Ву:	Angela Slaven, Customer and Communities Directorate, Director - Service Improvement
То:	Supporting People in Kent Commissioning Body
Subject:	Performance Management
Classification:	Unrestricted

### Summary

This report provides a summary of the performance of the programme to date against targets set by the Commissioning Body and recommends a task and finish group to evaluate the current performance management framework and to recommend the basis for a performance management framework for 2012/13.

### 1. Introduction

(1) The performance management framework for Kent Supporting People aims to ensure that the programme has an integrated approach to planning, reviewing and continuously improving its services for vulnerable people. The framework comprises;

- Quarterly workbook data giving information on those maintaining or achieving independence, the percentage of planned move on, the number of evictions from supported housing, and the utilisation and throughput of all services.
- Outcomes data gives information on the outcomes that the service has been able to assist service users to achieve.
- Quality Assessment Framework sets core objectives for housing related support services and the standards anticipated within them

(2) Additional information is collated from client record forms, reconnection returns and from the floating support database in relation to pending cases and duration of service.

## 2. Quarterly Workbook data.

(1) The data from quarterly workbooks is submitted to and published by the Communities and Local Government Department. At the time of writing, the Department had only published data to Quarter 2 (July-October). This has not interrupted the performance monitoring and management of local services however, which has continued using local data.

(2) The Commissioning Body set targets of 98% and 71% respectively for Key Performance Indicators 1 and 2 and its performance against these targets over the last 4 months is shown in **Appendix 1**.

(3) The Programme has not met its target for **Key Performance Indicator 1** (KPI1) – achieving or maintaining independence - over the last four quarters (figure 1 in **Appendix 1**). This is explained by the poor performance of a small number of district/borough based floating support services. Furthermore, one accommodation based service achieved only 0% in Quarter 3. The contracts for these services have not been renewed for 2011/12 and it is anticipated that the Programme's performance against KPI1 will correspondingly improve.

(4) The Programme's performance against the target for **Key Performance Indicator 2** (KPI2) - the percentage of planned departures from short term services - has continued to improve still further on 2009/10 figures

(5) Performance has improved across all service types and the Commissioning Body's target of 71% has been exceeded in each of the last four quarters (figure 2 in **Appendix 1**)

# 3. Quality Assessment Framework

(1) Validation visits to 154 Supporting People services have been conducted and concluded during the current contracting cycle. Figure 1 in **Appendix 2** shows the grades awarded as a result of these visits

(2) The visits have lead to an improvement in quality grade in 18 services, 17 of these to grade A. A total of 61 services have retained their previous grade, 50 of these at grade B or above. In new or ungraded services, 17 services were awarded the highest grade.

(3) There were 7 services found not to meet the minimum standards of the quality framework. Failings included inadequate arrangements in adult safeguarding and managing risk. Two of these services were removed from the Programme and the contracts for three were not renewed. These services were retendered. The final service was decommissioned as a support service and a contract awarded for the community alarm component of the service in its stead.

(4) Figure 2 in **Appendix 2** illustrates how services are currently graded, with 75% now operating above the minimum grade. The greatest concentration of C grades is in long term supported housing services (33%). Over half of all current floating support services are operating at grade A.

(5) There are 98 services that are yet to be visited and graded before the end of the current contract period in 2011/12.

## 4. Outcomes

(1) The Communities and Local Government Department announced that it would no longer fund data collection by the Centre for Housing Research at

the University of St Andrews in February 2011. The Centre for Housing Research suggested that it could continue to provide the service to Supporting People Programmes across the country providing that enough administering authorities agreed to participate. The Centre for Housing Research have stated that they do not intend to make a profit from the continuance of the service, but rather to benefit from the information that they receive for research purposes. Therefore the cost of the service to each administering authority has been kept at a remarkably competitive rate of £2,000 per administering authority. The development of a similar system locally has been considered in the past. For example, the quotation received for the development of a floating support database was £40,000 and with ongoing service costs, payable annually. The Supporting People Team requested permission within KCC to invest £2,000 in the continuance of the tried and tested service from the Centre for Housing Research as the most cost effective way of continuing to receive a key component of the performance management information utilised by the authority.

There may be an opportunity for the participating authorities to work with the Centre for Housing Research to further refine the parameters that are used in order to establish the outcomes relating to the programme. The CLG were unable to continue to fund the Centre for Housing research to produce the outcomes data but they are still very interested in the information provided. There have also been discussions between administering authorities, the CLG and the Chartered Institute of Housing about the further development of a national approach to outcomes with the Centre for Housing Research.

(2) Data from the outcome returns made by providers is received in arrears from the Centre for Housing Research (CHR) at St Andrews. At the time of writing, data from short term supported housing schemes has been received for Quarters 1-3 of 2010/11. However, data for long term supported housing schemes had been received only to quarter 2. Due to the sampling processes used, a greater number of returns for long term services are received in the latter half of the year than the former. The closing date for all outcome submissions for 2010/11 was Friday 6 May. The data is expected from the CHR approximately 8 weeks later.

(2) A summary of returns received is provided in Figure 1 of **Appendix 3**. Returns for quarter 4 had yet to be received at the time of writing, however, the Programme's target of a 70 % return rate and is expected to be exceeded.

(3) The target set for percentage success rate (60%) has been exceeded (Figure 2, **Appendix 3**) with services demonstrating an 82.3% success rate thus far in 2010/11. However, with many outcome returns yet to be submitted, it is unlikely that this rate will be maintained precisely by the time all returns have been received.

(4) An analysis of the outcomes achieved in 2010/11 **in long term supported housing services** in quarters 1 and 2 is provided in Figure 3 of Appendix 3. The percentage success rates across the outcome families have remained largely consistent in long term services from 2008/9 to present. However, the

individual outcome with the most improved performance since 2008/09 is "participate in work-like activities" (increase of 20% since 2008/09). Furthermore "achievement of "Finding Paid Work" has increased by 10% in 2010 compared with 2008/09 levels. Further analysis of success rates by primary client group and service type is provided in **Appendix 3**, Figures 4 and 5.

(5) A summary of the outcomes achieved in **short term supported housing services** during quarters 1, 2 & 3 is supplied in Figure 6. Although the achievement of "obtaining paid work" remains a challenge (41% successful in quarter 1 2 and 3 of 2010/11) this represents an improvement of 10% on 2008/09 levels. Further analysis of success rates by primary client group and service type are provided in Figures 7 and 8.

# 5. Supporting People Performance Management Criteria

(1) The Core Strategy Group has recommended to the Commissioning Body that there should be a task and finish group to evaluate the current performance management criteria and satisfy themselves that it meets their requirements and those of the Commissioning Body in relation to the performance management of the programme.

# 6. Conclusion

(1) The Kent Supporting People Programme has performed well against Key Performance Indicator 2 and the targets set for outcomes. Action taken recently is anticipated to improve performance against Key Performance Indicator 1.

# Recommendations

- 1. The Kent Supporting People Programme Commissioning Body is asked to note the content of this report.
- 2. To agree to the establishment of a task and finish group comprising volunteers from the Core Strategy Group to recommend to the Commissioning Body a performance management framework for 2012/13
- 3. To confirm their acceptance of the expenditure of £2,000 per annum to the Centre of Housing Research until and unless a suitable and more cost effective solution is found.

# Background Documents

None

#### Contact details -

Claire Martin Head of Supporting People 01622 221179 <u>Claire.Martin@kent.gov.uk</u>

Melanie Anthony Performance and Review Manager 01622 694937 <u>Melanie.Anthony@kent.gov.uk</u>

Appendices

**Appendix One**: Programme performance against Key Performance Indicators **Appendix Two**: Programme Performance against the Quality Assessment Framework

Appendix Three: Performance against the Outcomes Framework 2010/11

### Appendix One: Quarterly Performance Workbooks

# Programme performance against Key performance indicators

Independence				
KPI 1	Q4 2009/10	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 * 2010/11
Accommodation	97.47	98.8	98.1	97.4
Floating Support	95.17	95.2	94.06	94.4
Kent	96.54	97.2	96.32	96.1
Regional	98.13	98.7	98.18	Not available
National	98.44	98.6	98.57	Not Available

Figure 1 Key Performance indicator 1 – Achieving or maintaining independence

\* Local data only CLG data not yet published

# Figure 2 Key Performance indicator 2 - Percentage of planned move ons from short term services

KPI2	Q4 2009/10	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 * 2010/11
Accommodation	79.01	75.3	81	80.7
Floating Support	79.79	82.3	85.7	80.6
Kent	79.19	77.3	82.33	80.7
Regional	75.30	74.47	76.85	Not available
National	76.9	77.59	81.21	Not available

\* Local data only CLG data not yet published

**Appendix Two:** Programme Performance against the Quality Assessment Framework

Visits conducted in current contracting cycle 2009/11	Α	В	С	D	Not graded	Total
Existing Grade	46	51	13	~	44	154
Self assessed grade	57	44	16	~	37	154
Final grade Awarded	67	40	40	7	~	154

# Fig 1 Grades awarded following validation visits 2009/present

# Fig 2 Current grades of live services

Service Type	A	4	E	3		с	Total
Short term Accommodation	33	44(%)	21	28(%)	21	28(%)	75
Long term Accommodation	36	37(%)	29	30(%)	32	33(%)	97
Floating Support	18	51(%)	16	46(%)	1	3(%)	35
Total	87	42%	66	32%	54	26(%)	207

Live services as at 19 April 2011

# Appendix Three Performance against the Outcomes Framework 2010/11

Fig 1 Number of returns submitted – target 70%

-		Short Term Long Term Total			Long Term				
	Received	Anticipated	Percentage returned	Received	Anticipated	Percentage received	Received	Anticipated	Percentage received
2008/2009	1999	~	~	786	~	~			
2009/2010	3188	~	~	1410	~	~			
2010/2011	3041*	4053*	75%	206**	616	33.4%	3247	4669	69.5%

\* Only 3 quarters data available currently \*\* Only April 10 – Oct 10 published so far by CHR

#### Fig 2 Outcome Success rate – target 60 %

-		Short Term*			Long Term**				
	Outcome Sought	Outcome Achieved	Percentage Achieved	Outcome Sought	Outcome Achieved	Percentage Achieved	Total outcomes sought	Total Outcomes achieved	Percentage successful
2008/2009	10900	7891	72.4%	3602	3435	95.4%	14502	11326	78.1%
2009/2010	22944	14688	64.0%	6462	6026	93.3%	29406	20714	70.4%
2010/2011*	18713	15270	81.6%	1046	998	95.4%	19759	16268	82.3%

\*\* Only April 10 – Oct 10 published so far by CHR \* Only 3 quarters data available currently

Appendix 3 Outcome returns Figure 3 Long Term Outcomes Summary Quarter 1 and 2 2010/11

Total returns made 206	Was Support need identified		Was the Outcom	ne Achiev	ed	
Type of Support	Yes	Yes	As a % of those needing support	No	As a % of those needing support	Needs Ongoing Support
Achieving Economic Wellbeing	Total Needing support 187	Total succ	essful 171 (91.4%)			
To maximise Income	152	149	98%	3	2%	130
To reduce debt	21	18	86%	3	14%	18
To obtain paid work	14	4	29%	10	71%	4
Enjoy and Achieve	Total Needing support 238	Total succ	essful 219 (92.0%)			
To participate in training/education	27	19	70%	8	30%	17
To participate in informal learning	70	65	93%	5	7%	63
To participate in work-like activities	29	24	83%	5	17%	23
To establish contact with external groups	112	111	99%	1	1%	108
Be Healthy	Total Needing support 329	Total succ	essful 320 (97.3%)			
Manage physical health	132	126	95%	6	5%	126
Manage mental health	42	41	98%	1	2%	39
Manage substance misuse issues	3	3	100%	0	0%	3
Technology helping to maintain independence	152	150	99%	2	1%	120
Stay Safe	Total Needing support 183	Total succ	essful 182 (99.5%)			
To maintain their accommodation	109	109	100%	0	0%	107
To secure/obtain settled accommodation	34	34	100%	0	0%	23
To comply with statutory orders	2	2	100%	0	0%	2
To better manage self harm	6	6	100%	0	0%	6
To avoid causing harm to others	8	8	100%	0	0%	8
To minimise risk of harm from others	24	23	96%	1	4%	23
Make a positive Contribution	Total Needing support 109	Total succ	essful 106 (97.2%)			
To develop confidence and choice	109	106	97%	3	3%	104

# Appendix 3 - Outcome returns

Primary Client Group	Outcome Returns Received	Outcomes Sought	Outcomes Achieved	% Success
Frail elderly	5	17	17	100%
Learning disabilities	40	341	308	90%
Mental health problems	10	60	54	90%
Older people with support needs	143	578	570	99%
Physical or sensory disability	8	50	49	98%
Total	206	1046	998	95%

Fig 4 Outcomes Success in Long term schemes by Primary Client group Quarters 1 and 2 2010/11

# Figure 5 Outcomes achieved in Long term services by Service type quarters 1 and 2 2010/11

Service Type	Outcomes Returns Received	Outcomes Sought	Outcomes Achieved	% Success
Floating support	42	305	304	99.7%
Sheltered housing with warden	104	353	345	97.7%
Supported housing	50	362	323	89.2%
Very sheltered housing	10	26	26	100.0%
	206	1046	998	95.4%

Appendix 3 Outcome Returns Figure 6 Short term outcomes Summary quarters 1, 2 and 3 2010/11

Total 3041 returns made	Was Support need identified	Was the Outcome Achieved				
Type of Support	Yes	Yes	As a % of those needing support	No	As a % of those needing support	
Achieving Economic Wellbeing	Total Needing support 4366	Total s	successful 3494 (80%)			
To maximise Income	2339	2152	92%	187	8%	
To reduce debt	1338	1059	79%	279	21%	
To obtain paid work	689	283	41%	406	59%	
Enjoy and Achieve	Total Needing support 3946	Total s	successful 3209 (81.3%	)		
To participate in training/education	1002	673	67%	329	33%	
To participate in informal learning	661	569	86%	92	14%	
To participate in work-like activities	537	335	62%	202	38%	
To establish contact with external groups	1746	1632	93%	114	7%	
Be Healthy	Total Needing support 3637	Total s	uccessful 2999 (82.5%	)		
Manage physical health	1180	1021	87%	159	13%	
Manage mental health	1394	1148	82%	246	18%	
Manage substance misuse issues	873	653	75%	220	25%	
Technology helping to maintain independence	190	177	93%	13	7%	
Stay Safe	Total Needing support 4976	Total s	uccessful 3985 (80.1%	)		
To maintain their accommodation	1573	1294	68%	599	32%	
To secure/obtain settled accommodation	1893	1433	76%	460	24%	
To comply with statutory orders	406	325	80%	81	20%	
To better manage self harm	269	218	81%	51	19%	
To avoid causing harm to others	223	185	83%	38	17%	
To minimise risk of harm from others	612	530	87%	82	13%	
Make a positive Contribution	Total Needing support 1788	Total successful 1583 (88.5%)				
	5					

Appendix 3 Outcome returns Figure 7 and 8 Outcomes Success in Short term schemes by Primary Client Group and Service Type 2010/11

Primary Client Group	Outcomes Received	Outcomes Sought	Outcomes Achieved	% Success
Alcohol problems	93	756	619	82%
Drug problems	66	511	386	76%
Frail elderly	2	15	11	73%
Generic/Complex needs	524	2969	2514	85%
Homeless families with support needs	67	348	314	90%
Learning disabilities	68	395	330	84%
Mental health problems	344	2146	1837	86%
Mentally disordered offenders	1	7	5	71%
Offenders/at risk of offending	129	1105	814	74%
Older people mental health	10	64	61	95%
Older people with support needs	139	534	475	89%
People at risk of domestic violence	251	1619	1358	84%
People with HIV/AIDS	16	36	34	94%
Physical or sensory disability	70	455	389	85%
Refugees	2	8	7	88%
Rough Sleeper	190	977	835	85%
Single homeless with support needs	731	4663	3713	80%
Teenage parents	74	459	362	79%
Traveller	1	5	5	100%
Young people at risk	217	1302	896	69%
Young people leaving care	46	339	305	90%
Total	3041	18713	15270	82%

#### Figure 7 by Primary Client Group

## Figure 8 by service type

Service Type	Outcomes Received	Outcomes Sought	Outcomes Achieved	% Success
Direct access	169	1228	943	76.8%
Floating support	1655	9626	8149	84.7%
Foyer	99	668	487	72.9%
Outreach service	444	2162	1974	91.3%
Resettlement Services	18	146	91	62.3%
Supported housing	498	3817	2709	71.0%
Supported lodgings	34	281	263	93.6%
Teenage parent accommodation	17	113	93	82.3%
Women's refuge	107	672	561	83.5%
	3041	18713	15270	81.6%