



**Yorkshire and Humberside  
Association of Directors of Adult Social Services**

**Sector Led Improvement**  
***Independent Peer Performance Assessment Report 2014***

***ASCOF DATA***

**ROTHERHAM COUNCIL**

## Introduction

This assessment has been undertaken by the Yorkshire and Humber regional ADASS Performance and Standards group. The review has been undertaken by way of analysis of the NASCIS008 ASCOF document.

This document is the first element of the three stages outlined below

1. Performance headlines and observations against the 4 **ASCOF** domains including areas noted as good practice along with **outlier indicators**. The indicator analysis is based on comparator and regional group averages for ASCOF and provides the direction of travel of the individual council's performance over the last two years.
2. Feedback from the regional **mystery shopping exercise** on access to services
3. Observations of the **Local Account** against the list agreed by the regional Performance and Standards ADASS Group. This includes general professional observations from an independent Review Team as well as a report from a customer's perspective of the Local Account. The observation is regional based support intended to help councils develop their final versions prior to full publication.

The information obtained from the first two stages will inform an assessment to be made relating to the overall delivery of services within the individual council. This assessment is then cross checked with the Local Account which the authority submits to the region and is checked by the Review Team in order to determine the level of self-awareness currently existing within the Council.

The following councils are the top three performers (where there is a tie four councils are listed) regionally for the following ASCOF measures:

- **Social Care Quality of life (1A)** – East Riding, Rotherham, Hull
- **Control over daily life (1B)** – Leeds, Rotherham, North Lincs
- **Self Directed Support (1Ci)** – Rotherham, North East Lincs, Bradford, Hull
- **Receive Direct Payments (1Cii)** – Sheffield, North East Lincs, East Riding
- **LD Employment (1E)** – North East Lincs, Kirklees, York, Calderdale
- **Mental health employment (1F)** – East Riding, North Yorks, York
- **LD Independence (1G)** – Barnsley, Calderdale, Sheffield
- **MH Independence (1H)** – Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield, NE Lincs
- **Social Contact (1I)** – Bradford, East Riding, NE Lincs
- **Admissions younger adults (2Ai)** – Bradford, Calderdale, North Yorks
- **Admissions older adults (2Aii)** – North Yorks, Kirklees, Leeds
- **Re-ablement effectiveness from hospital – at home after 91 days (2Bi)** – North East Lincs, Bradford, North Lincs, Leeds
- **Reablement service offered following hospital discharge (2Bii)** – Sheffield, Hull, North Yorks
- **Delayed Transfers (2Ci)** – Barnsley, North Lincs, Bradford
- **Delayed Transfers Social Care (2Cii)** – Barnsley, Hull, Rotherham
- **Satisfaction (3A)** – East Riding, Rotherham, Hull
- **Information and advice (3D)** – NE Lincs, Rotherham, East Riding
- **Feel Safe (4A)** – Bradford, East Riding, North Lincs
- **Feel Safe as a result of services (4B)** – East Riding, NE Lincs, North Lincs

## Performance Headlines – ASCOF Domains

The following section contains an assessment of the council against the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework measures. This assessment provides a picture of direction of travel compared to 2011/12 and 2012/13, areas of strength and areas which require further investigation by the local authority. Included in the assessment are the outliers (regional and comparator group top 3 / bottom 3 performance) taken from public available ASCOF data return.

### Rotherham Council – Trend Data

The table below shows the performance for the council on each indicator over the last three years. Direction of travel is against performance in 2012/13 and then a direct comparison against the baseline of 2011/12 (the first year of the Yorkshire & Humber SLI model).

Measure	11/12	12/13	13/14	DOT 12 to 14	DOT 13 to 14	Y & H Ranking
Social Care Quality of life (1A)	19.1	19.2	19.4			1
Control over daily life (1B)	76.7	71.8	84			1
Self Directed Support (1Ci)	77.1	80.2	80.3			1
Receive Direct Payments (1Cii)	10.3	16.1	16.3			9
LD Employment (1E)	4.8	5.9	6			8
Mental health employment (1F)	4.2	6.4	4.8			13
LD Independence (1G)	76.4	76.2	79.6			8
MH Independence (1H)	64.5	78.6	75.5			2
Admissions younger adults (2Ai)	25.7	19.8	12.2			9
Admissions older adults (2Aii)	953.5	764.5	694.6			7
Re-ablement effectiveness from hospital – at home after 91 days (2Bi)	85.5	86.7	87.7			8
Reablement service offered following hospital discharge (2Bii)	1.8	1.7	1.7			8
Delayed Transfers (2Ci)	4.8	4.1	4.9			4
Delayed Transfers Social Care (2Cii)	1.1	0.5	1			3
Satisfaction (3A)	72.5	73.3	74.7			1
Information and advice (3D)	75.8	80.8	80.9			1
Feel Safe (4A)	60.7	67.4	68.8			7
Feel Safe as a result of services (4B)	77.8	81.8	82.2			7

## Direction of Travel

<p><b>Improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 out of 18 measures improved since 2012/13</li> <li>• 16 measures have improved since 2011/12</li> </ul>	<p><b>Over the last 12 months:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality of Life</li> <li>○ Control of daily life</li> <li>○ Self Directed Support</li> <li>○ Direct Payments</li> <li>○ LD Employment</li> <li>○ LD Independence</li> <li>○ Admissions (younger adults)</li> <li>○ Admissions (older adults)</li> <li>○ Re-ablement (effectiveness)</li> <li>○ Re-ablement (offered)</li> <li>○ Satisfaction</li> <li>○ Information and Advice</li> <li>○ Feel Safe</li> <li>○ Feel Safe as a result of service</li> </ul>	<p><b>Since 2011/12:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality of Life</li> <li>○ Control of daily life</li> <li>○ Self Directed Support</li> <li>○ Direct Payments</li> <li>○ LD Employment</li> <li>○ MH Employment</li> <li>○ LD Independence</li> <li>○ MH Independence</li> <li>○ Admissions (younger adults)</li> <li>○ Admissions (older adults)</li> <li>○ Re-ablement (effectiveness)</li> <li>○ Delayed Transfers (Social Care)</li> <li>○ Satisfaction</li> <li>○ Information and Advice</li> <li>○ Feel Safe</li> <li>○ Feel Safe as a result of service</li> </ul>
<p><b>Deterioration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 measures have declined since 2011/12, 0 measures have deteriorated 2 years running.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Over the last 12 months:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MH Employment</li> <li>• MH Independence</li> <li>• Delayed Transfers</li> <li>• Delayed Transfers (Social Care)</li> </ul>	<p><b>2 years running:</b></p>
<p><b>Top 3 (Region)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013/14, 7 measures are Top 3 in the region, 2 are best in region (Quality of life, Self Directed Support)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality of Life</li> <li>○ Control over daily life</li> <li>○ Self Directed Support</li> <li>○ MH Independence</li> <li>○ Delayed Transfers (Social Care)</li> <li>○ Satisfaction</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Information &amp; Advice</b></li> </ul>
<b>Bottom 3 (Region)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013/14, 1 measure in the bottom 3 in the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>MH Employment</b></li> </ul>
<b>Top 3 (IPF)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013/14, 5 measures top 3 in the IPF group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Quality of Life</b></li> <li>• <b>Control over daily life</b></li> <li>• <b>Self Directed Support</b></li> <li>• <b>Re-ablement (effectiveness)</b></li> <li>• <b>Satisfaction</b></li> </ul>
<b>Bottom 3 (IPF)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013/14, 1 measures in the bottom 3 in the IPF group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Re-ablement (offered)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Areas of Strength (based on improvement and regional and IPF rankings)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Quality of Life</b></li> <li>○ <b>Control over daily life</b></li> <li>○ <b>Self Directed Support</b></li> <li>○ <b>Satisfaction</b></li> </ul>

## Areas for further investigation

Critical areas requiring further Investigation (based on deterioration over 2 years and bottom 3 IPF)

- **Re-ablement (offered)**

The following graphs show direction of travel over the last 2 years and comparison against the IPF and regional average for each of the measures where it is suggested that the Council undertakes further analysis.

