



Improvement East Project Evaluation Form

Section 1: Project overview

Project title	Organisation and Performance
Lead authority	Cambridgeshire County Council
Lead officer contact details	Rod Craig, Executive Director (Community and Adult Services) Cambridgeshire County Council Telephone: 01223 699846 Rod.craig@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Partner authorities involved	All 11 local authorities with adult social service responsibilities in the East of England are involved in this work stream
Project description, purpose and outcomes	<p>The programme of work has supported Local Authorities to improve their performance across key adult social care deliverables, enabling improved delivery of key outcomes for service users.</p> <p>It has started to develop the link between the use of performance information and performance improvement, as well as the preparation for the Comprehensive Area Assessments. It has improved efficiency by supporting improved understanding of links between commissioning for quality services and the cost of services.</p> <p>The programme has supported Councils, identified through the Care Quality Commission Annual Performance Assessment process, as requiring further support to bring them in line with the rest of the region.</p>

Section 2: Final status

Original budget	The budget for this project was £199,000
Actual total cost	<p>Due to the time of submission of this paper the JIP are only able to make an estimate of final costs as all of the invoices have not yet been submitted</p> <p>The current estimate for the Organisation and Performance costs is approximately £90,000 to £100,000. This means that everything was delivered under budget!</p>

	However, the contract for the Programme Manager has been extended for an additional two months (end of May 2010) to continue to move the regional strategy forward and until a decision has been made on year 3 projects.
Cost savings and efficiencies achieved	The Performance Leads Meeting was reduced recently from a two day residential meeting to a one day strategic meeting. This resulted in some efficiency savings for this year as overnight accommodation was not required.

Original estimated end date	31 st March 2010
Actual end date	N/A

Section 3: Achievements and learning

Were the original objectives achieved?	<p>Performance Leads Development through the ADASS Performance Leads Group</p> <p>The original objectives were achieved through a rolling programme of developmental sessions, led by expert speakers/facilitators. The days have supported ongoing development of the performance agenda, offered peer support, networking and improved learning. The group has engaged with key stakeholders across the Health and Social Care Sector. For example in July 2009 the following subjects were discussed to improve learning and understanding which have helped the Leads in their localities to benchmark and create better ways of working:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NI Development via Simon Metcalf, DH • Outcome based review work via Martin Cattermole, DH • Three most important outcomes/three wishes indicator with Michael Varrow of Oxfordshire • Outcomes Star Triangle Consulting with Joy MacKeith • TRACS & TRIPS tools from CSED, Mike Charnley Fisher • Assessment and Inspection, Frances Carey, Care Quality Commission • Local Area Agreements, Jan Sensier, DCLG, GOEM • Strategic Improving Information Programme, Penny Hill NHS IC <p>The group use the Communities of Practice website to share information and facilitate discussions.</p> <p>Programme Manager recruitment</p> <p>A Programme Manager, Natasha Burberry (ex Care Quality Commission) was recruited and started on the 1st December 2009. Natasha works three days per week.</p>
---	--

	<p>Regional Improvement Strategy A Regional Improvement Strategy was developed successfully in collaboration with the Department of Health Social Care and Performance Team. The findings incorporate outcomes from the CQC and the CAA processes.</p> <p>Overall regional performance CQC acknowledged that improvements had been made in the performance assessment year 2008/09 and overall as a region, we managed to sustain our performing “well” status. This is seen as a great achievement in a time of financial challenges and ever changing processes. However, the region is not complacent and acknowledges the need to improve particularly on its personalisation and safeguarding outcomes.</p> <p>Support to Priority Councils The two newly-formed unitary authorities of Bedford Borough and Central Bedfordshire were not subject to formal judgement by CQC in 2009; nor were they assigned flag ratings (green or red) as a part of CAA. However, CQC has been clear that had they been formally assessed, both would have been rated as weaker performers due to concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inheritance of poor performing adult social services from the former county council • CSCI recommendations (from 2008) around adult safeguarding not yet achieved • Slow progress around delivering personalisation, prevention and early intervention agendas <p>The Performance work stream has provided some funding to support Bedford Borough and Bedford Central to improve performance. The impact of this work will not be known until the next performance assessment outcomes process has been completed in September.</p> <p>Annual JIP Conference The Organisation part of the programme has worked with the JIP Programme Manager and the JIP Support Officer to ensure the Annual JIP Conference incorporates the performance agenda for the year ahead. The Performance Leads are actively taking a role in presenting a workshop to showcase the outcomes of their work.</p> <p>JIP Peer Support The JIP Manager is engaged with the JIP Programmes and is working with the team to ensure an understanding of the requirements and links to the Performance Assessment Frameworks.</p>
<p>Were the end users/clients satisfied with the project?</p>	<p>Performance Leads Development The Performance Leads have a number of examples of how the interaction in the meetings has strengthened performance management locally and increased knowledge and understanding. For example:</p>

Specific work around benchmarking

“The early work around PAF 32 helped us as a Council to understand our performance and then go on to learn from high performing neighbouring Councils” (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Presentations at events

“The highlight for me was the NASCIAS presentation by Robert Lake of the Information Centre. Before the meeting I’d heard of NASCIS, last week I used the online report creator (OLAP) to evidence how the performance of our new authority compared to others to inform queries from CQC” (Central Bedfordshire)

The whole group reported that Performance Lead Development days supported ongoing development of the performance agenda, offered peer support, networking and learning and this has been invaluable for them.

Regional Improvement Strategy

The Regional Improvement Strategy was presented and successfully signed off by Directors and key stakeholders at the JIP Core Group. The strategy was seen as being positive and will act as a main vehicle for the improvement work in the year ahead.

JIP Conference

The JIP Organisation and Performance work stream worked with the JIP cross cutting team to develop the regional JIP Conference on the 11th March. Speakers included John Bolton and Jenny Owen. The conference was attended by 68 people mainly Directors of LAs and their ADs. It also offered an opportunity to show case some of the work the Jip has delivered in the region.

JIP Peer Support

The JIP Manager for organisation and performance is starting to work with the JIP Management Team to ensure the connection between the programmes and the Performance Assessment Process. For example:

- Work with the Safeguarding work stream to identify CQC priorities and has provided analysis of data and evidence to support this.
- Work with the JSNA work stream to create a framework of questions the CQC might ask in their assessment process.

Support to Priority Councils

The full impact of the support provided through the Performance Work stream to Bedford Borough and Bedford Central is not known, however, we are confident that the funds provided have been targeted at priority areas:

For Bedford Borough:

- Organisation/Cultural Development Programme;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transformation Programme Planning; ● Audit of Equalities Practice and Review of Policies and Procedures; ● Mental Health case file audit; ● Review of safeguarding policies and procedures; ● Review and establishment of best practice regarding section 75 and 756 arrangements; ● Review of joint commissioning strategies; ● Development of the service user and carer led and design service directory; ● Review of mobility and transport arrangements ● Development of services in rural counties. <p>For Bedford Central</p> <p>The funds have been used to support SCH&H Programme Management Office (PMO) to deliver a programme approach to transformational change initiatives allowing the business as usual processes to focus on service delivery and incremental change.</p> <p>Although, the full impact of the project is unknown, the PMO has ensured that transformation activities are prioritised and managed across the directorate, defining expectations and providing support. Specifically this has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programme Organisation and Leadership ● Stakeholder Management & Communications (including reporting) ● Risk Management & Issue Resolution ● Programme Planning & Control ● Business Case Management ● Benefits Management ● Programme Change Management ● Programme Quality Management ● Programme Budget Management
<p>Lessons learned: project planning</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the Programme Manager was not recruited until quite late in the programme. In addition, the transfer of the Lead Authority from Norfolk to Cambridgeshire in the middle of the financial year was not ideal. Despite this, there has been a vast amount of work achieved in a short space of time (4 months). The work achieved to date will act as a good basis for the year ahead.</p> <p>Whilst working with the Performance Leads Group members it became apparent that the group were not as engaged or linked into regional priority work as they should be. In addition, the structure of the Performance Leads Group Meeting has historically been much about process and learning rather than regional improvement work. This will be addressed in the year ahead with a new structure is being considered as part of the Bid for the year ahead.</p>

	<p>It was difficult to arrange the JIP Conference due to the unavailability of venues within the Cambridgeshire area. The venue and key speakers for next years Conference will be booked sooner. However, despite this, the Conference has been successfully arranged and will run according to plan.</p>
Lessons learned: effectiveness of project	As above.
Were any unexpected opportunities identified and realised?	Not at this stage.
What went right?	<p>The Performance Leads Groups Meetings continued and were very effective for managing process, learning and change.</p> <p>The JIP Conference has been arranged for the 11th March with a performance workshop which will showcase and raise the profile of the Performance Leads. The PLG were very keen to undertake this session and have a real appetite for understanding more about the Joint Improvement Partnership projects and regional priorities.</p> <p>The Regional Improvement Strategy was discussed and signed off by Directors on the same day it was presented. This was a great achieved with effective partnership working between JIP and the DH Health and Social Care Performance Team.</p>
What went wrong?	<p>Unfortunately, due to the late recruitment of the Organisation and Performance Manager it will not be possible to see the true impact of their work until the Annual Performance Assessment Year 2010/11, although, some achievements maybe apparent in 2009/10.</p> <p>The Performance Leads Group Meeting arrangements were very challenging. The move from a two day residential day to a one day event caused some discussion. The issues were discussed and there was an agreed way of moving forward.</p>
Were risks identified and mitigated?	Yes. As above.
What could have been done to improve the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer action planning for the PLG with measurable outcomes of success and more linkages to Regional Improvement priorities; • Early booking of the Conference event and key speakers;

Section 4: The future

Would the project merit evaluation in the future?	The project will be asking to continue its work and if continued, there will be some clear measurable outcomes from this work stream.
Has learning been shared? How will it be?	<p>The Performance Leads Group has a copy of all the presentations from key speakers which is being transferred to the Communities of Practice website.</p> <p>The proposed project for the year ahead will have a focus on creating some guidance and tools to improve regional consistency.</p>

Section 5: Improvement East performance

Please comment on the effectiveness of Improvement East throughout the project	Improvement East has been very helpful and supportive in moving the programme forward.
---	--

Section 6: Cluster evaluation

Comments from the Cluster:	<i>This section to be completed by the relevant Improvement East Cluster Group.</i>
-----------------------------------	---

Contact:

Improvement East
Flempton House
Flempton
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP28 6EG

01284 758300

info@improvementeast.gov.uk