

# Adult Review Group Meeting September 2010

Thanks again to Estelle Buscombe for providing a comprehensive report on the ARG meeting that was held on 7th September

## Minutes from July Meeting - Update (Kate Anderson, IC)

*ARG Involvement in CQC Review Development* – Steve Willner reported that CQC is currently working on the self assessment framework for 2010/11. The aim is to streamline the assessment into three themes: Safeguarding, Value For Money and Putting People First, and to examine these via outcome areas. This work is currently ongoing but they hope to consult with ARG members in September or October over any proposed new questions that they may need to ask

*Missing data in RAP Returns* – ARG LA reps will work with the IC re the Authorities that submit their RAP Return with missing data. A letter has been drafted which will be sent to the ADASS Standards and Performance Committee to raise awareness of this and the impact it is having on all Authorities. This letter will also be sent out to Directors.

It was proposed to compile a "league table" to reflect the quality of statutory returns from 2010/11, although a table will be issued based on 2009/10 first cut data if ADASS agree. It is hoped that this would then create impetus and improve data quality for 2010/11.

ARG LA reps were also asked to take this to their regional groups to highlight the issue further.

## CRILL – Plans for the future (Graham Booth, CQC)

As of 30th June, CQC are no longer doing key inspections, but are working on a new inspection system for next year. CRILL relies on quality ratings so there will be a gap whilst the new system is worked out.

The CRILL return has a large number of mandatory fields and CQC is suggesting

these are reduced this year, so that it just shows the homes and agencies used, and the number of service users involved. With respect to registration and compliance information, they will supply what they have based on the latest rating. The new rating system will be based around CRILL. The return could be moved but at the moment it'll be based around Sept/October as before. Graham said he would circulate a paper so that we can see what is involved and what the implications are. They are also looking at LAMA.

Steph Abbot commented that it would be useful to know what it is used for, as the ratings are often quite out-of-date. Graham said that the paper will include that. Dorset would like to be able to see what other LAs are buying in their area. CQC are happy to provide national data.

## NHS White Paper – "Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS" (Simon Medcalf, DH)

Simon gave the group a general overview of this and the implications for social care. The White Paper is the first in a series and will be followed by one on public health before the end of the year, and then another on social care next autumn. A summary that could be useful can be found here: <http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH117371>

The main focus will be on outcomes, although lots of old frameworks and systems will go. Over the next two months, the Dept. of Health (DH) is working with ministers to build up ideas on how social care will look. Consultation is ongoing over the Health & Wellbeing Boards too. With there being more of a local focus

rather than national accountability, and hence national targets not being set, the feeling is that this could result in a lack of consistency, with more LAs doing their own thing. The DH is trying to ensure that is not the case, for example via the Zero-based Review of returns and information, with a minimum data set being identified to help LAs manage their activity and services. This would also help with benchmarking. There would still be a national requirement to report on some things, but councils would have their own local priorities too.

Simon believes that there is still a clear role for a national information centre to collect consistent data and distribute it to other national bodies, etc. This will be a standing item on the ARG agenda over the next few months.

## NIS Development – Outcome-based Reviews (Anthony Harris, IC)

This discussion followed the proposal at the last ARG to develop an indicator on outcome-based reviews, and a subsequent ARG sub-group meeting in August where details were given further consideration. A revised definition was presented here, along with proposals to amend the RAP Return to meet the information requirements for this.

Councils have a statutory duty to carry out a regular review for people who are eligible for social care support. Reviews provide an important opportunity to establish that the person still has an eligible need for social care, and check whether the support arrangements in place are achieving the right results for the person and their family. Focusing reviews around pre-determined, personalised outcomes is a key element of the move to self-directed support.

## Social Care Research: Status 2010 Survey

Five years ago a national seminar on social care research capacity was held and objectives for the development of adult social care research were established. The National Institute for Health Research School for Social Care Research (NIHR SSCR) is running a survey to explore views about the current status of social care research. This survey will provide them with an opportunity to review the objectives set in 2005 and look at what may be needed to further enhance social care research.

Please complete the questionnaire Social Care Research: Status 2010 and help develop a greater understanding of key developments and issues in social care research. The survey can be accessed at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/WJ53XFH>.

The survey closes on Monday 11 October 2010, and initial findings will be made available from 1 November 2010.

If you have any queries please email Amritpal Rehill in the first instance ([a.s.rehill@lse.ac.uk](mailto:a.s.rehill@lse.ac.uk)).

Please also forward on this information to your colleagues.

*Thank you in advance for your time!*

The definition proposed is as follows: *'The purpose of an outcome-based review (OBR) is to identify the outcomes of service users and carers, and determine how far support is helping them achieve it. For a person to be counted as having an outcome-based review, the review should:*

- 1. Conduct assessment and reviews which elicit and record the outcomes that the person wants to achieve and the person's priorities for change;*
- 2. Record to what extent whether these outcomes are currently being achieved, and what is working and what is not working about the current arrangements.'*

Feedback from Councils has suggested that there are no specific groups for whom reviews (and therefore OBRs) would not be appropriate, and therefore no obvious exclusions from the scope of the indicator. This means that OBRs would be appropriate for the following groups of recipients of social services:

- Those receiving community-based services;
- Those receiving re-ablement and other short-term services, where there is an assessment and review of needs;
- Those in residential or nursing care; and,
- Carers receiving specific services (but not those only receiving information or advice - although these services are very important and are captured in NI135, it is generally thought a review is not necessary for these services, hence the exclusion from the OBR indicator).

### **i) Clients**

*Numerator* It is proposed to have a new RAP table A1x for the numerator, similar to RAP A1, to capture the number of clients receiving outcome-based reviews during the year by age and client group. This new table will be a subset of RAP table A1 page 1.

*Denominator* For the denominator it is proposed to use the total number of clients receiving services from RAP P1, including all clients receiving community-based services or residential care at some point during the year.

### **ii) Carers**

*Numerator* It is proposed to replace the current RAP C1 tables (pages 1 and 2) with a revised set of tables that separate out the carer assessments from the carer reviews, and within the reviews to record separately the outcome-based reviews from the non-outcome-based reviews. The data would be collected on the basis of the age group of the carer (page 1) and potentially by age group and primary client group of the person cared for by the carer (pages 2 and 3).

*Denominator* For the denominator it is proposed to extend the existing RAP table SD3 to include a new column under 'Not using Self Directed Support process' to capture other carer specific services only. The other column under non-SDS would also be renamed to 'both carer specific services and/or existing/new direct payments' to record where carers receive both carer specific services and a direct payment. Therefore the total for table SD3 will be the total number of carers receiving services provided or commissioned by the council during the year. The data would be collected on the basis of the age group of the carer (page 1) and potentially by age group and primary client group of the person cared for by the carer (page 2).

As this proposed change would extend the coverage of table SD3 to wider than self directed support, it is proposed to rename the revised table as RAP table C3 and place it alongside the other carers tables. A copy of the proposed table can be seen in Annex C.

RAP table C2 will still be maintained

as it is required to provide data on the number of carers receiving information and advice, and also is needed for NI135.

It was accepted that fuller guidance would be required for councils to provide this information consistently in line with the rest of the RAP return.

Simon Medcalf pointed out that work is still ongoing with respect to the toolkits so this return would not be all there is, but would just be the top-level part to try to incentivise councils to change processes etc. It was accepted that whilst this is a process indicator, it does focus on outcomes and what people hope to achieve.

There was concern that this is statistics leading policy more than about outcomes for service users, and that social workers will not see the benefits. However, it was agreed that it would indicate how LAs are progressing with SDS and individual outcomes, so it would help councils to keep track of their progress, hence the decision to bring this in ahead of the Zero-based Review of collections.

The IC accepts that some councils will be a lot further ahead than others, but it is important to consider the business case for this. Manchester felt that it would be hard for them to isolate the assessment process from preventative services such as re-ablement. The point was also made that some service users in the denominator won't be reviewed. DH and the IC accepted that.

Steph Abbot suggested that only service users be included in the indicator at first, as most councils are further ahead with respect to SDS and OBRs for service users than carers. Simon Medcalf felt that it is important that carers are included but that it would be acceptable for this to be done in stages. He agreed that just service users could be included in the indicator initially, but that maybe carer data could also be available.

Nalyni Shanmugathasan (DH) offered to look again at the proposal to break all three C tables down by client group and service user age, feeling that perhaps two might suffice.

Despite some concerns, it was therefore agreed that A1x should be created as a subset of A1. This will not be included in the September letter to councils and hence whilst coming into effect for 2011/12, it would not cover a full year in the first instance. This gives more time for the details to be worked out before councils are informed in full. (The collection is more likely to cover the six months from October 2011 to March 2012 at first.) This will come back to ARG for further work.

#### Mini Review of Adult Social Care Collections (Anthony Harris, IC)

The objective of the zero-based review all current social care data collections commissioned by SIIP is to build an agreed data set of key management information which is of direct use and benefit to Local Authorities and their local strategic partners, to the Department of Health and other government departments, to the regulator and to the general public. This is a medium term project and will not be fully completed in time to be implemented for the 2010-11 or 2011-12 data collections.

Following changes to the National Indicator Set in April 2010 by the coalition government, allied to the requirement to reduce the burden on Local Authorities of central data collections, there is a need for an urgent, interim review of data collections while the main zero-based review is conducted. A number of changes were therefore proposed by the IC which will impact upon the 2010/11 returns.

**NOTE:** None of these proposed changes will require new data recording, and are limited to deletions of tables or changes to their presentation.

## 'Ageing & Society' Editorial Changeover

Professor Tony Warnes is retiring as Editor of the Cambridge Journal 'Ageing and Society' The new Editor is Professor Christina Victor who brings an international reputation in gerontological research and higher education, and a strong personal commitment to advancing scholarship and developing the next generations of researchers in this field.

In addition, the journal welcomes Dr Glenda Cook from the UK and Dr Sally Keeling from New Zealand to the roles of Associate Editor; joining Professor Mima Cattan in this role. Dr Jim Ogg from France will be Deputy Editor of the journal.

Cambridge Journals publishes over 250 peer-reviewed academic journals across a wide range of subject areas. For more information, visit <http://journals.cambridge.org>.