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The Government is publishing this Data Definitions Handbook, which sets out the technical detail of each measure in the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework, with worked examples – to minimise confusion and inconsistency in reporting and interpretation.
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Introduction

On 31 March 2011, Transparency in outcomes: a framework for adult social care announced the first Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF), covering the year 2011/12.

This followed consultation on both the general approach and a draft Outcomes Framework between November 2010 and February 2011, where respondents commented on the framework as a whole as well as the proposed criteria for including specific measures. Based on responses to the consultation, a final framework was agreed between The Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), The Local Government Group (LGG) and The Department of Health (DH).

The purposes of the ASCOF are essentially two-fold:

- Nationally, the ASCOF will give an indication of the strengths of social care and success in delivering better outcomes for people who use services. This will support the Government’s role in reporting to the public and Parliament on the overall system, and influence national policy development.
- Locally, one of the key uses of the ASCOF is for ‘benchmarking’ and comparison between areas. This will enable councils to compare their results with others and, for example, discuss policy approaches with outstanding performers to share learning and best practice. It will also support the “local account” of social care in an area by providing high-level information to underpin the narrative of these accounts.

It also important to reiterate that the ASCOF is not a national performance management tool – there will be no national targets set against any of the measures.

Instead, the framework is intended to be the beginning rather than the end of a conversation about the state of adult social care both locally and nationally. For example:

- Councils can use the nationally facilitated comparability of the outcome measures as a way in to more detailed conversations between colleagues about how to achieve better outcomes.
- Councils can also use data sources such as the Adult Social Care Survey to compare other information they are interested in that are not formal national measures.
- Support local accounts of social care by providing high-level information that can validate the account and the priorities it sets out, as well as support more detailed comparisons.
- Both national and local policy-makers can use the trends identified in the aggregated outcomes (as well as breakdowns such as for equality groups) to form the basis of discussion of policy goals and to identify new priorities.

To support such conversations, the Government committed to publishing this Data Definitions Handbook, which sets out the technical detail of each measure with worked examples – to minimise confusion and inconsistency in reporting and interpretation.
The intended audience for this handbook is therefore both local authority employees who are responsible for data collection, reporting or interpretation and members of the public who are interested in understanding the ASCOF in more detail or who are unclear on the meaning of some of the measures.

How to use this handbook

Included in this document is detailed information for each measure, following a template similar to previous guidance around, for example indicators in the National Indicator Set. The following fields are included for each:

**Title**: Identifier (1A, 1B, etc) and name of indicator as it appears in the ASCOF

**Domain / Outcome**: The domain of the ASCOF in which the measure appears and the associated outcome statement within the domain.

**Rationale**: A brief description of the rationale for including the measure in the framework – why it is important and how it aligns with current policy thinking in social care.

**Definition / Interpretation**: Setting out essentially what the measure is looking at, with any relevant definitions of words or terms (for example of self-directed support) and any notes on interpretation.

**Risk adjustment**: Comments on factors that could affect the comparability of the measure, for example age distribution of the local population and possible adjustment to better reflect the contribution of services to the overall outcome.

**Formula**: Setting out in detail how the measure will be calculated, with a formula and precise definitions of where each component is drawn from, for example source table of a data collection or question in a survey.

**Worked example**: An example of how this formula would be applied to a particular set of data to yield the measure.

**Disaggregation available**: A list of client groups and equality groups by which the measure can be broken down to identify equality issues.

**Frequency of collection**: How frequently the data will be disseminated – biennially, annually or more frequently.

**Data source**: The data collection or survey from which the measure is drawn – in some cases this may combine data from more than one source.

**Return format**: Whether the measure will be presented as a percentage or as a number.

**Decimal places**: Number of decimal places used in the presentation of the measure.

**Longer-term development options**: Ideas for improving or replacing the measure to be explored for future iterations of the ASCOF.
Further guidance: Where to find further guidance relating to the data collections underpinning the measure.

Points to note

Risk Adjustment

The aim of risk adjustment of measures is to improve their comparability between different local authorities by controlling for factors which local authorities do not have the power to determine.

One example of this is measure 1E ("Proportion of adults with learning disabilities in paid employment"). It is clear that the availability of local employment opportunities will have an impact on the ability of local authorities to help people with learning disabilities into paid employment and therefore it seems sensible to risk adjust the measure for this factor.

However, risk adjustment can also make measures more difficult to understand and interpret. Therefore, risk adjustment should only be applied where there is a clear benefit in doing so. The improvement in the comparability of the measure should be significant enough to outweigh the additional complexity in understanding the measure that risk adjustment would bring. Where risk adjustment is not thought to be appropriate current practices of comparing councils with similar authorities can be used for benchmarking purposes.

This handbook sets out some thoughts for each measure on what factors if any should be explored for risk adjustment. Further analysis and discussion with stakeholders will be needed to inform this work. Decisions on whether risk adjustment is justified and applied should be made on a case-by-case basis.

Development of Definitions

We are still developing the detailed definitions that will be used to calculate several measures. Where this is the case, an indication of the general approach is set out. Again, the definitions will seek to balance maximum clarity with a fair and balanced definition – in each case they will be agreed between DH, ADASS and LGG.

ASCOF and the handbook in the future

We will publish a further iteration of this handbook in Autumn 2011, which will be updated to reflect work on definitions and risk adjustment. In the meantime, councils should consider how they could monitor and demonstrate outcomes in the interim period, using locally-defined measures.

The ASCOF is not a fixed framework and the number of placeholders in the initial version reflects the fact that we intend to improve it with new possibilities for outcome measurement. This means that both the framework and the handbook are living and evolving documents.

In general we will aim to publish an updated handbook alongside each year’s agreed ASCOF (usually in March before the year starts), with a further update in the Autumn (alongside the IC letter to councils setting out changes to data collections) if needed.
All future versions of both the ASCOF and the handbook will be co-produced between DH, LGG and ADASS. Currently the mechanisms envisaged for agreeing the documents are through the Outcomes and Information Development Board (OIDB), where all three organisations are represented, with input from the ADASS Standards and Performance committee.

Publication

Data will be published by the Information Centre for Health and Social Care (IC) via its publication pages (http://www.ic.nhs.uk/statistics-and-data-collections/social-care/adult-social-care-information) and also via the online National Adult Social Care Intelligence Service (http://nascis.ic.nhs.uk). Provisional data for the indicator will usually be made available in the summer following the end of the year of collection (i.e. summer 2012 for 2011/12 data). Final data will usually be published early in the following year.

Further queries

If you have any queries relating to the framework and measures please send them to socialcarequeries@ic.nhs.uk.
## (1A) Social care-related quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain / Outcome</th>
<th>1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs (Overarching Measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>This indicator gives an overarching view of the quality of life of users based on outcomes identified through research that are relevant to adult social care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Definition / Interpretation** | This measure represents an average quality of life score for a person based on the responses of those that completed the Adult Social Care Survey. It is a composite measure using responses to questions from the Adult Social Care Survey covering eight domains (control, dignity, personal care, food and nutrition, safety, occupation, social participation and accommodation). The relevant questions are listed below:  
  - **Control** - Q3: Which of the following statements best describes how much control you have over your daily life?  
  - **Personal care** - Q4: Thinking about your personal care, by which we mean being clean and presentable in appearance, which of the following statements best describes your situation?  
  - **Food and Nutrition** - Q5: Thinking about the food and drink you get, which of the following statements best describes your situation?  
  - **Accommodation** - Q6: Which of the following statements best describes how clean and comfortable your home/care home is?  
  - **Safety** - Q7: Which of the following statements best describes how safe you feel?  
  - **Social participation** - Q8: Thinking about how much contact you’ve had with people you like, which of the following statements best describes your social situation?  
  - **Occupation** - Q9: Which of the following statements best describes how you spend your time?  
  - **Dignity** - Q11: Thinking about the way you are helped and treated, and how that makes you think and feel about yourself, which of these statements best describes your situation?  

Note that these are the question numbers and wording for the 2010/11 survey and may change for 2011/12 onwards  

Each of the questions has four possible answers, which are equated with having either no unmet needs in a specific life area or domain (the ideal state), having needs adequately met, having some needs met and having no needs met.  

Responses to the questions indicate whether the individual has unmet needs in any of the eight areas. The measure is calculated to give an overall score based on respondents’ self-reported quality of life, using a combination of the questions above. All eight questions are given equal weight.  

**Interpretation**  
The measure gives an overall indication of reported outcomes for individuals – it does not, at present, identify the specific contribution of councils’ adult social care towards those outcomes (see longer-term development below).  

| Risk adjustment | A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are:  
  - Age of user  
  - Needs of users  
  - Client groups of user |
Where:

**X:** Each respondent is assigned a score based on their answers to questions 3 to 9 and 11. Each of the questions has four answers which are equated with having either no unmet needs in a specific life area or domain, having needs adequately met, having some needs met and having no needs met. The scores are assigned as follows:

- No needs met (the last answer option for each question) = 0
- Some needs met (3rd answer option) = 1
- Needs adequately met (2nd answer option) = 2
- No unmet needs (1st answer option) = 3

The numerator is then a sum of the scores for all respondents who have answered questions 3 to 9 and 11.

**Y:** The number of respondents who answered all the questions 3 to 9 and 11.

**Exclusions**

Any respondents who failed to answer all the questions 3 to 9 and 11 are excluded from the calculation of the indicator. For example, a respondent who answered questions 3 to 8 and 11 but did not answer Q9 will be excluded from the indicator calculation.

Data may be weighted to compensate for differences in local populations, using some of the factors highlighted above. The precise factors and methodology for weighting is to be agreed and will be published in 2012. In the interim, it is recommended that any local analysis based on past results should use non-weighted data.

**Worked example**

The table below represents the responses of 145 users who answered questions 3 to 9 and 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No unmet needs</th>
<th>Needs adequately met</th>
<th>Some needs met</th>
<th>No needs met</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (Q3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care (Q4)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition (Q5)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation (Q6)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Q7)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation (Q8)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (Q9)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity (Q11)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerator for the indicator is \((335*3) + (443*2) + (284*1) + (98*0)) = 2,175
The denominator for the indicator is 145.
Therefore the indicator value is 2175/145 which equals 15.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th><strong>Equalities</strong>: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Client groups</strong>: Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th><strong>Data source</strong>: Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return format</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td><strong>Decimal places</strong>: One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer-term development options</th>
<th>Develop a 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to quality of life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Further guidance | Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys) |

¹ Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
(1B) The proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life

| Domain / Outcome | Control is one of the key outcomes for individuals derived from the policy on personalisation. Part of the intention of personalised services is to design and deliver services more closely matching the needs and wishes of the individual, putting them in control of their care and support. This measure is one means of determining whether that outcome is being achieved.  

This indicator measures one component of the overarching measure 1A – social care-related quality of life. A preference study conducted by RAND2 found that members of the public gave this domain the highest weight of the eight included, i.e. of all the domains included in the overarching measure this is the one that is considered by the public to be the most important. |
| --- |
| Rationale | The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 3: ‘Which of the following statements best describes how much control you have over your daily life?’, to which the following answers are possible:  

- I have as much control over my daily life as I want  
- I have adequate control over my daily life  
- I have some control over my daily life but not enough  
- I have no control over my daily life  

Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2010/11 survey and may change for 2011/12 onwards  

The measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who identify no needs in this area or no needs with help – i.e. by choosing the answer ‘I have as much control over my daily life as I want’ or “I have adequate control over my daily life”. This has been chosen to focus the measure on those individuals achieving the best outcomes, to allow for better use in benchmarking.  

Interpretation  

The measure gives an overall indication of the reported outcome for individuals – it does not, at present, identify the specific contribution of councils’ adult social care towards the outcome (see longer-term development below). |
| Definition / Interpretation | A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are:  

- Age of user  
- Needs of users  
- Client groups of user  

Formula  

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right)^*100
\]

Where:  

X: In response to Question 3, those individuals who selected the response ‘I have as much control over my daily life as I want and “I have adequate control over my daily life”’.  

Y: All those that respond to the question.  

---

Data is likely to be weighted to compensate for differences in local populations, using some of the factors highlighted above. The precise factors and methodology for weighting is to be agreed and will be published in the second version of the Handbook to be published in Autumn 2011. In the interim, it is recommended that any local analysis based on past results should use non-weighted data.

### Worked example

The number of users who said 'I have as much control over my daily life as I want' or "I have adequate control over my daily life" was 156.

In total the number of users who responded to the questions was 210.

The indicator value is \[\left(\frac{156}{210}\right)\times100\] = 74.3%

### Disaggregation available

**Equalities:** Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation

**Client groups:** Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+).

### Frequency of collection

| Data source | Annual | Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS) |

### Return format

| Percentage | Decimal places | One |

### Longer-term development options

None identified. To be considered as part of review of ASCOF following first full year's implementation (in 2012).

### Further guidance

Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys)

---

3 Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
| Domain / Outcome | 1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs  
People manage their own support as much as they wish, so that are in control of what, how and when support is delivered to match their needs. |
|---|---|
| Rationale | This measure supports the drive towards personalisation outlined in the Vision for adult social care and Think Local, Act Personal, by demonstrating the success of councils in providing personal budgets and direct payments to individuals using services.  
Research has indicated that personal budgets have a positive effect in terms of impact on well-being, increased choice and control, cost implications and improving outcomes.  
Studies have shown that direct payments make people happier with the services they receive and are the purest form of personalisation. Therefore, the two-part measure will help capture both overall progress towards personalisation and use of best practice. |
| Definition / Interpretation | This is a two-part measure which reflects both the proportion of people using services who receive self-directed support (part 1), and the proportion who receive a direct payment either through a personal budget or other means (part 2).  
Part 1 is presented as the number of adults, older people and carers receiving self-directed support in the year to 31st March as a percentage of all clients receiving community based services and carers receiving carer’s specific services.  
To be counted as receiving self-directed support, the person (adult, older person or carer) must either:  
• be in receipt of a direct payment; or  
• have in place a personal budget which meets all the following criteria:  
  1. The person (or their representative) has been informed about a clear, upfront allocation of funding, enabling them to plan their support arrangements; and  
  2. There is an agreed support plan making clear what outcomes are to be achieved with the funding; and  
  3. The person (or their representative) can use the funding in ways and at times of their choosing.  
Councils will need to evidence that these criteria are met, for example through local monitoring of outcomes and satisfaction, as outlined in paragraph 69 of Transforming social care (LAC (DH) (2008) 1).  
Part 1:  
The data collections will record for each category; |

---

5 Quoting: Choice and competition in public services: a guide for policy makers (2010, OFT/Frontier Economics)  
6 For the purposes of this measure the following age brackets are used:  
Adult: aged 18-64  
Older person: aged 65 and over  
Carer: aged 16 or over but caring for an adult aged 18 or over
i) people who have been through a self-directed support planning process;
   - people receiving a personal budget in the form of a direct payment for all or
     some of the package
   - people receiving a personal budget (based on the above definition), and
     who do not receive a direct payment

ii) or people who have not been through a self-directed support planning
    process;
   - people receiving an existing or new direct payment (they may also be
     receiving other services).

Part 2:
Those receiving direct payments. The denominator remains the same (i.e. all
adults and carers receiving community-based services), but the numerator
captures only those from part 1 with direct payments.

Interpretation
There are established issues with the data definitions in relation to this measure,
which means that care must be taken when interpreting the information for
analysis and benchmarking.

The denominator of the current measure is based upon a definition of people
receiving community-based services which includes some individuals for whom
self-directed support may not be appropriate, for instance those receiving some
one-off, short-term or universal services such as equipment and reablement.
This means the overall proportion does not reflect the true extent of the provision
of self-directed support to those who are eligible, and it is not possible to reach
100%.

Work is underway to improve the data collections which support this measure, so
that refinements in future years will allow for a revised measure which better
reflects progress on personalisation, and supports analysis against the Think
Local, Act Personal agreement. Pending the implementation of these changes,
and taking into account the general advice on interpretation, the 2011/12
measure will retain the pre-existing definition.

In the meantime, this measure can be used in conjunction with a similar question
in the ADASS survey of social care services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk adjustment</th>
<th>Risk adjustment does not seem appropriate for this measure since the objective is that self directed support is offered to all users regardless of ages, client group etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Formula | \[
|--------|\
| \( \left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100 \) | Where, for part 1 (receiving self-directed support):
|\( X \): The number of users and carers receiving self-directed support in the year to 31st March. 
Source: RAP Tables SD1 and SD3 \[7\] |
|\( Y \): Clients receiving community-based services and carers receiving carers' specific services aged 18 or over in the year to 31st March. 
Source: RAP Table P2f and Table C2\[7\] |

\[7\] RAP SD1 Row 10 Column 5 (Total 18 and over) plus RAP SD3 Row 6 Column 5 (Total all ages)
### Worked example

**Part 1**
Suppose the total number of people who received self directed support (existing/new direct payment or personal budget) in the year 2011/12 to March 31 = 600 and the total number of people receiving community based services and carers receiving carer specific services = 2,000

The indicator value is \[\frac{600}{2000} \times 100\% = 30.0\%\]

**Part 2**
If the total number of people receiving a direct payment (whether part of a self directed process or not) is 195.

Then the indicator value is \[\frac{195}{2000} \times 100\% = 9.8\%\]

### Equalities: Age

**Client groups:** Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Substance misuse (18-64), Other vulnerable people (18-64), Older people (65+).

### Frequency of collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Referrals, Assessments and Packages of care (RAP) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2010/11 proforma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Return format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decimal places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Longer-term development options

As above, we intend to revise the measure to focus only on those for whom self-directed support and direct payments are appropriate, which is not possible from the current data collections. This will give a better representation of the progress of the personalisation agenda and enable fairer benchmarking between councils.

The development of the data collections required is being taken forward as part of the ‘zero-based review’ of social care data and resulting workplan. This review aims to deliver reforms and improvements to the national data set for social care, from 2012/13 onwards. The timetable for amending this measure will be dependent on the progress of the review and subsequent data development.

### Further guidance


---

8 (Number of clients receiving community-based services during the period, provided or commissioned by the CASSR, by age group, primary client type and components of service) pages 1 and 3, row 11 (Total of above), column 1 (Total of clients)

9 (Number of carers receiving different types of services as an outcome of assessment or review by age group of carer, and age group and primary client type of the person cared for by the carer) page 1, row 5 (all ages), column 1 (services including respite for the carer and/or other carer specific services)

10 RAP SD1 Row 10 sum of columns 1, 2 and 4 (Total 18 and over )plus RAP SD3 Row 6 sum of columns 1, 2 and 4 (Total all ages)
(1D) Carer-reported quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain / Outcome</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs</td>
<td>This measure gives an overarching view of the quality of life of carers based on outcomes identified through research by the Personal Social Services Research Unit. This is the only current measure related to quality of life for carers available, and supports a number of the most important outcomes identified by carers themselves, to which adult social care contributes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure is deferred in 2011/12 and will be published for the first time using 2012/13 data.

This is a composite measure which combines individual responses to seven questions measuring different outcomes related to overall quality of life which are mapped to 7 domains (occupation, time and space, control, personal care, safety, social participation and encouragement and support). This is an overarching outcome measure for carers, similar to the equivalent for people who use services (1A – social care-related quality of life).

The seven questions, drawn from the Carers Survey, are:

- **Occupation** - Q18. Which of the following statements best describes how you spend your time?
- **Time and space** - Q19. Thinking about the space and time you have to be yourself in your daily life, which of the following statements best describes your present situation?
- **Control** - Q20. Which if the following statements best describes how much control you have over your daily life?
- **Personal care** - Q21. Thinking about how much time you have to look after yourself – in terms of getting enough sleep or eating well – which statement best describes your present situation?
- **Safety** - Q22. Thinking about your personal safety, which of the statements best describes your present situation?
- **Social participation** - Q23. Thinking about how much social contact you’ve had with people you like, which of the following statements best describes your social situation?
- **Encouragement and support** - Q24. Thinking about encouragement and support in your caring role, which of the following statements best describes your present situation?

Note that these are the question numbers and wording for the 2009/10 survey and may change for 2012/13 pending review and rationalisation of the Carers Survey during 2011/12.

Each of the questions has three possible answers, which are equated with having either no unmet needs in a specific life area or domain (the ideal state), having some needs met and having no needs met.

Responses to the questions indicate whether the carer has unmet needs in any of the seven areas. The measure is calculated to give an overall score based on respondents’ self-reported quality of life, using a combination of the questions above. All seven questions are given equal weight.

**Definition / Interpretation**

The measure gives an overall indication of the reported outcomes for carers – it does not, at present, identify the specific contribution of councils’ adult social care towards those outcomes.
A range of factors may be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are:

- The intensity of the caring role
- Age of carer
- Characteristics of the cared for person

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

- \( X \): Each respondent is assigned a score based on their answers to the seven questions above. Each of the questions has four answers which are equated with having either no unmet needs in a specific life area or domain, having some needs met and having no needs met.
  - No needs met (the last answer option for each question) = 0
  - Some needs met (2nd answer option) = 1
  - No unmet needs (1st answer option) = 2

The numerator is then a sum of the scores for all respondents who have answered all the seven questions.

- \( Y \): The number of respondents who answered all the seven questions.

**Exclusions**

Any respondents who failed to answer any of the seven questions above are excluded from the calculation of the indicator. For example, a respondent who answered six of the questions but did not answer any one will be excluded from the indicator calculation.

The table below represents the responses of 105 carers who answered all seven questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No unmet needs</th>
<th>Some needs met</th>
<th>No needs met</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Space</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and Support</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerator for the indicator is \([(373 \times 2) + (261 \times 1) + (101 \times 0)] = 1,007\)

The denominator for the indicator is 105.

Therefore the indicator value is 1007/105 which equals 9.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th><strong>Equalities:</strong> Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation$^{11}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client groups</td>
<td>Carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decimal places</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Longer-term development options

The Carers Survey is subject to review in 2011/12 to look at potential for reducing length and burden, and the final version will be subject to agreement by ADASS and other stakeholder for collection in 2012/13. There is potential for moving to annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to agreement of local government.

We will also look to develop a 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to carers’ quality of life, as we will for people using services.

### Further guidance

Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys)

---

$^{11}$ Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
| Domain / Outcome | 1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs  
*People are able to find employment when they want, maintain a family and social life and contribute to community life, and avoid loneliness or isolation.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>The measure is intended to improve the employment outcomes for adults with learning disabilities reducing the risk of social exclusion. There is a strong link between employment and enhanced quality of life, including evidenced benefits for health and wellbeing(^{12}) and financial benefits(^{13}).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Definition / Interpretation | The measure shows the proportion of all adults with learning disabilities who are known to the council, who are recorded as being in paid employment at the time of their last review.  
The definition of individuals ‘known to the council’ is currently restricted to those adults with learning disabilities who have been assessed or reviewed by the council during the year (irrespective of whether or not they receive a service) or who should have been reviewed but were not. This is because the process of assessment or review is the mechanism through which the individual’s employment status is most likely to be easily recorded. However, it is recognised that this existing definition limits the scope of the measure, potentially excluding individuals who have been supported to maintain paid employment but not assessed or reviewed in the year (for instance, because the effect of maintaining employment is to increase independence to the extent that further reviews are not considered necessary in that year). This aspect is subject to review and development work in 2011/12 with a view to agreeing a revised definition for ‘known to the council’.  
The measure is focused on ‘paid’ employment, to be clear that voluntary work is to be excluded for the purposes of this measure. Paid employment is measured using the following two categories:  
- Working as a paid employee or self-employed (16 or more hours per week); and,  
- Working as a paid employee or self-employed (up to 16 hours per week).  
A ‘paid employee’ is one who works for a company, community or voluntary organisation, council or other organisation and are earning at or above the National Minimum Wage. This includes those who are working in supported employment (i.e. those receiving support from a specialist agency to maintain their job) who are earning at or above the National Minimum Wage.  
‘Self-employed’ is defined as those who work for themselves and generally pay their National Insurance themselves. This should also include those who are unpaid family workers (i.e. those who do unpaid work for a business they own or for a business a relative owns).  
The measure will not require collection of any further employment status (e.g. unpaid voluntary work); though councils may choose to provide this in addition to support their own benchmarking.  
As above, it is intended to revise this measure so that it captures the employment status of people with learning disabilities, irrespective of whether they have been assessed or reviewed during the year. We are currently exploring the practicality... |

---

and burden of making this change and will include an update on this in the second iteration of the handbook in Autumn 2011.

**Interpretation**
Interpretation of the measure should take into account the point above regarding scope, and the likelihood that some people with learning disabilities are being supported in paid employment by the council, but are not captured within the current definition. Additional local data may be available to support analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk adjustment</th>
<th>We will consider what factors should be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. However the most obvious factor to consider is a measure of the strength of the local labour market proxied by local employment rates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formula**     | \[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

X: The number of working-age (aged 18-64) learning disabled clients known to councils who are in paid employment at the time of their assessment or latest review, using the two paid employment categories above.

Source: Table L1, ASC-CAR

Y: Number of working-age learning disabled clients known to CASSRs during the period. This includes:

- those who are assessed or reviewed in the financial year and have received a service;
- those who are assessed or reviewed in the financial year and have not received a service;
- In addition, include in the denominator
- those who should have been reviewed in the financial year but were not.

Source: Table L1, ASC-CAR

Those who are detained under the Mental Health Act should be excluded from the denominator (Y).

| Worked example | Adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs = 722
Adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs in paid employment = 134
The indicator value = \((134/722) \times 100 = 18.6\%\) |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Disaggregation available | **Equalities:** Gender

**Client groups:** Learning disability (18-64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2010/11 proforma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 (Number of working age learning disabled clients known to CASSRs during year to 31\textsuperscript{st} March, by service type and gender and by employment status at the time of their latest assessment or review) sum of rows 1 to 5 column 9

15 (Number of working age learning disabled clients known to CASSRs during year to 31\textsuperscript{st} March, by service type and gender and by employment status at the time of their latest assessment or review) row 9 column 9.
### Longer-term development options

The 2011/12 ASCOF includes a ‘placeholder’ for a new outcome measure for ‘the proportion of working age adults in contact with social services who are in paid employment’ (within domain 1). The new measure would replace this existing measure for people with learning disabilities (as well as that for those in contact with secondary mental health services), and combine all adults into a single measure for employment status. The learning disabilities element would continue to be available in disaggregation for analysis.

Data development work is being taken forward as part of the ‘zero-based review’ of social care data, and any future changes to national data requirements would be subject to the agreement of local government, and communicated to councils at least six months in advance of implementation.

### Further guidance

### (1F) Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment

| Domain / Outcome | 1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs  
*People are able to find employment when they want, maintain a family and social life and contribute to community life, and avoid loneliness or isolation.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>The measure is intended to measure improved employment outcomes for adults with mental health problems, reducing their risk of social exclusion and discrimination. Supporting someone with their employment aspirations is a key part of the recovery process(^{16}). Employment outcomes demonstrate quality of life and are indicative that social care support is personalised. Employment is a wider determinant of health and social inequalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Definition / Interpretation | The measure shows the percentage of adults receiving secondary mental health services in paid employment at the time of their most recent assessment, formal review or other multi-disciplinary care planning meeting. Please note this measure has the same definition as the previous NI 150.  
Adults ‘in contact with secondary mental health services’ is defined as those aged 18 to 69 who are receiving secondary mental health services and who are on the Care Programme Approach (CPA). Similarly to measure 1E, however, it is recognised that this existing definition may limit the scope of the measure, potentially excluding individuals who have been supported to maintain paid employment but are not on the CPA. This aspect is subject to review and development work in 2011/12 with a view to agreeing a revised definition for ‘in contact with secondary mental health services’.  
The measure is focused on ‘paid’ employment, to be clear that voluntary work is to be excluded for the purposes of this measure. Employment status in general is recorded using the following categories:  
01 Employed  
02 Unemployed and Seeking Work  
03 Students who are undertaking full (at least 16 hours per week) or part-time (less than 16 hours per week) education or training and who are not working or actively seeking work  
04 Long-term sick or disabled, those who are receiving Incapacity Benefit, Income Support or both; or Employment and Support Allowance  
05 Homemaker looking after the family or home and who are not working or actively seeking work  
06 Not receiving benefits and who are not working or actively seeking work  
07 Unpaid voluntary work who are not working or actively seeking work  
08 Retired  
ZZ Not Stated (PERSON asked but declined to provide a response)  
Further development work will explore those on the CPA who it may be appropriate to exclude from the indicator – for example those who are detained under the Mental Health Act for a significant portion of the year.  
As above, it is intended to revise this measure so that it captures the employment status of adults in contact with secondary mental health services, irrespective of whether they are on the CPA. This will require amendments to the manner in which data are collected to populate the measure, and is being taken forward in the context of the ‘zero-based review’ of social care data. The existing definition will remain in force pending the agreement of any revisions arising for future years. |

**Interpretation**

Interpretation of the measure should take into account the point above regarding scope, and the likelihood that some people in contact with secondary mental health services are being supported in paid employment by the council, but are not captured within the current definition. Additional local data may be available to support analysis.

**Risk adjustment**

We will consider what factors should be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. However the most obvious factor to consider is a measure of the strength of the local labour market proxied by local employment rates.

**Formula**

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

- **X**: Number of working age adults aged 18-69 who are receiving secondary mental health services and who are on the Care Programme Approach recorded as being in employment. The most recent record of employment status for the person during the financial year is used. *Source: Table 3 Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4*

- **Y**: Number of working age adults aged 18-69 who have received secondary mental health services and who were on the Care Programme Approach at any point during the financial year. *Source: Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4*

**Worked example**

Adults receiving secondary mental health services = 964

Adults receiving secondary mental health services in paid employment = 196

The indicator value = \((196/964) \times 100 = 20.3\%\)

**Disaggregation available**

- **Equalities**: Age, Gender, Ethnicity
- **Client groups**: Mental health (18-64)

**Frequency of collection**

- Annual (from Quarterly returns)

**Data source**

- Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4 (MHMDS)

**Return format**

- Percentage

**Decimal places**

- One

**Longer-term development options**

The 2011/12 ASCOF includes a ‘placeholder’ for a new outcome measure for ‘the proportion of working age adults in contact with social services who are in paid employment’ (within domain 1). The new measure would replace this existing measure for people in contact with secondary mental health services (as well as that for those with learning disabilities), and combine all adults into a single measure for employment status. The mental health element would continue to be available in disaggregation for analysis.

Data development work is being taken forward as part of the ‘zero-based review’ of social care data, and any future changes to national data requirements would be subject to the agreement of local government, and communicated to councils at least six months in advance of implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic social care collection page at <a href="http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections">http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections</a> by clicking on the year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## (1G) Proportion of adults with learning disabilities who live in their own home or with their family

### Domain / Outcome

1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs

   *People are able to find employment when they want, maintain a family and social life and contribute to community life, and avoid loneliness or isolation.*

### Rationale

The measure is intended to improve outcomes for adults with learning disabilities by demonstrating the proportion in stable and appropriate accommodation. The nature of accommodation for people with learning disabilities has a strong impact on their safety and overall quality of life and reducing social exclusion.

### Definition / Interpretation

The measure shows the proportion of all adults with learning disabilities who are known to the council, who are recorded as living in their own home or with their family at the time of their last review.

The definition of individuals ‘known to the council’ is currently restricted to those adults with learning disabilities who have been assessed or reviewed by the council during the year (irrespective of whether or not they receive a service). This is because the process of assessment or review is the mechanism through which the individual’s employment status is most likely to be easily recorded. However, it is recognised that this existing definition limits the scope of the measure, potentially excluding individuals who have been supported to maintain settled accommodation but not assessed or reviewed in the year (for instance, because the effect of maintaining accommodation is to increase independence to the extent that further reviews are not considered necessary in that year). This aspect is subject to review and development work in 2011/12 with a view to agreeing a revised definition for ‘known to the council’.

‘Living on their own or with their family’ is intended to describe arrangements where the individual has security of tenure in their usual accommodation, for instance because their own the residence or are part of a household whose head holds such security. This has the same definition as ‘Living independently, with or without support’ in measure 1H (see below), however different wording is used to capture the emphasis on avoiding residential care homes.

Situations included within the scope of ‘living on their own or with their family’ are the same as those of ‘settled accommodation’ in the previous NI145:

- Owner occupier or shared ownership scheme;
- Tenant (including local authority, arm’s-length management organisation, registered social landlord, housing association);
- Tenant – private landlord
- Settled mainstream housing with family/friends (including flat-sharing);
- Supported accommodation/supported lodgings/supported group home (i.e. accommodation supported by staff or resident caretaker);
- Adult Placement Scheme
- Approved premises for offenders released from prison or under probation supervision (e.g. probation hostel);
- Sheltered housing/extra care housing/other sheltered housing; and,
- Mobile accommodation for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller communities.

The following circumstances are not included within the scope of ‘living on their own or with their family’:

- Rough sleeper/squatting;
- Night shelter/emergency hostel/direct access hostel (temporary accommodation accepting self-referrals);
- Refuge;
- Placed in temporary accommodation by council (including homelessness resettlement);
- Staying with family/friends as a short-term guest;
**Acute/long-stay healthcare residential facility or hospital** (e.g. NHS independent general hospital/clinic, long-stay hospital, specialist rehabilitation/recovery hospital);
**Registered care home**
**Registered nursing home**;
**Prison/Young Offenders Institution/detention centre**; and,
**Other temporary accommodation.**

As above, it is intended to revise this measure so that it captures the accommodation status of people with learning disabilities, irrespective of whether they have been assessed or reviewed during the year. We are currently exploring the practicality and burden of making this change and will include an update on this in the second iteration of the handbook in Autumn 2011.

**Interpretation**
Interpretation of the measure should take into account the point above regarding scope, and the likelihood that some people with learning disabilities are being supported in accommodation by the council, but are not captured within the current definition because they were not reviewed in the current financial year. This is being reviewed and additional local data may be available to support analysis.

**Risk adjustment**
It is not clear whether any factors should be considered for risk adjustment for this measure.

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

**X**: Number of working-age (aged 18-64) learning disabled clients known to councils who are living in their own home or with their family at the time of their assessment or latest review.

*Source: Table L2, ASC-CAR*[^17]

**Y**: Number of working-age (aged 18-64) learning disabled clients known to councils. This includes:
- those who are assessed or reviewed in the financial year and have received a service;
- those who are assessed or reviewed in the financial year and have not received a service; and,
- those who should have been reviewed in the financial year but were not.

*Source: Table L2, ASC-CAR*[^18]

Those who are detained under the Mental Health Act should be excluded from the denominator (Y).

**Worked example**
Adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs = 722
Adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs living in their own home or with their family = 455
The indicator value = \((455/722) \times 100 = 63.0\%\)

**Disaggregation available**
**Equalities**: Gender

[^17]: (Number of working age learning disabled clients known to CASSRs during year to 31st March, by gender and by accommodation status at the time of their latest assessment or review) sum of rows 12 to 20 column 3
[^18]: (Number of working age learning disabled clients known to CASSRs during year to 31st March, by gender and by accommodation status at the time of their latest assessment or review) row 22 column 3
**Client groups:** Learning disability (18-64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Returns format</th>
<th>Return format</th>
<th>Decimal places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2010/11 proforma</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Longer-term development options**

As above, work is underway to improve the scope of the existing measure. No further development options have been identified at this stage. This will be considered as part of review of ASCOF following first full year’s implementation.

**Further guidance**

(1H) Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with or without support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain / Outcome</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Definition / Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs</td>
<td>The measure is intended to improve outcomes for adults with mental health problems by demonstrating the proportion in stable and appropriate accommodation. This is closely linked to improving their safety and reducing their risk of social exclusion.</td>
<td>The measure shows the percentage of adults receiving secondary mental health services living independently at the time of their most recent assessment, formal review or other multi-disciplinary care planning meeting. Please note this measure has the same definition as the previous NI 149. Adults ‘in contact with secondary mental health services’ is defined as those aged 18 to 69 who are receiving secondary mental health services and who are on the Care Programme Approach (CPA). Similarly to measure 1F, however, it is recognised that this existing definition may limit the scope of the measure, potentially excluding individuals who have been supported to maintain paid employment but are not on the CPA. This aspect is subject to review and development work in 2011/12 with a view to agreeing a revised definition for ‘in contact with secondary mental health services’. ‘Living independently, with or without support’ refers to accommodation arrangements where the occupier has security of tenure or appropriate stability of residence in their usual accommodation in the medium- to long-term, or is part of a household whose head holds such security of tenure/residence. These accommodation arrangements are recorded as settled accommodation in the MHMDS This has the same definition as ‘Living on their own or with their family’ in measure 1G (see above), however different wording is used to capture the emphasis on general independence. Accommodation arrangements that are precarious, or where the person has no or low security of tenure/residence in their usual accommodation and so may be required to leave at very short notice, are excluded from the definition of ‘living independently, with or without support’. These accommodation arrangements are recorded as non-settled accommodation in the MHMDS Accommodation types that represent settled or non settled accommodation for the purpose of this measure are presented in Appendix 1 to this document. Further development work will explore those on the CPA who it may be appropriate to exclude from the indicator — for example those who are detained under the Mental Health Act for a significant portion of the year. As above, it is intended to revise this measure so that it captures the accommodation status of people in contact with secondary mental health services, irrespective of whether they have been assessed or reviewed during the year or are on the CPA. This will require amendments to manner in which data are collected to populate the measure, and is being taken forward in the context of the ‘zero-based review’ of social care data. The existing definition will remain in force pending the agreement of any revisions arising for future years. Interpretation Interpretation of the measure should take into account the point above regarding scope, and the likelihood that some people in contact with mental health services are being supported in accommodation by the council, but are not captured within the current definition because they are not on the CPA. Additional local data may...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Risk adjustment**

It is not clear whether any factors should be considered for risk adjustment for this measure.

**Formula**

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

- **X**: Number of adults aged 18-69 who are receiving secondary mental health services on the Care Programme Approach recorded as living independently (with or without support). The most recent record of whether or not the person is in settled accommodation during the financial year is used. 
  
  *Source: Table 4 Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4*

- **Y**: Number of adults aged 18-69 who have received secondary mental health services and who were on the Care Programme Approach at any point during the financial year.
  
  *Source: Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4*

Those who are detained under the Mental Health Act should be excluded from the denominator (\(Y\)).

**Worked example**

- Adults receiving secondary mental health services = 964
- Adults receiving secondary mental health services living independently = 655
  
  The indicator value = \((655/964) \times 100 = 67.9\%\)

**Disaggregation available**

- **Equalities**: Age, Gender, Ethnicity

- **Client groups**: Mental health (18-64)

**Frequency of collection**

- Annual

**Data source**

- Mental Health Minimum Data Set v4 (MHMDS)

**Return format**

- Percentage

**Decimal places**

- One

**Longer-term development options**

- As above, work is underway to improve the scope of the existing measure. No further development options have been identified at this stage. This will be considered as part of review of ASCOF following first full year’s implementation.

**Further guidance**

## (2A) Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain / Outcome</th>
<th>2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support (Overarching measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rationale
Avoiding permanent placements in residential and nursing care homes is a good indication of delaying dependency, and local health and social care services will work together to reduce avoidable admissions. Research suggests where possible people prefer to stay in their own home rather than move into residential care.

### Definition / interpretation
This is a measure of the number of admissions to residential and nursing care homes relative to population size, comparing council records with ONS population estimates.

People counted as a permanent admission should include:
- Residents where the local authority makes any contribution to the costs of care, no matter how trivial the amount and irrespective of how the balance of these costs are met;
- Supported residents in:
  - Local authority staffed care homes for residential care;
  - Independent sector care homes for residential care; and,
  - Registered care homes for nursing care.

Residential or nursing care which is of a permanent nature and where the intention is that the spell of care should not be ended by a set date. For people classified as permanent residents, the care home would be regarded as their normal place of residence.

Where a person who is normally resident in a care home is temporarily absent at 31 March 2011 (e.g. through temporary hospitalisation) and the local authority is still providing financial support for that placement, the person should be included in the numerator.

Trial periods in residential or nursing care homes where the intention is that the stay will become permanent should be counted as permanent.

Whether a resident or admission is counted as permanent or temporary depends on the intention of the authority making the placement.

### Risk adjustment
Interpretation of the measure will be aided by weighting the denominator by age distribution and level of need. These factors will have a significant influence on the rate of admission to care homes, so calibrating for these will focus on the contribution of services to reducing admissions.

Work to develop the weighting of the measure will progress over the coming months and will be shared with councils in due course. As elsewhere, the weighting will not affect the collection of the data.

The following exogenous factors may be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils:
- Age distribution of local population
- Overall level of need of local population
### Formula

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100,000
\]

Where:

- **X**: Number of council-supported permanent admissions of adults (aged over 18) to residential and nursing care during the year (excluding transfers between residential and nursing care)
  
  *Source: Table S3, ASC-CAR*

- **Y**: Size of adult population (aged over 18) in area (ONS mid year population estimates)
  
  *Source: Office of National Statistics*

### Worked example

The number of permanent admission to residential or nursing care during the year was 430 and the number of permanent admissions that were transfers between residential and nursing care was 39. Therefore the number of permanent admissions recorded in ASC-CAR S3 is 430 - 39 = 391.

The population aged 18 and over in the area is 266,257.

The indicator value is \[\frac{(391)}{266,257} \times 100,000 = 146.9\]

### Disaggregation

**Available Client groups:** Physical disability, Mental health, Learning disability, Substance misuse and other vulnerable people (as one group)

### Frequency of collection

**Annually**

**Data source**

*Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR)* – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2010/11 proforma

*Office of National Statistics*

**Return format**

Rate per 1,000 population **Decimal places**

One

### Longer-term development options

None identified – subject to feedback on operation of measure in 2011/12.

### Further guidance

Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic social care collection page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections) by clicking on the year

---

19 (Number of LA supported permanent admissions to residential and nursing care during 1 April to 31 March (excluding admissions to group homes) by type of residence, primary client type and age group), page 1, row 16, sum of columns 1 to 3
| Domain / Outcome | 2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support  
*When people develop care needs, the support they receive takes place in the most appropriate setting, and enables them to regain their independence.* |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rationale       | This measures the benefit to individuals from reablement, intermediate care and rehabilitation following a hospital episode, by determining whether an individual remains living at home 91 days following discharge – the key outcome for many people using reablement services.  
It captures the joint work of social services and health staff and services commissioned by joint teams, as well as adult social care reablement. |
| Definition / interpretation | The proportion of older people aged 65 and over discharged from hospital to their own home or to a residential or nursing care home or extra care housing for rehabilitation, with a clear intention that they will move on/back to their own home (including a place in extra care housing or an adult placement scheme setting) who are at home or in extra care housing or an adult placement scheme setting three months after the date of their discharge from hospital.  
Those who are in hospital or in a registered care home (other than for a brief episode of respite care from which they are expected to return home) at the three month date and those who have died within the three months are not reported in the numerator.  
The collection of the denominator will be from 1 October 2011 to 31 December 2011, with a 91-day follow-up for each case to populate the numerator.  
Data development work is being taken forward to:  
(i) expand the scope of those counted to include social care-only placements (as well as joint health and social care ones), and  
(ii) expand the basis for the calculation to present this as a proportion of the total number of older people discharged form acute or community hospitals in the period.  
These are discussed in turn below. |
| (i) Expand the scope of those counted to include social care-only placements | The proposal is to remove the requirement for someone to have received a joint multi-disciplinary assessment prior to or following their discharge from hospital before going on to receive a rehabilitation service. This would mean that those that were assessed just on social care needs would now be included in the data collection.  
The rationale for this proposed change is that we should be interested in outcomes for individuals irrespective of whether or not they have had a joint assessment of need. Once it has been fully developed this proposal will be put to the Adult Review Group (ARG) for agreement.  
In the future it may also be possible to expand the measure to include individuals assessed only on health needs, on the basis that this is a measure of joint working and is due to be replicated in the NHS Outcomes Framework once it comes into use in 2012/13. In addition, even in circumstances where there has been an assessment conducted by the NHS not including social care needs, social care may still be involved in delivering the service to the individual. Such a change would of course be subject to agreement from partners including ARG. |
| (ii) Expand the basis for the calculation to present this as a proportion of the total number of older people discharged form acute or community hospitals in the period | |

-32-
The proposal is to expand the denominator so that it covers the total number of older people discharged from acute or community hospitals in the period. This would be based on Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) data on discharges of older people from hospital, possibly excluding some groups for whom reablement would not generally be appropriate (development work will explore various possible exclusions).

Expanding the denominator in this way would mean that the measure would be in two parts – the number of people 65 and over offered reablement as a proportion of all those for discharged from hospital (possibly with some exclusions) and of those, the number still living at home 91 days after discharge.

The rationale is to capture the volume of reablement offered as well as the success of reablement offered. This will avoid a situation such as has occurred in the past where an area scores well on the measure having offered reablement to only a very small number of people.

This change will need to be developed and agreed with stakeholders over the coming months. If the changes are agreed, further detail will be provided in Version 2 of the Handbook, to be published in Autumn 2011.

It is recommended that councils wanting to monitor progress in the meantime use the old definition in the interim.

### Risk adjustment

We will consider whether it is appropriate to adjust for exogenous factors in the course of developing the denominator.

### Formula

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right)
\]

Where:

- **X**: Number of older people discharged from acute or community hospitals to their own home or to a residential or nursing care home or extra care housing for rehabilitation, with a clear intention that they will move on/back to their own home (including a place in extra care housing or an adult placement scheme setting) who are at home or in extra care housing or an adult placement scheme setting three months after the date of their discharge from hospital. 
  
  **Source**: Table I1, ASC-CAR

- **Y**: Number of older people discharged from acute or community hospitals from hospital to their own home or to a residential or nursing care home or extra care housing for rehabilitation, with a clear intention that they will move on/back to their own home (including a place in extra care housing or an adult placement scheme setting) **Source**: Table I1, ASC-CAR Development to expand the denominator to comprise the total number of older people discharged form acute or community hospitals in the period

**Source**: TBC

### Worked example

Suppose the number of people aged 65+ on discharge and who were discharged and benefited from intermediate care/ rehabilitation still living at home 3 months after discharge = 2,848.

And if the total number people discharged from hospital aged 65+ and entering

---

20 (Number of clients aged 65 and over achieving independence through rehabilitation during 1 October to 31 December by age group and gender), row 1 column 9

21 (Number of clients aged 65 and over discharged to rehabilitation during 1 October to 31 December by age group and gender), row 2 column 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th>Equality: Age, Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client groups: Older people (65+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2010/11 proforma Hospital Episode Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return format</th>
<th>Decimal places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer-term development options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over time, we will aim to measure the success of all those offered a reablement service, rather than restricting measurement to those discharged from hospital only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic social care collection page at <a href="http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections">http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections</a> by clicking on the year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

into joint ‘intermediate care’ or a ‘rehabilitation service’ = 4,297
Therefore the percentage achieving independence = (2,848/4,297) x 100 = 66.3%
2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support
*When people develop care needs, the support they receive takes place in the most appropriate setting, and enables them to regain their independence.*

**Rationale**

This measures the impact of hospital services (acute, mental health and non-acute) and community-based care in facilitating timely and appropriate transfer from all hospitals for all adults. This indicates the ability of the whole system to ensure appropriate transfer from hospital for the entire adult population, and is an indicator of the effectiveness of the interface within the NHS, and between health and social care services. Minimising delayed transfers of care and enabling people to live independently at home is one of the desired outcomes of social care.

This is a two-part measure that reflects both the overall number of delay transfers of care (part 1) and, as a subset, the number of these delays that are attributable to social care services (part 2).

A delayed transfer of care occurs when a patient is ready for transfer from a hospital bed, but is still occupying such a bed.

A patient is ready for transfer when:
(a) a clinical decision has been made that the patient is ready for transfer AND
(b) a multi-disciplinary team decision has been made that the patient is ready for transfer AND (c) the patient is safe to discharge/transfer.

Set out below is a table showing UNIFY2 definitions for the attributability of different reasons for delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition / interpretation</th>
<th>Attributable to NHS</th>
<th>Attributable to Social Care</th>
<th>Attributable to both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Awaiting completion of assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Awaiting public funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Awaiting further non-acute (including PCT and mental health) NHS care (including intermediate care, rehabilitation services etc)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D i). Awaiting residential home placement or availability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii). Awaiting nursing home placement or availability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Awaiting care package in own home</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Awaiting community equipment and adaptations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Patient or Family choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Disputes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Housing – patients not covered by NHS and Community Care Act</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

Using a two-part measure means that we can maintain a focus on joint working, while balancing this with a measure that focuses more closely on the specific contribution of social care services.
Risk adjustment does not seem appropriate for this measure since the objective is that delayed transfers of care are minimised. The factors affecting whether this is achieved should largely be within the control of local health and care services.

\[ \left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100,000 \]

Where, for **part 1** (total delayed transfers):

\(X\): The average number of delayed transfers of care (for those aged 18 and over) on a particular day taken over the year. This is the average of the 12 monthly snapshots collected in the monthly Situation Report (SitRep).

\(Y\): Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over)

*Source: ONS mid year population estimates*\(^{22}\)

For **part 2** (delayed transfers attributable to social care):

\(X\): The average number of delayed transfers of care (for those aged 18 and over) on a particular day taken over the year, that are attributable to social care or jointly to social care and the NHS. This is the average of the 12 monthly snapshots.

*Source: UNIFY2*

\(Y\): Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over)

*Source: ONS mid year population estimates*\(^{23}\)

**Worked example**

Suppose the total number of delayed discharges from the 12 monthly snap shots is 812.. Divide this by 12 for a monthly figure.

And if the ONS mid-year population estimate = 570,562

Therefore the average rate of delayed transfers is calculated as

\[ \frac{(812 / 12) / 570,562}{100,000} \]

\[ = 11.9 \]

If the total number of delays attributable to social care or jointly to social care and the NHS is 271, the average rate of delayed transfers of care attributable to social care or social care and the NHS jointly is calculated as

\[ \frac{(271 / 12) / 570,562}{100,000} \]

\[ = 4.0 \]

**Disaggregation available**

**Equalities:** Age

**Client groups:** Older people (65+)

**Frequency of collection**

Annual

**Data source**

UNIFY2 (DH) Office of National Statistics

**Return format**

Numeric

**Decimal places**

One

**Longer-term development options**

None identified – subject to feedback on operation of measure in 2011/12.

---

\(^{22}\) If a population estimate does not exist for the current year then the previous year’s estimate will be used.

\(^{23}\) If a population estimate does not exist for the current year then the previous year’s estimate will be used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Further guidance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### (3A) Overall satisfaction of people who use service with their care and support

| Domain / Outcome | 3. Ensuring people have a positive experience of care and support.  
*People who use social care and their carers are satisfied with their experience of care and support services.*  
*(Overarching measure)* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>This measures the satisfaction with services of people using adult social care, which is directly linked to a positive experience of care and support. Analysis of surveys suggests that this question is a good predictor of the overall experience of services and quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition / interpretation

The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 1: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the care and support services you receive?”, to which the following answers are possible:

- I am extremely satisfied
- I am very satisfied
- I am quite satisfied
- I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- I am quite dissatisfied
- I am very dissatisfied
- I am extremely dissatisfied

The measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who identify strong satisfaction – i.e. by choosing the answer “I am extremely satisfied” or the answer “I am very satisfied”.

Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2010/11 survey and may change for 2011/12 onwards.

#### Risk adjustment

While this question asks directly about services, it is potentially subject to influence of exogenous factors. For example a previous study of home care users suggested that better perceptions of home care were related to amongst other things receiving less than 10 hours home care (a proxy for need) and receiving help from others. Further analysis will be required to explore this and establish whether risk adjustment should be applied.

#### Formula

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) 
\]

Where:

- **X**: In response to Question 1, those individuals who selected the response “I am extremely satisfied” or “I am very satisfied”.
- **Y**: All those that responded to the question.

#### Worked example

The number of users who said “I am extremely satisfied” or “I am very satisfied” was 234.

In total the number of users who responded to the question was 261.

The indicator value is \([(234/261)*100] = 89.7\%\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th><strong>Equalities</strong>: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client groups</strong>:</td>
<td>Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of collection</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td><strong>Adult Social Care Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return format</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimal places</td>
<td><strong>One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term development options</td>
<td>None identified – subject to feedback on operation of measure in 2011/12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further guidance</td>
<td>Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at <a href="http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys">http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>24</sup> Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
### Domain / Outcome

3. Ensuring people have a positive experience of care and support.

*People who use social care and their carers are satisfied with their experience of care and support services.*

*(Overarching measure)*

### Rationale

This measures the satisfaction with services of carers of people using adult social care, which is directly linked to a positive experience of care and support. Analysis of user surveys suggests that this question is a good predictor of the overall experience of services and quality.

### Definition / interpretation

This measure is deferred in 2011/12 and will be published for the first time using 2012/13 data.

The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is question 7: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the support or services you and the person you care for have received from Social Services in the last 12 months?”, to which the following answers are possible:

- We haven’t received any support or services from Social Services in the last 12 months
- I am extremely satisfied
- I am very satisfied
- I am fairly satisfied
- I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- I am fairly dissatisfied
- I am very dissatisfied
- I am extremely dissatisfied

The measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who identify strong satisfaction – i.e. by choosing the answer “I am extremely satisfied” or the answer “I am very satisfied”.

Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2009/10 survey and may change for 2012/13 pending review and rationalisation of the Carers Survey during 2011/12.

### Risk adjustment

While this question asks directly about services, it is potentially subject to influence of exogenous factors. For example a previous study of home care users suggested that better perceptions of home care were related to amongst other things receiving less than 10 hours home care (a proxy for need) and receiving help from others. Further analysis will be required to explore this and establish whether risk adjustment should be applied.

### Formula

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right)
\]

Where:

- **X**: In response to the question above, those individuals who selected the response “I am extremely satisfied” or “I am very satisfied”.
- **Y**: All those that responded to the question.

**Exclusions**

People who select the response “We haven’t received any support or services from Social Services in the last 12 months” will not be counted in either the
numerator or the denominator.

**Worked example**

The number of carers who said “I am extremely satisfied” or “I am very satisfied” was 112.

In total the number of carers who responded to the question was 160 but 7 gave a response of “We haven’t received any support or services from Social Services in the last 12 months”.

The indicator value is \(\frac{(112/(160-7))*100}{100} = 73.2\%\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th><strong>Equalities:</strong> Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client groups:</strong></td>
<td>Carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of collection</strong></td>
<td>Biennial (to be first conducted in 2012/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source</strong></td>
<td>Carers Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return format</strong></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decimal places</strong></td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longer-term development options</strong></td>
<td>The Carers Survey will be reviewed to look at potential for reducing length and burden. There is potential for moving to annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further guidance</strong></td>
<td>Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at <a href="http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys">http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>25</sup> Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
### (3C) The proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussion about the person they care for

| Domain / Outcome | 3. Ensuring people have a positive experience of care and support.  
Carers feel that they are respected as equal partners throughout the care process. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Carers should be respected as equal partners in service design for those individuals for whom they care – this improves outcomes both for the cared for person and the carer, reducing the chance of breakdown in care. This measure reflects the experience of carers in how they have been consulted by both the NHS and social care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Definition / interpretation | This measure is deferred in 2011/12 and will be published for the first time using 2012/13 data.  
The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is Q37: “In the last 12 months, do you feel you have been involved or consulted as much as you want to be, in discussion about the support or services provided to the person you care for?”, to which the following answers are possible:  
- There have been no discussion that I am aware of, in the last 12 months  
- I always felt involved or consulted  
- I usually felt involved or consulted  
- I sometimes felt involved or consulted  
- I never felt involved or consulted  
Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2009/10 survey and may change for 2012/13 pending review and rationalisation of the Carers Survey during 2011/12.  
The measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who choose the answer “I always felt involved or consulted” and “I usually felt involved or consulted”.  
| Risk adjustment | None |
| Formula |  
\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]  
Where:  
X: In response to the above question, all those individuals who selected the response “I always felt involved or consulted” and “I usually felt involved or consulted”.  
Y: All those that responded to the question.  
Further consideration will be given to what responses should be included in the numerator of this measure and confirmed before 2012/13 when this measure comes into operation.  
Exclusions  
People who select the response “There have been no discussions that I am aware of, in the last 12 months” will not be counted in either the numerator or the denominator.  
Worked example | The number of carers who said “I always felt involved or consulted” (and “I usually felt involved or consulted”) was 129.  
In total the number of carers who responded to the question was 160 with 7
giving a response of “There have been no discussion that I am aware of, in the last 12 months”.
The indicator value is \(\frac{129}{(160-7)}*100\) = 84.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th><strong>Equalities</strong>: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation*26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Client groups</strong>: Carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of collection</td>
<td>Biennial (to be first conducted in 2012/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Carers Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return format</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimal places</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Longer-term development options**

The Carers Survey will be reviewed to look at potential for reducing length and burden. There is potential for moving to annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to agreement.

**Further guidance**

Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys)

---

26 Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
### Domain / Outcome
3. Ensuring people have a positive experience of care and support.

*People know what choices are available to them locally, what they are entitled to, and who to contact when they need help.*

### Rationale
This measure reflects social services users’ and carers’ experience of access to information and advice about social care in the past year. Information is a core universal service, and a key factor in early intervention and reducing dependency.

Improved and/or more information benefits carers and the people they support by helping them to have greater choice and control over their lives. This may help to sustain caring relationships through for example, reduction in stress, improved welfare and physical health improvements. These benefits accrue only where information is accessed that would not otherwise have been accessed, or in those cases where the same information is obtained more easily.

### Definition / interpretation

**This measure is part deferred in 2011/12 and will be published for the first time in full in 2012/13.**

This is measure is comprised of a combination of questions in the Adult Social Care Survey and Carers Survey.

The question from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 13: “In the past year, have you found it easy or difficult to find information and advice about support, services or benefits?”, to which the following answers are possible:

- Very easy to find
- Fairly easy to find
- Fairly difficult to find
- Very difficult to find
- I’ve never tried to find information or advice

This portion of the measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who select the response “Very easy to find” and “fairly easy to find”.

Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2010/11 survey and may change for 2011/12 onwards.

The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is Question 31: “In the last 12 months, have you found it easy or difficult to find information and advice about support, services or benefits? Please include information and advice from different sources, such as voluntary organisations and private agencies as well as Social Services”. The following answers are possible:

- I have not tried to find information or advice in the last 12 months
- Very easy to find
- Fairly easy to find
- Fairly difficult to find
- Very difficult to find

Note that this is the question number and wording for the 2009/10 survey and may change for 2012/13 pending review and rationalisation of the Carers Survey during 2011/12.

This portion of the measure is defined by determining the average percentage across the two surveys of all those responding who select the response “Very easy to find” and “fairly easy to find”.

The Adult Social Care Survey will be annual whereas the Carers Survey will, at least initially, be biennial. Therefore, in years where only one survey is conducted
In years where both are conducted (including 2012/13), each part of the measure will be given equal weight, as set out in the “formula” section below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk adjustment</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Formula**

**In 2011/12:**

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

X: In response to Question 13 of the ASCS, those individuals who selected the response “Very easy to find” and “fairly easy to find”.

Y: All those that responded to the question.

**From 2012/13 onwards:**

\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{X}{Y} \times 100 \right) + \left( \frac{A}{B} \times 100 \right) \right\} \frac{1}{2}
\]

Where:

X and Y are as above.

A: The sum of all those who in response to the above question of the Carers Survey, selected the response “Very easy to find” and “fairly easy to find”.

In years where the Carers Survey has not been completed (since this is initially a biennial collection), the most recent value for the carers element should be carried over and counted in the second of these parts in the numerator. In these years, only the changes in the service user element (drawn from the ASCS) will be identifiable.

B: The sum of all those that responded to the above question of the Carers Survey.

The overall measures from 2012/13 onwards will therefore be the average of the score on the ASCS and the Carers Survey.

**Exclusions**

People who select the response “I’ve never tried to find information or advice” for the ASCS or “I have not tried to find information or advice in the last 12 months” for the Carers Survey will not be counted in either the numerator or the denominator.

**Worked example**

For 2011/12 when only data for users is available:

The number of users who select the responses “Very easy to find” or "fairly easy to find" was 85.

In total the number of users who responded to the question was 269 of whom 8 gave a response of “I’ve never tried to find information or advice”.

The indicator value is \([(85/(269-8))\times100] = 32.6\%\)
From 2012/13 Onwards:

The number of respondents to the Adult Social Care Survey who select the responses "Very easy to find" or "fairly easy to find" was 102.

In total the number of users who responded to the question was 285 of whom 10 gave a response of "I've never tried to find information or advice".

The score for the ASCS is \[\frac{102}{285-10}\times100\% = 37.1\%\]

The number of respondents to the Carers Survey who select the responses "Very easy to find" or "fairly easy to find" was 93.

In total the number of users who responded to the question was 220 of whom 8 gave a response of "I have not tried to find information or advice in the last 12 months".

The score for the Carers Survey is \[\frac{93}{220-8}\times100\% = 43.9\%\]

The average of the score for the ASCS and the score for the Carers Survey is \[\frac{37.1+43.9}{2} = 40.5\%\]

The indicator value is 40.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation available</th>
<th>Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client groups:</td>
<td>Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+), Carers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Annual (ASCS) Biennial (Carers Survey)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Adult Social Care Survey Carers Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return format</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Decimal places</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Longer-term development options

This measure does not include self-funders or people with low-level services that may have been directed to voluntary organisations. In the future, we will look at the feasibility of putting in place a broader measure to capture outcomes for these groups. The Carers Survey will be reviewed to look at potential for reducing length and burden. There is potential for moving to annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, which means this could be measured in full every year, subject to agreement.

Further guidance


<sup>27</sup> Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
## (4A) The proportion of people who use services who feel safe

### Domain / Outcome

4. Safeguarding people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm

*(Overarching measure)*

### Rationale

This measures one component of the overarching ‘social care related quality of life’ measure. It provides an overarching measure for this domain.

Safety is fundamental to the wellbeing and independence of people using social care (and others). There are legal requirements about safety in the context of service quality, including CQC’s essential standards for registered services. There is also a vital role of being safe in the quality of the individual’s experience.

### Definition / interpretation

The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 7: “Which of the following statements best describes how safe you feel?”, to which the following answers are possible:

- I feel as safe as I want
- Generally I feel adequately safe, but not as safe as I would like
- I feel less than adequately safe
- I don’t feel at all safe

The measure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who choose the answer “I feel as safe as I want”.

Note that is were the question number and wording for the 2010/11 survey and may change for 2011/12 onwards.

**Interpretation**

The measure gives an overall indication of a reported outcome for individuals – it does not, at present, identify the specific contribution of councils’ adult social care towards to feeling safe (see measure 4B below).

While the indicator will measure those choosing the most positive response - "I feel as safe as I want" - it will important locally to analyse responses on safeguarding in the context of the distribution of answers across all four possible responses. For example, if a council has a relatively high proportion of respondents selecting "I feel as safe as I want" (i.e. scores highly on the indicator) but also has a relatively high proportion of respondents selecting "I don’t feel at all safe", this could reflect gaps in safeguarding services.

### Risk adjustment

A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are:

- Age of user
- Needs of users
- Client groups of user

### Formula

\[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]

Where:

- \(X\): In response to Question 7, those individuals who selected the response “I feel as safe as I want”.
- \(Y\): All those that responded to the question.
| Worked example | The number of users who said “I feel as safe as I want” was 109. In total the number of users who responded to the question was 261. The indicator value is \[(109/261)*100\] = 41.8% |
| Disaggregation available | **Equalities**: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation<sup>28</sup>  
**Client groups**: Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+). |
| Frequency of collection | Annual | **Data source** | Adult Social Care Survey |
| Return format | Percentage | **Decimal places** | One |
| Longer-term development options | Develop a broader 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to people feeling safe. |
| Further guidance | Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at [http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys](http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys) |

<sup>28</sup> Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
| Domain / Outcome | 4. Safeguarding people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm  
Everyone enjoys physical safety and feels secure.  
People are free from physical and emotional abuse, harassment, neglect and self-harm.  
People are protected as far as possible from avoidable harm, disease and injury.  
People are supported to plan ahead and have the freedom to manage risks the way that they wish. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Safety is fundamental to the wellbeing and independence of people using social care (and others). There are legal requirements about safety in the context of service quality, including CQC essential standards for registered services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Definition / interpretation | This measure will be based around a new proposed question 7b in the Adult Social Care Survey, which asks the question “Do care and support services help you in feeling safe?” with potential responses being “yes” and “no”.  
The precise definition will be developed and agreed shortly.  
**Interpretation**  
Whilst the overarching measure (4A) indicates a higher-level individual perspective on feeling safe, this measure complements with a specific response on the impact of services on this outcome. |
| Risk adjustment | While this question asks directly about services, it is potentially subject to influence of exogenous factors, for example the characteristics of users. Further analysis will be required to explore this and establish whether risk adjustment should be applied. As data for this measure will be collected for the first time 2011/12 this will not be possible for the first year of the operation of the framework. |
| Formula | \[
\left( \frac{X}{Y} \right) \times 100
\]  
Where:  
\(X\): In response to Question 7b, those individuals who selected the response “yes”.  
\(Y\): All those that responded to the question.  
Note that this is a new question which will be included in the 2011/12 Adult Social Care Survey. It was previously asked as one of the options within question 12 in the 2010/11 survey. |
| Worked example | The number of users who said services had helped them feel safe was 174.  
In total the number of users who responded to the question was 257.  
The indicator value is \([(174/257) \times 100] = 67.7\% \] |
| Disaggregation available | **Equalities:** Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Sexual orientation  
**Client groups:** Physical disability (18-64), Learning disability (18-64), Mental health (18-64), Older people (65+). |

---

\[29\] Although the survey results will in theory be disaggregated by religion and sexual orientation, in practice there are likely to be significant gaps in the data on these characteristics at least in the short term.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of collection</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Adult Social Care Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return format</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Decimal places</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term development options</td>
<td>Develop a broader 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to people feeling safe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further guidance</td>
<td>Guidance for 2011/12 onwards can be found via the generic user survey guidance page at <a href="http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys">http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections/user-surveys</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Accommodation types that represent settled or non-settled accommodation for the purpose of measure 1H “Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with or without support”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MHMDS Code</th>
<th>Accommodation type</th>
<th>Settled accommodation status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Settled accommodation</td>
<td>0 = Non-settled accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mainstream Housing (MA00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA01</th>
<th>Owner occupier</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA02</td>
<td>Settled mainstream housing with family/friends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA03</td>
<td>Shared ownership scheme e.g. Social Homebuy Scheme (tenant purchase percentage of home value from landlord)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA04</td>
<td>Tenant – Local Authority/Arms Length Management Organisation/Registered Landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA05</td>
<td>Tenant – Housing Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA06</td>
<td>Tenant – private landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA09</td>
<td>Other mainstream housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homeless (HM00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HM01</th>
<th>Rough sleeper</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM02</td>
<td>Squatting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM03</td>
<td>Night shelter/emergency hostel/Direct access hostel (temporary accommodation accepting self referrals, no waiting list and relatively frequent vacancies)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM04</td>
<td>Sofa surfing (sleeps on different friends floor each night)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM05</td>
<td>Placed in temporary accommodation by Local Authority (including Homelessness resettlement service) e.g. Bed and Breakfast accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM06</td>
<td>Staying with friends/family as a short term guest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM07</td>
<td>Other homeless</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodation with mental health care support (MH00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MH01</th>
<th>Supported accommodation (accommodation supported by staff or resident caretaker)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH02</td>
<td>Supported lodgings (lodgings supported by staff or resident caretaker)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH03</td>
<td>Supported group home (supported by staff or resident caretaker)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH04</td>
<td>Mental Health Registered Care Home</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH09</td>
<td>Other accommodation with mental health care and support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acute/long stay healthcare residential facility/hospital (HS00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS01</td>
<td>NHS acute psychiatric ward</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS02</td>
<td>Independent hospital/clinic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS03</td>
<td>Specialist rehabilitation/recovery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS04</td>
<td>Secure psychiatric unit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS05</td>
<td>Other NHS facilities/hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS09</td>
<td>Acute/long stay healthcare residential facility/hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodation with other (not specialist mental health) care support (CH00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH01</td>
<td>Foyer – accommodation for young people aged 16-25 who are homeless or in housing need</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH02</td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH03</td>
<td>Non-Mental Health Registered Care Home</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH09</td>
<td>Other accommodation with care and support (not specialist mental health)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodation with criminal justice support (CJ00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJ01</td>
<td>Bail/Probation hostel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ02</td>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ03</td>
<td>Young Offenders Institution</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ04</td>
<td>Detention Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ09</td>
<td>Other accommodation with criminal justice support such as ex-offender support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sheltered Housing (accommodation with a scheme manager or warden living on the premises or nearby, contactable by an alarm system if necessary) (SH00)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH01</td>
<td>Sheltered housing for older persons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH02</td>
<td>Extra care sheltered housing (also known as ‘very sheltered housing’. For people who are less able to manage on their own, but who do need an extra level of care. Services offered vary between schemes, but meals and some personal care are often provided.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH03</td>
<td>Nursing Home</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH09</td>
<td>Other sheltered housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML00</td>
<td>Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller community)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC96</td>
<td>Not elsewhere classified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC97</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC98</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC99</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>