


# Adult Social Care Statutory Returns 2015-16 Benchmarking Report

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Adult Social Care statutory returns are used both locally and nationally to improve the quality of care and support, and the experiences of people who use social care services. They are also used to set priorities, measure progress, and strengthen transparency and accountability.
- 1.2. The comparable councils in the ASCOF were selected according to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Nearest Neighbour Model, which identifies similarities between authorities based upon a range of socio-economic indicators. Havering has been added to the comparator group for local benchmarking and analysis, as it is a neighbouring authority. A full list of the authorities in our comparator group is available in Appendix 1.
- 1.3. This paper draws out the highlights of LBBB's performance in the following statutory returns, for the 2015-16 reporting year:
  - Short- and Long-Term Support (SALT)
  - Safeguarding Adults Collection (SAC)
  - Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS)
  - Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)

## 2. Supporting older and disabled adults and carers to have choice and control

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	ASCOF group average	LBBB in quartile	DOT since 2014-15
SALT	ASCOF 1C (part 1a) Adults receiving self-directed support	90.5	<b>90.5</b>	85.1	Top	↔
SALT	ASCOF 1C (part 1b) Carers receiving self-directed support	73.8	<b>100.0</b>	89.8	Top	↑
SALT	ASCOF 1C (part 2a) Adults receiving direct payments	61.2	<b>62.6</b>	29.4	Top	↑
SALT	ASCOF 1C (part 2b) Carers receiving direct payments	61.5	<b>88.1</b>	76.4	Middle	↑

<b>ASCS</b>	ASCOF 1B Proportion of people who had control over daily life	72.3	<b>72.7</b>	70.4	Top	
-------------	--	------	-------------	------	-----	---

### **ASCOF 1C (part 1a) - Adults receiving self-directed support**

- 2.1. During 2015-16 90.5% of people who used services received a personal budget. We were above average in performance, placing us in the top quartile. The remaining 9.5% of our service users received long term support through directly commissioned services. We are currently working through the last elements of personalising extra care and supported living, which will address this gap, whilst providing people with further choice and providing a direct alternative to residential care.

### **ASCOF 1C (part 1b) - Carers receiving self-directed support**

- 2.2. We also perform well in terms of delivering personalised services to carers. 100% of carers with services received a personal budget during 2015-16, an increase of 26 percentage points compared with the year before. The increase has moved us into the top quartile, although many comparator authorities performed well in this measure. All councils in the top quartile had a score of 100%.

### **ASCOF 1C (part 2a) - Adults receiving direct payments**

- 2.3. Evidence used by NHS digital, as a rationale for the measure, has shown that direct payments increase satisfaction with services and enable the truest form of personalisation for people using services. LBBD is a high performing authority with regards to direct payments. We rank first in the comparator group, with 62.6% of people receiving their support in this form, more than double the group average.

### **ASCOF 1C (part 2b) - Carers receiving direct payments**

- 2.4. Performance in this indicator increased by 26.6 percentage points compared with 2014-15, placing us in the middle quartile for the cohort. All councils in the top quartile had 100% of carers in receipt of a direct payment.

### **ASCOF 1B - Proportion of people who had control over daily life**

- 2.5. The council's success in delivering the personalisation agenda may help to explain why 72.7% of people reported that they had control over their daily life in the Adult Social Care Survey. We performed well in this measure and were above average, ranking in second place.

### 3. Enhancing quality of life

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	ASCOF group average	LBBB in quartile	DOT since 2014-15
ASCS	ASCOF 1A Social care related quality of life	18.3	<b>18.3</b>	18.5	Bottom	↔
SALT	ASCOF 1E Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment	3.2	<b>3.5</b>	6.7	Bottom	↑
SALT	ASCOF 1G Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family	90.8	<b>88.9</b>	72.8	Top	↓

#### ASCOF 1A - Social care related quality of life

- 3.1. This measure is collected through a series of questions on the Adult Social Care Survey, that relate to different aspects of quality of life. Our service users had an average quality of life score of 18.3 out of a maximum of 24. Our position was not unique, and in total a third of the councils in the comparator group had the same score as us (18.3).

#### ASCOF 1E - Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment

- 3.2. 3.5 % of people with a learning disability who are in receipt of long term services were employed during 2015-16. Our score was significantly below the ASCOF group average of 6.7, placing LBBB in the bottom quartile for performance.

#### ASCOF 1G - Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family

- 3.3. During 2015-16 88.9% of service users with a learning disability lived in settled accommodation, either in their own home or with family. Although this is a slight reduction compared with the previous year, we still rank first in the ASCOF group and therefore remain in the top quartile.

#### 4. Supporting older people and disabled adults to live independently

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	ASCOF group average	LBBB in quartile	DOT since 2014-15
SALT	ASCOF 2B part 1 – Proportion of older people (65 and over) still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services	67.2	80.5	86.7	Bottom	↑
SALT	ASCOF 2D – The outcome of short term services: sequel to service	55.2	78.5	70.5	Top	↑

##### **ASCOF 2B (part 1) – Proportion of older people (65 and over) still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement services**

- 4.1. 80.5% of people supported by the Crisis Intervention Service following a hospital stay were back in the community within 3 months. This is an improvement of 13 percentage points compared with 2014-15. Despite the success compared with 2014-15, our performance is still below average for the comparator group (86.7%).

##### **ASCOF 2D – The outcome of short term services: sequel to service**

- 4.2. Short term interventions such as reablement, or locally Crisis Intervention, provide people with skilled help when they are unable to cope at home, or return home from hospital. This indicator measures the success of short term services, shown through the proportion of people do not need further services or who go on to receive low level support only, following the intervention. A significant number of our service users did not need long term support immediately after the service. Our score of 78.5% is an improvement of 23 percentage points compared with the previous year, and we have moved into the top quartile for performance.

## 5. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	ASCOF group average	LBBB in quartile	DOT since 2014-15
SALT	ASCOF 2A Part 1 Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care (18-64)	14.2	<b>13.9</b>	10.2	Bottom	↑
SALT	ASCOF 2A Part 2 Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care (65 and over)	900.5	<b>913.5</b>	600.0	Bottom	↓

### ASCOF 2A Part 1 - Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care (18-64)

- 5.1. LBBB placed 17 people aged 18 to 64 into residential care during 2015-16 (13.9 per 100,000 population), the same number as the year before. The slight improvement in performance is due to growth in our younger adult population in the year, which affects the rate per 100,000.

### ASCOF 2A Part 2 - Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care (65 and over)

- 5.2. During 2015-16 179 older people were admitted to residential and nursing care. Although this was 2 more than the year before, it comes in the face of unprecedented demand on the NHS and adult social care during the year. Our relative position is better than for 2014-15 when we had the worst performance in the comparator group. Although we remain in the bottom quartile we are now 14th out of the 17 councils.

## 6. Safeguarding vulnerable adults

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	Comparator group average
SAC	Section 42 safeguarding enquiries per 100,000 population (18+)	199.9	<b>300.0</b>	192.0
SAC	Proportion of safeguarding concerns that ended in no further action	15%	<b>43%</b>	30%
DoLS	DoLS – Volume of applications (per 100,000 people aged 18 and over)	265	<b>343</b>	317

<b>DoLS</b>	DoLS - Proportion of applications granted	74%	<b>93%</b>	88%
-------------	---	-----	------------	-----

### **Section 42 safeguarding enquiries per 100,000 population (18+)**

- 6.1. LBBD had 425 Section 42 safeguarding enquiries during 2015-16, equivalent to a rate of 300 per 100,000 population aged 18 and over. This has increased since 2014-15, which had 199.9 enquiries per 100,000. The process for starting an enquiry may differ from authority to authority and this is reflected in the varying rates across the group.

### **Proportion of safeguarding concerns that ended in no further action**

- 6.2. 43% of safeguarding concerns in Barking and Dagenham ended in no further action, a substantial increase from 15% in 2014-15. Although our score is higher than the ASCOF group average, the data indicates there is great disparity in practices between local authorities.

### **DoLS – Volume of applications (per 100,000)**

- 6.3. During 2015-16 LBBD received 485 applications for DoLS, a 29% increase from 375 in 2014-15. The number of applications received in 2015-16 is equivalent to 343 per 100,000 adults and is higher than the comparator group average of 317 per 100,000. On average councils in the comparator group received 647 applications during 2015-16.

### **DoLS - Proportion of applications granted**

- 6.4. In Barking and Dagenham 93% of DoLS applications were granted, an increase of 19 percentage points compared with 2014-15. The borough ranks 4th in the comparator group.

## 7. Ensuring people have a positive experience of care and support

Source	Measure	2014-15	2015-16	ASCOF group average	LBBB in quartile	DOT since 2014-15
ASCS	<b>ASCOF 3A</b> Proportion of people who were satisfied with care and support services	61.9	<b>59.7</b>	60.6	Middle	↓
ASCS	<b>ASCOF 3D</b> Proportion of people who found information and advice easily	68.9	<b>67.1</b>	71.1	Middle	↓
ASCS	<b>ASCOF 1I (part 1)</b> Proportion of people who have as much social contact as they would like	43.0	<b>39.3</b>	40.9	Bottom	↓

### **ASCOF 3A - Proportion of people who were satisfied with care and support services**

- 7.1. 59.7% of people said that they were 'extremely' or 'very' satisfied with their care and support. Performance is marginally below both our score in 2014-15 and the group average.

### **ASCOF 3D - Proportion of people who found information and advice easily**

- 7.2. One aspect of customer experience relates to the availability of information and advice about care and support services, which people can use to make informed choices about their lives. 67.1% of people who responded to the Adult Social Care Survey said they found it easy to find information about services, 4 percentage points less than the group average.

### **ASCOF 3D - Proportion of people who have as much social contact as they would like**

- 7.3. 39.3% of people reported that they had as much social contact as they wanted. Our score fell from 43.0% in 2014-15 and is only slightly below the group average of 40.9%.

**A list of councils in London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's ASCOF  
Comparator Group (with the addition of Havering)**

- Brent
- Croydon
- Ealing
- Enfield
- Greenwich
- Hackney
- Haringey
- Havering
- Hounslow
- Lambeth
- Lewisham
- Newham
- Redbridge
- Southwark
- Tower Hamlets
- Waltham Forest