


















































Appendix 1 - Social Work Statutory Performance Indicators

Report Author: Grant Thorne



























Generated on: 01 August 2008

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
SAS1 ASW1: Average time taken to provide community care services				Performance has reduced from 21 days in 2006/07 to 22 days in 2007/08. Our performance matched the Scottish average during 06/07 but figures are not yet available for comparison for 07/08.	Assess impact on performance of individual services timescales		0 %	22	21	22	20	19	18	17	15
					Set targets for each individual service		0 %								
SAS2a ASW2a: % of care staff with appropriate qualifications in council residential homes for older people				Unaudited PI figure	100% of staff in older peoples care homes to complete required course within 12 months of commencing		0 %	49.2%	61%	57.7%	80%	95%	95%	95%	95%
					100% of staff in older peoples care homes to be qualified		0 %								
SAS3a1ii ASW3: % of older people accommodated in single rooms in council owned care homes				Unaudited PI figure	Undertake a Capacity Planning Review		0 %	100%	100%	100%					
					Maintain 100% single room occupancy in local authority older peoples homes		0 %								
SAS3a1iii ASW3: % of older people accommodated in rooms with en-suite facilities in council owned care homes				Unaudited PI figure	Undertake a Capacity Planning Review		0 %	20.7%	24.1%	25%					
					Implement capital programme of improvements		0 %								
					Action and implement recommendations of Balance of Care Study		0 %								
SAS3b1ii ASW3: % of other adults accommodated in single				Unaudited PI				0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
rooms in council owned care homes															
SAS3b1iii ASW3: % of other adults accommodated in rooms with en-suite facilities in council owned care homes				Unaudited PI Figure				0%	71.4%	83.3%					
SAS4bii ASW4b: Total number of homecare hours provided as a rate per 1,000 population aged 65+				Target has been exceeded for 2007/08 following continued improvement since quarter 2 of 07/08. In 06/07 we ranked 4th nationally but comparator information will not be available for 07/08 until December	Evaluate impact of Revised Model of Service Delivery		0 %	758.3	750.5	758.6	750.5	750.5	750.5	750.5	750.5
					Secure/ensure funding for free personal care		0 %								
					Implement recommendations of Balance of Care Study		0 %								
SAS4ci1 ASW4c: Percentage of homecare clients aged 65+ receiving personal care				Will require to further increase in line with shift in Balance of Care	Complete Needs Assessment		0 %	43%	62.5%	65.1%	65%	67%	69%	70%	70%
					Secure/ensure funding for free personal care		0 %								
					Implement recommendations of Balance of Care Study		0 %								
SAS4cii2 ASW4c: Percentage of homecare clients aged 65+ receiving a service during evening/overnight				Will require to further increase in line with shift in Balance of Care	Complete Needs Assessment		0 %	19%	22.8%	26%	25%	28%	30%	32%	33%
					Secure/ensure funding for free personal care		0 %								
					Implement recommendations of Balance of Care Study		0 %								
SAS4ciii2 ASW4c: Percentage of homecare clients aged 65+ receiving a service at weekends				Will require to further increase in line with shift in Balance of Care	Complete Needs Assessment		0 %	47.1%	48.4%	53.1%	51%	55%	57%	59%	60%
					Secure/ensure funding for free personal care		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
					Implement recommendations of Balance of Care Study		0 %								
SAS5aii ASW5a: Number of nights of respite care provided for elderly people (65+) per 1000 65+				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	292.6	295.6	297.2	325	350	350	350	350
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
SAS5aiv ASW5a: Number of nights of respite care provided for other adults (18-64) per 1000 18-64				Increased from 45 as 40 additional nights included	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	35.5	39.2	45.7	38	39	39	39	39
					Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process of Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
SAS5bii ASW5b: % of overnight respite nights not in a care home for elderly people (65+)				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	0.5%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
SAS5biv ASW5b: % of overnight respite nights not in a care home for other adults (18-64)				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	0%	0%	0%					
					Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process of Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
SAS5cii ASW5c: Number of hours daytime respite care provided for elderly people (65+) per 1000 65+				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	5,811.4	8,558.9	9,140.2	8,560	9,140.2	9,140.2	9,140.2	9,140.2
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
					Maintain total daytime respite hours provided for Older People		0 %								
SAS5civ ASW5c: Number of hours daytime respite care provided for other adults (18-64) per 1000 18-64				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	3,145.3	3,055.9	2,861.6	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
					Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process of Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
					Maintain total daytime respite hours provided for other adults		0 %								
SAS5dii ASW5d: % of daytime respite hours not in a day care centre for elderly people (65+)				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	22.2%	16.9%	15.3%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
SAS5div ASW5d: % of daytime respite hours not in a day care centre for other adults (18-64)				Unaudited figure	Convene Respite Working Group		0 %	44.2%	45.1%	50.4%	45%	50%	50%	50%	50%
					Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process of Pilot One Point of Contact in Learning Disability		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
					Review Respite Processes and Provision		0 %								
SAS6b ASW6b: % of social enquiry reports submitted to courts by the due date				This is a draft figure.	Monitor timescales for SER requests from courts outwith WDC		0 %	85.9%	96.8%	97.1%	100%	95%	95%	95%	95%
					Submit report to DMT		0 %								
SAS7b ASW7b: Proportion of new probationers seen by a supervising officer within one week				88.8% was a draft figure.	System in place to ensure all Probationers instructed to report to Probation Team on day of order being made		0 %	79%	63.3%	83.4%	80%	90%	95%	95%	95%
					Submit report to DMT on effectiveness of actions		0 %								
SAS8b ASW8b: Average number of hours per week taken to complete Community Service Orders					Further Investments in Supervising Officers time (a)		0 %	3.7	3.5	3.1	5	5	5	5	5
					Increase in staff (b)		0 %								
					Additional support to placement organisations (c)		0 %								
					Sampling of average hours to establish when offenders available for work placement (d)		0 %								
					Report to DMT on impact (a, b & c)		0 %								
					Report to DMT on outcome (d)		0 %								
SCS4b EC4b Percentage of social background reports submitted within target time				Figure obtained from SCRA	Assess allocation times		0 %	31.6%	26%	51%	60%	60%	70%	70%	80%
					Implement Standards		0 %								
					Assess & report on the impact of IAF process		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
					Assess & report on the impact of Pathfinders process		0 %								
					Submit report on allocation timescales to Child Care Management Team		0 %								
SCS5b EC5b: Proportion of children seen by a supervising officer within 15 days				This is a draft figure.	Assess & report on the impact of IAF process		0 %	54.8%	69.9%	78%	75%	80%	80%	80%	80%
					Implement Standards		0 %								
					Assess & report on the impact of Pathfinders process		0 %								
SCS6b4 EC6b Percentage of 16 or 17 year olds ceasing to be looked after attaining at least one SCQF level 3 in at least one subject AWAY from home				This is an unaudited figure	Map all current initiatives in place		0 %	69.6%	69.6%	60.9%	70%	72%	72%	72%	72%
					Submit report to DMT		0 %								
					Assess gaps and impact		0 %								
SCS6b6 EC6b: Percentage of 16 or 17 year olds ceasing to be looked after attaining at least one SCQF level 3 in at least one subject AT home				This is a draft figure	Map all current initiatives in place		0 %		50%	54.7%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
					Submit report to DMT		0 %								
					Assess gaps and impact		0 %								
SCS6c10 EC6c Percentage of 16 or 17 year olds ceasing to be looked after that attained at least English and Maths SCQF level 3 AT home				-This is a draft figure	Map all current initiatives in place		0 %		13.6%	30.9%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%
					Submit report to DMT		0 %								
					Assess gaps and impact		0 %								
SCS6c8 EC6c: Percentage of 16 or 17 year olds ceasing to be looked after that attained at				-This is an unaudited figure	Map all current initiatives in place		0 %	56.5%	47.8%	39.1%	40%	40%	45%	45%	45%
					Submit report to DMT		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
least English and Maths SCQF level 3 AWAY from home					Assess gaps and impact		0 %								
SCS7 EC7: % of care staff with appropriate qualifications in residential children's homes				This is unaudited	100% of staff in childrens residential homes to complete required course within 12 months of commencing		0 %	63%	73.2%	75%	80%	95%	95%	95%	95%
					100% of staff in childrens residential care homes to be qualified		0 %								
SCS8a EC8a Number of overnight respite nights provided for children (0-17 yrs)					Convene respite working group		0 %	945	957	1,187	957	957	957	957	957
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 1)		0 %								
					Pilot one point of contact model in learning disability		0 %								
					Submit report to DMT & Care Strategy Group		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process throughout pilot		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 2)		0 %								
SCS8b EC8b: Percentage of overnight respite nights not in a care home provided for children (0-17 yrs)					Convene respite working group		0 %	0.8%	1.5%	1.9%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 1)		0 %								
					Pilot one point of contact model in learning disability		0 %								
					Submit report to DMT & Care Strategy Group		0 %								

PI Code & Name	Traffic Light	Long Term Trend	Short Term Trend	Latest Notes	Improvement Action Plan	Action Status	Action prog %	2005/06 Value	2006/07 Value	2007/08 Value	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2011/12 Target
					Evaluate model and process throughout pilot		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 2)		0 %								
SCS8c EC8c Number of daytime respite hours provided for children (0-17 yrs)				Target to sustain pending review outcome	Convene respite working group		0 %	1,511.9	1,591.8						
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 1)		0 %								
					Pilot one point of contact model in learning disability		0 %								
					Submit report to DMT & Care Strategy Group		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process throughout pilot		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 2)		0 %								
SCS8d EC8d: Percentage of daytime respite hours provided not in a day care centre for children (0-17 yrs)				Target to sustain pending review outcome	Convene respite working group		0 %	82.9%	72%		72%				
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 1)		0 %								
					Pilot one point of contact model in learning disability		0 %								
					Submit report to DMT & Care Strategy Group		0 %								
					Evaluate model and process throughout pilot		0 %								
					Review Respite Processes and Provision (stage 2)		0 %								