across a range of parameters which are outlined in Appendix 1. In addition to participating in these national data collection systems, the Programme in Kent currently utilises the data it contributes and derives from them to monitor and manage the performance of providers and the outcomes achieved for service users. It also measures move-on and reconnection in co-operation with the Joint Policy and Planning Board (Housing).

1.2 The Local Area Agreement included two performance management targets that specifically related to the Supporting People Programme in Kent. These were in relation to the number of people who had successfully completed a programme of support. Following the cessation of this framework

Kent has expressed the intention to retain one of the Local Agreement targets relating to the Programme by the County, and District and Boroughs as part of the Vision for Kent agenda.

1.3 It is clear that the collection of data and target setting has undergone a sea change since the new coalition came into being. It is now a question of the local partnerships determining which targets should be measured, and what outcomes should be sought. It is therefore timely for the Commissioning Body to consider the development of a refined framework for performance management that is fit for purpose and supports the work that will address the achievement of savings whilst maintaining high quality provision. However the CLG has indicated that it will retain a requirement for local authorities to continue to provide information relating to the Supporting People Local System, Outcomes and Client Records.

2.0A Refined Performance Management Framework.

2.1 The Core Strategy Group and the Executive Forum of Providers have both discussed payment by results at recent meetings and support the development of a model across Kent. The Supporting People Team has proposed a model which offers a more comprehensive suite of indicators for the assessment of performance of providers (see Appendix Two). The Core Strategy Group would favour a payment by results model that is more outcomes driven ensuring that the Commissioning Body is able to assess and evaluate the impact of its investment. There needs to be a balance that enables the Team to manage the programme effectively whilst reflecting the priorities of the Core Strategy Group.

2.2 Discussions with providers note that they are understandably anxious and that they cite the need to retain a baseline level of funding to remain viable and are enabled to continue to deliver services to vulnerable people. They are concerned about the potential wholesale application of models that have been adopted elsewhere in the country. There has been considerable publicity relating to the current pilot associated with Peterborough Prison. This model is based upon a Social Impact Bond also known elsewhere as a Social Investment Bond. It is obviously important to implement a system that is workable in the context of delivering housing related support to vulnerable people and assuming that Kent retains the funding from the CLG, the Social Impact/Investment Bond models are unlikely to apply. It is imperative that the Programme is able to reassure providers via the careful management of future communication of any potential models that the Commissioning Body determines to adopt.

2.3 The Programme has an existing payment by results model within sheltered housing which is easy to deliver, understandable, and affordable. This is related to the Quality Assessment Framework (referenced at Appendix 3). Providers are currently paid £12.24 if they achieve an A grade against the Quality Assessment Framework.

2.4 The model we have adopted in Kent has attracted general interest from the National Housing Federation, the Chartered Institute of Housing, the CLG and the Local Government Association. They are interested to see where

Kent goes next in relation to payment by results. Payment by results is referred to in a separate paper.

3.0 Legal Implications

3.1 The need to investigate the legal ramifications that relate to any changes to contracts, specifications, or payment by results with the County's legal advisers will follow any decision to implement a model.

4.0 Consultation and Communication

4.1 The Supporting People Team will consult fully with all key stakeholders, providers, and service users prior to implementation.

5.0 Risk and Business Continuity Management

5.1 The Supporting People Team will produce a risk and business continuity issues log for the implementation of a refined performance management framework.

6.0 Sustainability Implications

6.1 The ability of providers to deliver services and for service users to receive a service that is viable will need to be considered.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 The work of the Supporting People Team over recent years has focussed sharply on improving outcomes and value for money. The development of a model for Payment by Results lends itself to the current and future requirements of the Programme. The Programme has already taken the initiative by developing a specific model which relates to sheltered housing and has been able to evaluate its success. This report concludes that work should be commissioned to develop a model for Payment by Results for application across the entire Supporting People Programme within an appropriate timescale.

Claire Martin
Head of Supporting People
01622 22179
Claire.martin@kent.gov.uk

Background Documents

None

Appendix One - Communities and Local Government Performance Management Overview

Appendix Two - Payment by Results

Appendix Three - Quality Assessment Framework

Appendix One - Communities and Local Government Performance Management Overview

The CLG have implemented a national performance management regime since the Programme's inception in 2003.

Elements of the regime include

Quality Assessment Framework – a framework of core service standards, which include health and safety, equality and safeguarding. The framework enables service quality to be tested and measured by grading services that are measured.

Client Records - records and monitors client characteristics about those who enter SP funded services. The information includes data about the routes by which vulnerable people come to access services both nationally and locally.

Outcomes Framework - Measures the outcomes for clients matched against their identified needs. The Framework is based on the DfES 'Every Child Matter's framework' and captures 5 high level outcomes (relating to economic well-being; enjoying and achieving e.g. participating in training or education activities; being healthy; staying safe and; making a positive contribution) with further indicators captured underneath.

Supporting People Local System (SPLS) – measures key performance indicators such as the proportion of users who successfully completed a period of support. Also captures throughput (number of people who have moved through a service), utilisation (whether or not the service is being used to its fullest capacity)

Data is completed by providers of Supporting People services. It is a condition of Supporting People contracts in Kent that providers submit this information.

Appendix Two

Payment by Results

What Is Payment By Results?

The Kent Supporting People Programme has already introduced a payment by results model for sheltered housing. Sheltered housing providers currently receive a payment based on the grading achieved against the Quality Assessment Framework.

How Could A Payment By Results Model Be Further Enhanced?

The intention is to expand this model so that sheltered, supported housing and floating support providers will be evaluated against a grade that reflects a range of performance management requirements. This means that providers could be evaluated rewarded and against a breadth of criteria. Examples are given below

Floating Support.

- Quality Assessment Framework (including welcome pack and support planning)
- Throughput
- Utilisation
- pending in relation to floating support allocations
- Closures
- failure to engage
- Outcomes
- Client Records
- Utilisation of appropriate documentation
- Accurate and timely workbooks

Supported Housing

- Quality Assessment Framework (including welcome pack and support planning)
- Throughput
- Utilisation
- Pending in relation to the nomination of service users to voids
- Failure to engage
- Outcomes
- Client Records
- Move-on
- Reconnection
- Resettlement
- Accurate and timely workbooks

Sheltered Housing

- Quality Assessment Framework (including welcome pack and support planning)
- Outcomes
- Accurate and timely workbooks

This list is not exhaustive and there may be a further range of performance management criteria which is considered appropriate to ensure the funding providers receive is being utilised to its full extent.

How is the Programme to Implement This?

The successful implementation of any new scheme will require consultation with service providers, stakeholders and service users.

However as an illustration, we could assess providers as “A” grade if they meet all or the majority of the performance management criteria. They could be a “B” grade if they achieved 66% of the performance management criteria, and “C” grade if they met 33% of the performance management criteria. This assessment could be based on a year’s performance criteria and the contractual payments could be linked to this grade.

Appendix Three

Quality Assessment Framework.