

αβχδεφγηιφκλμ

Health Department
Directorate of Primary Care and Community Care

Community Care Division
St Andrew's House
Regent Road
Edinburgh EH1 3DG

Chief Executives – NHS Boards
Chief Executives – Local Authorities
Directors of Social Work
Joint Future Managers
Community Health Partnership Managers

Telephone: 0131-244 1835
Fax: 0131-244 3502
Adam.Rennie@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk>

Your ref:
Our ref:

4 August 2006

Dear Colleague

JOINT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION AND ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (JPIAF) DRAFT ANNUAL EVALUATION STATEMENTS – 2005/06

I enclose the draft JPIAF Annual Evaluation Statement (AES) 2005/06 for your Joint Future partnership. The JPIAF is designed to assist local partnerships in delivering improved outcomes for service users and their carers. It should complement the local performance measurement and management frameworks which local partnerships are developing. The draft AES creates an opportunity for local and national partners to assess progress. The AES should also help partners to determine local priorities, inform the strategic development of joint working locally and ensure that the focus on delivering better outcomes is maintained.

Please could you forward this letter and the draft Statement to the relevant Boards, Committees and managers for their attention and appropriate action. I would be grateful for replies by Friday 15 September 2006.

Context for the JPIAF Annual Evaluation Statement 2005/06

Background

The outcomes approach is now at the centre of delivering joint working. In January Rory Mair and Kevin Woods, the joint chairs of the Joint Future Implementation Advisory Group (JFIAG), issued guidance aimed at embedding outcomes in a performance management framework and culture. The

Group's expectation is that the focus will shift from reporting in-house and to the Executive to more regular public reporting. They also expect that local targets will be testing and challenging, as well as achievable, and will focus more on longer term improvement, rather than short-term responses.

For 2005-06 we were looking for partnerships to consolidate the progress they had made on the outcomes approach in 2004/05. Consequently the two outcomes indicators (JPIAF 10 and JPIAF 11) once more focus on services for older people. JPIAF 6 (SSA) and JPIAF 8 (direct access) continue to cover all adult client groups, as they did in 2004-05.

Outcomes Group

In response to the challenges for partnerships in moving to an outcomes approach, JFIAG established two new sub-groups: one on Outcomes, to examine what focusing on outcomes means in cultural and organisational terms; and the other on Faster Access to Services, to look at the infrastructure required to achieve and sustain that approach.

The JFIAG meeting in May decided that a more radical examination of how joint progress is reported and evaluated should be undertaken. It has now been agreed that there should be one sub-group, not two. This will be the Outcomes Group. This group is chaired by Tim Davison (NHS Lanarkshire) and he and the other 3 original co-chairs (John Burns, Colin MacKenzie and David Kelly) form a Project Board for the wider group. Membership of this group was agreed with CoSLA and the project board, and is drawn from across the partnerships and from a wide range of organisations. It includes users and carers.

The joint chairs of JFIAG will provide further information to partnerships on the scope and remit of the Outcomes Group, following the meeting of JFIAG on 14 August. The work of this Group will be developed in close consultation with partnerships and other stakeholders through a series of workshops, seminars and other events.

Overview

I am pleased to report that in JPIAF 2005-06 joint performance has improved. Although the indicators are more challenging this year, consistency of performance across the partnerships has improved. I am most grateful to partnerships for their commitment to bringing that about. Progress in some areas is not as strong as we would like, but generally there has been a significant shift in partnerships' understanding of whole systems and outcomes. The majority of partnerships reported within the specified timescale and non-reporting has been very limited. However, where partnerships have not reported on an indicator, this has affected their score.

It has also been encouraging that several partnerships have made active links across all of the indicators in JPIAF 2005-06, rather than seeing them in isolation. In addition, for the first time submissions under JPIAF 6 and JPIAF 8 are able to provide us with a national picture of the development of SSA and direct access to resources. This data requires more detailed interrogation before conclusions can be drawn, but it provides a valuable baseline of information for the work of the Outcomes Group.

Although there was no requirement to produce Local Improvement Targets (LITs) for all client groups, partnerships that were already doing so were asked to include such LITs within their submissions. The national partners are greatly encouraged to note that 20 of the 32 partnerships have developed LITs for at least one client group other than older people, and several partnerships have

provided a full suite of targets for all Community Care service users. Feedback on these targets has been provided to relevant partnerships within their evaluations, although (as partnerships were not required to provide this information) this has not been included in the overall assessment score. In addition to providing a clear outcomes focus on service development locally, these submissions are helpful in informing the extension of LITs. Partnerships might like to note that this now forms one element of the work of the Outcomes Group. A meeting with Joint Future Managers to discuss how this might proceed is planned for October.

Draft Annual Evaluation Statements

The draft annual evaluation statements have been compiled by an Annual Evaluation Team which consists of members of the Scottish Executive Health Department and Audit Scotland.

Purpose - The Indicators and what they are measuring

The Whole System Indicator (JPIAF 10) measures local partnerships' demonstration of their ability to identify priorities for improvement in their systems of service delivery. Local Improvement Targets are expected to address these priorities and relevant national targets. The Local Improvement Targets Indicator (JPIAF 11) measures the appropriate development of partnerships' 2006-07 targets in terms of their coverage, technical sufficiency and substantive content. In addition partnerships have for the first time been measured on their full year progress against the targets they set for 2005-06. We have reported back to partnerships on the initial assessment of their LITs for equipment and adaptations. Almost all were scored as 'insufficient'. Because this is a new target area, we have not included this within the overall scores for JPIAF 11.

The cross-agency access to resources indicator (JPIAF 8) measures local partnerships' progress on delivering direct access to resources in social work, health and housing through Single Shared Assessment. For 2005-06 partnerships were asked to indicate the proportion of resources from each partner which can be directly accessed by other professionals.

The Single Shared Assessment Indicator (JPIAF 6) is aimed at providing quantitative data on the number and nature of SSAs by lead assessor and agency and the time period from referral to delivery of first service where an SSA has been conducted. The indicator seeks to provide information about local improvement on assessment and increasing the speed of access to services. In turn, this is expected to inform analysis of whole system priorities and local improvement targets.

Content

The draft AES sets out our assessment of the information submitted by local partnerships. The overall evaluation statement contains our assessment of your local partnership's progress on meeting the JPIAF indicator requirements. This has been weighted toward measuring progress on the outcomes indicators JPIAF 10 and 11. Given their significance, these account for approximately two-thirds of the assessed overall performance rating. We have assessed overall performance as falling into one of the following categories:

- Meets or nearly meets - *(the indicator requirements)*
- Good progress - *(towards meeting the indicator requirements)*
- Steady progress - *(towards meeting the indicator requirements)*
- Improvement required - *(to meet the indicator requirements)*
- No evidence submitted

These terms are used throughout the evaluation. The only two exceptions are the comparative model in JPIAF 10, which refers to the relationships to the average, and in JPIAF 11, where progress against 2005-06 targets is measured in percentage terms

No Evidence Submitted

Where evidence has not been submitted, we have clearly recorded this in the individual indicator evaluation statements, and treated it as evidence of improvement required in the overall draft AES.

Areas of Improvement or Action

Areas for improvement and action by local partnerships are set out in the draft AES following the evaluation statement and any detailed evaluation comments.

Evaluation of 'Improvement Required'

An evaluation of 'improvement required' means that the AES Team had cause for concern over a local partnership's progress on developing local outcome-focused joint performance measurement systems and supporting processes. The individual indicator statements included within the draft AES set out these specific concerns. Local partnerships with an evaluation of 'improvement required' for any indicator are requested to report their plans for improvement/action in their management response. **We are not asking partnerships to submit additional evidence, but to set out a brief plan of action which partnerships can then reflect in their returns for JPIAF 2006-07.**

Management Response

Accuracy and Completion of Evidence Submission

We recognise that the draft Annual Evaluation Statements are the output from a paper-based analysis based on evidence submitted by local partnerships. The management response provides the opportunity for local partnerships to address any points of accuracy or incompleteness raised by the draft AES in order that these may be corrected prior to publication of the final AES. **We are not this year asking for further material to be provided.**

Please could the management response from your partnership be submitted by email **by Friday 15 September 2006** to Judy King at :

<mailto:judith.king@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>

Any comments or queries about this letter should be addressed to Kirsty MacPherson on 0131-244-5654 or by e-mail to kirsty.macpherson@scotland.gsi.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely



αβχδε αβχ α

ADAM RENNIE

αβχδε αβχ α