



Integration Joint Board

Report Title	Performance Monitoring
Lead Officer	Sally Shaw, Interim Chief Officer
Report Author (Job Title, Organisation)	Jillian Evans - Head of Health Intelligence (NHSG) Alison MacLeod – Lead Strategy and Performance Manager
Report Number	HSCP/18/034
Date of Report	17 th April 2018
Date of Meeting	22 nd May 2018

1: Purpose of the Report

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Integration Joint Board (IJB):

- The latest data in the latest format in respect of Aberdeen City Health and Social Care Partnership's (ACHSCP's) performance against the National Core Suite of Integration Indicators;
- Detail on progress against other high level IJB performance measures;
- An update on discussions on these performance indicators and their relevance and value.

2: Summary of Key Information

Introduction

2.1. The Strategic Plan of Aberdeen City HSCP sets out high level and long term priorities supporting the partnership's ambition to be a well-led organisation that supports people to live healthy, independent lives, providing person-centred care when needed. Currently performance against these ambitions is measured both through a 'Core Suite' of national integration indicators and a set of local measures determined by the partnership as sentinel markers of performance and progress.



Integration Joint Board

Aberdeen City HSCP Performance against National Integration Indicators

2.2. Appendix 1 shows Aberdeen City HSCP's performance against the Core Suite of National Integration Indicators. The information is drawn from the most recent national published data available and shows how progress in Aberdeen City:

- Compares with the other 31 Scottish Partnerships and Scotland overall
- Has changed from the previous reporting period

It should be noted that data for indicators N10 and N21 – N23 is not yet available.

2.3. This information was previously reported to the IJB at its meeting on 31st October 2017 but in a different format. It is suggested that the revised format is easier to read, displaying all of the key information on one page, and using a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) status to provide an 'at a glance' indication of performance.

2.4. Commentary on ACHSCP's performance on those indicators, which were previously agreed as worthy of exception reporting, is noted in Appendix 2.

Progress against other key IJB measures

2.5. In maintaining oversight of performance overall, the partnership monitors a range of other indicators which have been chosen locally. These indicators fall under the headings of Safe; Effective; Caring; Responsive and Well-led care and are detailed in Appendix 3. These are considered to be sentinel markers which give insight into system performance, rather than individual operational measures of performance.

2.6. The data for these indicators is drawn from locally held management information and is more up to date in comparison with information provided nationally. There are still some gaps in this data however. A commentary on ACHSCP's performance on those indicators where there is notable change is provided in Appendix 4.

Comment

2.7. Both the high level national and local indicators used to assess performance of the partnership point to a mixed picture in relation to



Integration Joint Board

performance. Of the total of 33 measures reported, 16 have shown improvement and one has remained static.

- 2.8. Much of the data is historical however. The data for the Core Suite of National Integration Indicators N1 to N9 are drawn from the results of local population surveys. The surveys are conducted bi-annually and recipients are picked at random from GP databases. The latest survey results reported are for 2015/16. The response rates to these surveys are traditionally quite low but have reduced significantly in recent years. In 2015/16 – the latest year available at the time of writing this report – the response rate was 16% nationally. For Aberdeen City the response rate was 14% and when taken as a proportion of the population of Aberdeen overall this represents only 1.5%. Of those who responded in 2015/16, 68% did not have any limiting illness or disability. The results of the surveys undertaken in 2016/17 are due to be published on 28th April 2018.
- 2.9. Whilst we are still required to report on these national indicators, it is suggested that the value they have in terms of demonstrating the impact the partnership's activities are having on the health and wellbeing of the local population is questionable. As our transformation programme is implemented, we expect to see tangible improvements and a clear trajectory towards becoming a consistently high performing partnership. We will only be able to capture that improvement if firstly, we have a reasonable baseline of where we are now and secondly, we capture relevant performance data from those who are directly experiencing both the business as usual and the transformational activity.
- 2.10. The data used to report on performance against the local indicators can be provided in a more timely manner and is extracted from local systems. There are still a number of challenges however. Differences in data collection processes mean we cannot always extract data in a similar way from both Council and NHS systems. In relation to the number of complaints received via the NHS, we are unable at this time to easily identify those that relate solely to partnership services. Similarly with Vacant Posts – only Social Care figures can be reported easily and accurately. Targets have still to be agreed for these local indicators and we need to understand what good performance looks like. In relation to Community Payback Orders and Criminal Justice Social Work Reports to



Integration Joint Board

Court, does an increase or decrease constitute good performance?

- 2.11. There are a number of areas where data is not currently reported which the IJB may find useful. Data on hosted services for instance. Also data on services that are hosted in either Aberdeenshire or Moray but impact on the health and wellbeing of patients in Aberdeen.
- 2.12. It has been noted that benchmarking Aberdeen's performance against Scottish averages and other comparator authorities would be useful. This will be possible only where other relevant authorities capture the same data in the same way and it is reported on a national basis. There is also some discussion as to which partnerships are relevant comparators to Aberdeen. Historically there have been comparators identified within Health and within Social Care but across the country, partnerships are set up very differently. A significant amount of work will be required to identify where the best comparisons can be made. It may be that there are different comparator partnerships for different measures.
- 2.13. Since performance was last reported to the IJB in October 2017 a Performance Management and Evaluation Group (PMEG) has been established. The group is tasked with developing a clear, consistent and appropriate performance management and evaluation framework which provides a mechanism for assurance and monitoring of the management and delivery of integrated and delegated services enabling the appropriate scrutiny of performance; informing continuous improvement; and enabling the partnership to be recognised at a local and national level as high performing.
- 2.14. At the October meeting it was confirmed that the Head of Strategy and Transformation would report performance quarterly over the year; bi-annually to the IJB and bi-annually to the Audit and Performance Systems (APS) Committee. Following the first performance report submission to the APS Committee on 2nd March 2018, the Head of Strategy and Transformation and the Lead Strategy and Performance Manager met with the Chair and had a very useful discussion around the issues with the current data during which it was agreed that further development work should be undertaken and proposals for future reporting brought to the September meeting of APS. It was also agreed that the issues should be



Integration Joint Board

shared with the IJB at their May meeting in order that they had the opportunity to comment on the issues and influence the direction of the development work.

- 2.15. PMEG will progress the development work led by the Lead Strategy and Performance Manager and the Head of Health Intelligence (NHSG).

Appendices

1. City Core National Indicators December 2017
2. Commentary on City Core National Indicators Dec 2017
3. City Local Indicators Jan 2018
4. Commentary on City Local Indicators Jan 2018

3: Equalities, Financial, Workforce and Other Implications

- 3.1 Performance monitoring, development and improvement are crucial aspects of business management. The systems which enable data and information sharing are evolving and a significant amount of work is being conducted behind the scenes to implement safe and secure arrangements.

4: Management of Risk

Identified risk(s):

This links with the following risk identified in the strategic risk register:

- Failure of the IJB to function, make decisions in a timely manner.
- There is a risk that the outcomes expected from hosted services are not delivered and that the IJB does not identify non-performance through its systems. This risk relates to services that Aberdeen IJB hosts on behalf of Moray and Aberdeenshire, and those hosted by those IJBs and delivered on behalf of Aberdeen City.
- There is a risk that the governance arrangements between the IJB and its partner organisations (ACC and NHSG) are not robust enough to provide necessary assurance within the current assessment framework – leading



Integration Joint Board

to duplication of effort and poor relationships.

- There is a risk that the IJB and the services that it directs and has operational oversight of fail to meet performance standards or outcomes as set by regulatory bodies.

How might the content of this report impact or mitigate the known risks:


Regular review of performance prompts analysis and mitigating action where appropriate. The provision of data, information and intelligence to support performance improvement and governance is crucial. This enables the IJB and committees to have the necessary assurance that the partnership is performing to the highest standards and fulfilling the national outcomes.

5: Recommendations

It is recommended that the Integration Joint Board:

1. Notes the performance and progress of the partnership against the national and local performance indicators currently reported;
2. Notes the planned development work on performance reporting.

6: Signatures

	<p>Sally Shaw (Interim Chief Officer)</p>
	<p>Alex Stephen (Chief Finance Officer)</p>