

The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework 2013/14

Handbook of Definitions

You may re-use the text of this document (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit
www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/
© Crown copyright
Published to gov.uk, in PDF format only.
www.gov.uk/dh

Handbook of Definitions

Prepared by the Department of Health

Contents

Introduction6
Development of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework
Changes to the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/1410
Using the Handbook of Definitions11
The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/1413
Domain 1: Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs
1A: Social care-related quality of life13
1B: The proportion of people who use services who have control over
their daily life16
1C: To be revised from 2014/15: proportion of people using social care
who receive self-directed support and those receiving direct payments17
• 1D: Carer-reported quality of life21
1E: Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment23
1F: Under review: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment
1G: Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family
1H: Under review: Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services who live independently, with or without support
New measure for 2013/14: 1I: Proportion of people who use services and their carers who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like28
Domain 2: Delaying and reducing the need for care and support
• 2A: Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population
2B : Proportion of older people (65 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation services33
• New measure for 2014/15: 2D: The outcomes of short-term: sequel to service36
• New placeholder: 2E: Effectiveness of reablement services37
2C: Delayed transfers of care from hospital and those which are attributable to adult social care
New placeholder: 2F: Dementia – a measure of the effectiveness of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life39

Domain 3: E	Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care and support
• 3	A: Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support40
• 3	B: Overall satisfaction of carers with social services42
• ^	lew placeholder: 3E: Improving people's experience of integrated care43
	C: The proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in iscussions about the person they care for
	D : The proportion of people who use services and carers who find it easy to find formation about services
	Safeguarding adults who circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm
• 4	A: The proportion of people who use services who feel safe48
	B : The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have nade them feel safe and secure50
	lew placeholder: 4C: Proportion of completed safeguarding referrals where people eport they feel safe51
Appendix 1:	The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework 2013/14 at a glance53
Appendix 2:	The Public Health Outcomes Framework 2013-16 at a glance54
Appendix 3:	The NHS Outcomes Framework 2013/14 at a glance55
Appendix 4:	Interpretation of social care-related quality of life measure (ASCOF measure 1A)56
r.	Accommodation types that represent settled or non-settled accommodation for the ourpose of measure 1H, 'Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with or without support'

Introduction

The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/14 was published on 22 November 2012. This technical handbook of definitions should be read in conjunction with the framework document. Both the framework and this handbook have been developed by the Department of Health (DH), the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), and the Local Government Association (LGA).

The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF) is used both locally and nationally to set priorities for care and support, measure progress and strengthen transparency and accountability.

The purpose of the ASCOF is three-fold:

- Locally, the ASCOF supports councils to improve the quality of care and support. By
 providing robust, nationally comparable information on the outcomes and experiences
 of local people, the ASCOF supports meaningful comparisons between councils,
 helping to identify priorities for local improvement and stimulating the sharing of
 learning and best practice;
- The ASCOF fosters greater transparency in the delivery of adult social care, supporting local people to hold their council to account for the quality of the services they provide. A key mechanism for this is through councils' local accounts, where the ASCOF is already being used as a robust evidence base to support councils' reporting of their progress and priorities to local people; and,
- Nationally, the ASCOF measures the performance of the adult social care system as a whole and its success in delivering high-quality, personalised care and support. The framework will support Ministers in discharging their accountability to the public and Parliament for the adult social care system and will inform and support national policy development.

The Government will not seek to performance manage councils in relation to any of the measures set out in this framework. Instead, the ASCOF will inform and support improvement led by the sector itself, underpinned by strengthened transparency and local accountability.

The Care and Support White Paper, published in July 2012, set out the Government's vision for a reformed care and support system, building on the 2010 Vision for Adult Social Care, and Transparency in Outcomes: a framework for quality in adult social care2. The ASCOF for 2013/14 will support councils to rise to the challenge of delivering key White Paper priorities by providing a clear focus for local priority setting and improvement and by strengthening the accountability of councils to local people.

This handbook sets out the detailed definition of each ASCOF measure with worked examples, to support consistency in reporting and interpretation of the measures. The intended audience for this handbook is local authorities, members of the public and other stakeholders with an interest in social care outcomes, such as health and wellbeing boards and the voluntary sector.

_

¹ http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/11/ascof1314/

² http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/www.dh.gov.uk/en/Aboutus/Features/dh_121664

Through Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs), health and wellbeing boards will identify the current and future health and care needs of the local population, building a robust evidence base of local needs and also looking at local assets available. From this, boards will develop Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWSs), to drive local services by setting the framework for NHS, public health and social care commissioning, and delivering improved outcomes for local communities.

Health and wellbeing boards will have an interest in where the NHS, Public Health and Adult Social Care Outcomes Frameworks overlap locally, and the measures in the frameworks can help inform their local priorities (as well as other local evidence), and be used to transparently demonstrate their progress in improving outcomes to their community. However, the measures from the outcomes frameworks are not intended to overshadow local evidence to inform JSNAs and JHWSs. Where the NHS, Public Health and Adult Social Care Outcomes Frameworks (and future Child Health Outcomes Strategy) come together, local partners will be able to see how well they are delivering integrated services for their communities, especially around specific health and care issues.

Performance against the ASCOF, at both the national and individual council level, will be published annually by the Health and Social Care Information Centre, and the Department will also release an annual commentary on the national picture.

Measures will be broken down by certain equality characteristics, to show how the outcomes achieved by people and their experiences of care and support, might differ between groups.

Development of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework

The ASCOF was first published in March 2011 and is updated annually in partnership with local government. For 2013/14, the ASCOF has been strengthened with the addition of new measures, reflecting the Department's and local government's key priorities for social care. In the development of new measures, we remain mindful of the reporting burden on councils and the need to retain a focus on measuring the success of the adult social care system in delivering high-quality care and support that is of use both nationally and locally.

There have been three key drivers for change to the ASCOF for 2013/14: the Care and Support White Paper, the 'zero-based review' of adult social care data collections from local authorities, and increasing alignment with the NHS and Public Health Outcomes Frameworks.

The Care and Support White Paper

This year, the ASCOF has been augmented to better reflect key White Paper priorities for care and support. Although many of the themes of the White Paper were already reflected in the framework, it has been strengthened in some areas – including the promotion of care and support which is integrated and joins up around the needs of the people who use them, and the need to tackle loneliness and social isolation in our communities. It also reflects the Government's objective to improve the quality of life for people with dementia.

The Zero-Based Review

Since November 2010, the Health and Social Care Information Centre has led a 'zero-based review' of adult social care collections from local authorities. The objective of the review is to ensure that the information we collect nationally reflects the changing face of adult social care – keeping pace with the transformation of care towards more personalised, preventative forms of support. The review has actively supported the development of the ASCOF for 2013/14 and beyond, and when the proposals are fully implemented they will support several new measures. Where new ASCOF measures rely on changes to collections after 2013/14, measures will be implemented in full when the supporting data are available. Placeholders have been used to indicate the nature of the proposed measures.

Alignment of the Outcomes Frameworks

The Department has committed to improve alignment between the ASCOF and the Public Health and NHS Outcomes Frameworks, reflecting the joint contribution of health and social care to improving outcomes. The 2013/14 ASCOF and NHS Outcomes Framework and the technical refresh of the Public Health Outcomes Framework include an increased number of shared and complementary measures and placeholders. In November, the Department also published, 'Improving health and care: the role of the Outcomes Frameworks. This document sets out how the three frameworks work together to support improvement in outcomes for people who use health and care services and the public.

4 http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/11/health-care-of/

8

³ A measure is shared when the same measure appears in more than one framework. A measure is complementary when a similar measure addressing the same issue features in more that one of the frameworks.

Future Developments

The ASCOF is a key mechanism by which the Government sets national priorities for adult social care, and measures national progress against those priorities. The Department will continue to use national performance against the ASCOF to inform national policy-making and will work with local government to ensure the continued focus of the framework on measuring the success of the adult social care system in delivering high-quality care and support.

The Department has commissioned a number of pieces of research to support the development of the ASCOF, including work on generating a social care-related quality of life 'value added' measure (described in more detail below) and further work by the Personal Social Services Research Unit on promoting the use of Adult Social Care Survey data locally. The objective of this work is to demonstrate the purpose and value of surveys locally and further information will be available at www.maxproject.org.uk later in the spring.

Changes to the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/14

This section outlines the changes introduced to the ASCOF for 2013/14. Where placeholders have been added, or the implementation of new measures deferred until 2014/15, this reflects ongoing development work and the need to secure underpinning data sources before the measure can be implemented.

New measures for 2013/14

A new measure of social isolation for users of care and support and carers has been added to Domain 1, in response to the key White Paper commitment to address loneliness and social isolation (measure shared with the Public Health Outcomes Framework 1.18)

Changes deferred to 2014/15

The Department has committed to revise measure 1C (*Proportion of people using social care who receive self-directed support, and those receiving direct payments*) from 2014/15, to better reflect local authorities' progress in delivering personalised services. This revision is dependent on the full proposals of the zero-based review being implemented.

A new measure of the effectiveness of reablement care in supporting people to maintain their independence has been added to Domain 2, for implementation in 2014/15. This measure will provide evidence of a good outcome in delaying dependency or supporting recovery — short-term support that results in no further need for care. The inclusion of this measure is dependent on the full proposals of the zero-based review being implemented.

New placeholders for 2013/14

A new placeholder measure has been added to Domain 2, to support interpretation of the new measure of effectiveness of reablement services when implemented. This is intended to support a more rounded view of the success of short-term support in supporting people to recover their independence.

A new placeholder measure on the effectiveness of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life for people with dementia has also been added to Domain 2. This is a priority area for the ASCOF and will promote joined up working across adult social care and the NHS (measure shared with the NHS Outcomes Framework 2.6ii).

A new placeholder measure on improving people's experience of integrated care (measure shared with the NHS Outcomes Framework 4.9) has been added to Domain 3, in response to the Care and Support White Paper, which restated the Department's commitment to a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to drive further improvements in people's experiences of integrated care.

A new placeholder measure has been added to Domain 4 on the proportion of completed safeguarding referrals where people report they feel safe, reflecting the Care and Support White Paper's statement that a high-quality service must be one which keeps people safe from harm.

Using the Handbook of Definitions

The handbook sets out the following information for each measure:

Detail	Description
Title	Identifier (1A, 1B, etc) and name of the measure 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 the inclusion of the measure
Definition/interpretation	Guidance on the definition of the measure, including the definition of related terms and any notes on interpretation
Alignment	Whether the measure is shared or complementary with a measure in the Public Health or NHS Outcomes Frameworks
Risk adjustment	Comments on factors that could affect the comparability of the measure, for example age distribution of the local population, and possible adjustments to support more meaningful comparisons between areas
Formula	The detail of how the measure will be calculated, with a formula and precise definitions of each component (for example, the 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 disaggregated, to identify outcomes for different groups and highlight any 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	Potential improvements or alternatives to current measures to be explored for future iterations of the ASCOF
Further guidance	Where to find further guidance relating to the data collections underpinning the measure

Risk adjustment

The aim of risk adjustment of the measures is to improve meaningful comparisons between different local authorities by controlling for factors which are not within the power of local authorities to influence. An example of this is measure 2A (permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population). This measure is presented as two separate measures, one covering those aged 18 to 64 and the other covering those aged 65 and over, to reflect that the likelihood of admissions to residential and nursing care is related to the age of the client.

However, risk adjustment can also make measures more difficult to understand and interpret. As a result, risk adjustment should only be applied when the improvement in the comparability of the measure is significant enough to outweigh the additional complexity in understanding a risk-adjusted measure. Where risk adjustment is not thought to be appropriate, the current practice of comparing councils with similar authorities can be used for benchmarking purposes.

This handbook sets out suggested factors which could be explored for the risk adjustment of measures. Decisions on whether risk adjustment is justified and should be applied should be made on a case-by-case basis.

The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/14

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

(1A) Social care	related quality of life
Domain / Outcome	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs (Overarching Measure)
Rationale	This measure gives an overarching view of the quality of life of users of social care. It is based on the outcome domains of social care-related quality of life identified in the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT) developed by the Personal Social Services Research Unit (www.pssru.ac.uk/ascot).
Definition / Interpretation	This measure is an average quality of life score based on responses to the Adult Social Care Survey. It is a composite measure using responses to survey questions covering the eight domains identified in the ASCOT (control, dignity, personal care, food and nutrition, safety, occupation, social participation and accommodation). The relevant questions are listed below: **Control - Q3a: Which of the following statements best describes how much control you have over your daily life? **Personal care - Q4a: Thinking about keeping clean and presentable in appearance, which of the following statements best describes your situation? **Food and Nutrition - Q5a: Thinking about the food and drink you get, which of the following statements best describes your situation? **Accommodation - Q6a: Which of the following statements best describes how clean and comfortable your home/care home is? **Safety - Q7a: Which of the following statements best describes how safe you feel? **Social participation - Q8a: Thinking about how much contact you've had with people you like, which of the following statements best describes your social situation? **Occupation - Q9a: Which of the following statements best describes how you spend your time? **Dignity - Q11: Which of these statements best describes how the way you are helped and treated makes you think and feel about yourself? **Each of the questions has four possible answers, which are equated with having: **no nument needs in a specific life area or domain (the ideal state); **no needs met, and; **no needs met. **Responses to the questions indicate whether the individual has unmet needs in any of the eight areas. The measure gives an overall score based on respondents' self-reported quality of life across the eight questions. All eight questions are given equal weight. **Interpretation** **Guidance on the interpretation of this measure is presented in Appendix 4 to this document. The measure gives an overall indication of reported outcomes for individuals – it does not,

	1		1110	taai	Coolai	04.000	1001110	o i ian	ICWOIN IOI	2010
Alignment	This measure is complementary with Measure 2 (health-related quality of life for people with long-term conditions) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 29). Health-related quality of life is measured using the EQ5D tool.									
Risk adjustment	A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are: Age of users Needs of users Client groups of users See the section on longer term developments for information about progress in this area.									
Formula	Some needNeeds aded	are assigned are the last as met (3rd ar luately met (1 eeds (1 st an luately met (1 eeds (1 st an luately met (1 eeds (1 st an luately will be livalent to the espondents ability will be livalent to the espondents are survey. The survey of	answer openswer openswer option answer option of the scale of the scale of the scale of the answer option of the weight OF outconvey data on of the answer answer an of the option of th	outcontion): ver opon) = ores e sen n the rning were vere vill be e stra s are me n are a c?id=	for each = 1 otion) = 2 is 3 for all rest the versual disabilition (Y), weight extified sare automatic available 10142&p the question of the q	cores are question) spondents sion of the y, as this es version as 3a to 9 hted data ed by the inpling tectically cal at the call and the call are in Appendically cal are	assign = 0 s who he questing questing and a should Health chnique culated dix I of	nave an ionnaire onnaire and So that had within of how the gui	swered e for people has been ed to calculocial Care as been us the survey to use the dance for the	e llate sed the
Worked example	The table below re and 11. The data h conducting the sur	as been wei vey. No unmet needs		reflec tely	Some needs met	itified sar No r met	npling t		ue used wh	
	Control (Q3a) Personal Care	20 65		58 65		48 15	19 0		145 145	

	(0.4-)							
	(Q4a) Food and	78	65	2	0	145		
	Nutrition (Q5a)	-			-	-		
	Accommodation	45	36	55	9	145		
	(Q6a) Safety (Q7a)	30	75	35	5	145		
	Social	36	46	36	27	145		
	Participation	00	10	00	_,	1 10		
	(Q8a)							
	Occupation	28	51	46	20	145		
	(Q9a)	22	47	47	10	1.45		
	Dignity (Q11) Total	33 335	47 443	47 284	18 98	145		
	, rotal	500	110	204	30			
	Scores are assigned as follows	lows:						
	 No unmet needs (1s 							
	 Needs adequately n 							
	Some needs met (3No needs met (the language)				·)			
	- No needs met (the i	asi answer i	ριιοπ ισι	each question	1) = 0			
	Higher scores are assigned	d to better ou	itcomes,	so the higher	the overall s	score the better		
	the average social care-rela			3				
					(!-\ -			
	The numerator for the mea	sure is [(335	5*3)+ (44	3*2)+(284*1)+	(98*0)]=2,17	75		
	The denominator for the measure is 145							
	THE GENORIHATOR THE HICASURE IS 143							
	Therefore the measure value is 2175/145 which equals 15.0							
	Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation*							
Disaggregation	Lyadinato. Ago, Condor, Emmony , Rengion , Conda offentation							
available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)**, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Mental							
	Health (all ages), Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**							
Frequency of						(4.000)		
collection	Annual	Data sour	ce	Adult Social (Care Survey	(ASCS)		
Return format	Numeric	Decimal p	laces	One				
	The social care-related qua							
	but does not isolate the impact that care and support services have on those outcomes							
Longer-term development options The Department has commissioned research from the Quality and Outcomes of P Centred Care Policy Research Unit to identify a way of generating a social care-requality of life 'value added' measure, which would allow us to identify the impact of social care on people's quality of life. This research is due to report its findings in social care on people's quality of life.								
	2014. If successful, this will allow us to develop a new or additional measure for the ASCOF.							
	ASCOF.							
	ASCOF.							
Further		ards can be	found via	a the user surv	ev guidance	e page at		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwa					e page at		

_

[&]quot;This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

^{*} Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

(1B) The proporti	ion of people who use services who have control over their daily life
Domain / Outcome	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs. People manage their own support as much as they wish, so that they are in control of what, how and when support is delivered to match their needs.
Rationale	A key objective of the drive to make care and support more personalised is that support more closely matches the needs and wishes of the individual, putting users of services in control of their care and support. Therefore, asking users of care and support about the extent to which they feel in control of their daily lives is one means of measuring whether this outcome is being achieved. This measures one component of the overarching measure 1A – social care-related quality of life. A preference study conducted by RAND ⁵ 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.
Definition / Interpretation	The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 3a: '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 I have no control over my daily life 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". These have 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).
Alignment	ASCOF measure only
Risk adjustment	A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some examples are: Age of users Needs of users Client groups of users
Formula	

 5 Burge, P et al (2010) How do the public value different social care outcomes? Estimation of preference weights for ASCOT

	with a learning disability will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version.					
	Y: All those that respond to the question.					
	For both the numerator (X) and denominator (Y), weighted data should be used to calculate the measure. The data from the survey will be weighted by the Health and Social Care Information Centre to take account of the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey (http://www.ic.nhs.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10142&p=0).					
	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.					
Worked	In total the number of users who responded to the questions was 210.					
example	(Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey)					
	The measure value is [(156	6/210)*100] = 74.3%				
Disaggregation	Equalities : Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation*					
available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)**, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Ment Health (all ages)**, Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**					
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS)			
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One			
Longer-term development options	Develop a 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to quality of life as described for Measure 1A.					
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/article/2213/User-survey-guidance-2012-13					

(1C) Proportion of direct payments	of people using social care who receive self directed support, and those receiving
Domain / Outcome	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs. People manage their own support as much as they wish, so that they are in control of what, how and when support is delivered to match their needs.

_

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

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. ⁶ Studies have shown that direct payments make people happier with the services they receive and are the purest form of personalisation. ⁷

The Department remains committed to the 2013 objective for personal budgets; meaning everyone eligible for long-term community-based care should be provided with a personal budget, preferably as a Direct Payment, by April 2013. As there are recognised limitations in the current measure meaning that 100% provision of personal budgets is not possible nationally, the April 2013 objective was set at 70% of people receiving a personal budget nationally. The April 2013 objective, along with the proposals in the Care and Support White Paper and draft Bill to place personal budgets into legislation as part of the care and support plan, will ensure that personalised care becomes standard practice. This measure reflects the success of councils in delivering personalised services, through self-directed support, including direct payments.

Rationale

Measure 1C from 2014/15

There are recognised limitations to the current measure, for example its scope includes some services and users of care and support for whom self-directed support may not be appropriate, and so it currently does not reflect the true extent of the provision of self-directed support and direct payments to those who are eligible.

To address these issues, implementation of the proposals of the zero-based review will result in a strengthened measure 1C, by limiting its scope to people who only receive long-term support, for whom self-directed support is most relevant, to better reflect councils' progress in delivering personalised services. The existing measure will also be replaced by two measures: one which focuses on users; and another measure will be introduced which focuses on carers. Each will have a sub-measure for users/carers in receipt of direct payments, showing progress made on personalisation for users and carers separately. The final change is for this measure to be based on 'snapshot' rather than full-year data, to better reflect the progress made on personalisation at the end of the year.

For 2013/14, the current definition of this measure remains.

Definition / Interpretation

This is a two-part measure which reflects both the proportion of people using services who receive self-directed support (1C part 1), and the proportion who receive a direct payment either through a personal budget or other means (1C part 2).

1C part 1 is presented as the number of adults, older people and carers receiving selfdirected support in the year to 31st March as a percentage of all clients receiving community based services and carers receiving carer specific services.⁸

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

Adult: aged 18-64

Older person: aged 65 and over

Carer: aged 16 or over but caring for an adult aged 18 or over

⁶ Quoting; C Glendinning et al, The national evaluation of the Individual Budgets pilot programme (IBSEN (Individual Budgets Evaluation Network); Social Policy Research Unit, University of York, 2008);

Individual Budgets: Impacts and outcomes for carers, (2009, IBSEN; Social Policy Research Unit, University of York); Choice and competition in public services: a guide for policy makers (2010, OFT/Frontier Economics)

⁷ Quoting; Choice and competition in public services: a guide for policy makers (2010, OFT/Frontier Economics)

⁸ For the purposes of this measure the following age brackets are used:

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). 1C Part 1: The data collections will record for each category: 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) of 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). 1C 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%. The Department has been working with the sector to address this issue, and recently agreed that for the April 2013 objective, a milestone of 70% is realistic. **Alignment** ASCOF measure only Risk adjustment does not seem appropriate for this measure since the objective is that self Risk adjustment directed support is offered to all users regardless of ages, client group etc. $\left(\frac{X}{Y}\right)$ *100 Where, for **1C part 1** (receiving self-directed support): **Formula** X: The number of users and carers receiving self-directed support in the year to 31st March. Source: RAP Tables SD1 and SD39

⁹ RAP SD1 Row 10 Column 5 (Total 18 and over) plus RAP SD3 Row 6 Column 5 (Total all ages)

		Tile Addit S	ocial Care Outcomes Framework for 201,			
	Y: Clients receiving community-based services (aged 18 or over) and carers (caring for someone aged 18 or over) receiving carer-specific services in the year to 31 st March. Source: RAP Table P2f ¹⁰ and Table C2 ¹¹					
	For 1C part 2 (direct payments):					
	X: The number of users an Source: RAP Tables SD1 a	d carers receiving dir and SD3 ¹²	rect-payments in the year to 31st March.			
	for someone aged18 or ove Source: RAP Table P2f and	er) receiving carer sp	(aged 18 or over) and carers aged (caring ecific services in the year to 31 st March.			
	1C part 1					
	payment or personal budge	et) in the year 2011/1	ed self directed support (existing/new direct 2 to March 31 = 600, and the total number and carers receiving carer-specific services			
Worked	The measure value is [(600	0/2000)x100] = 30.0%	6			
example	1C part 2					
	If the total number of peopl process or not) is 195.	e receiving a direct p	ayment (whether part of a self directed			
	Then the measure value is	[(195/2000)x100] = 9	9.8%			
	Equalities: Age					
Disaggregation available	65+**), Mental Health (18-6	64, 65+), Substance I	d 65+**), Learning Disabilities (18-64 and Misuse (18-64, 65+**), Other vulnerable ers (18-64, 65-74 and 75+)**			
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Referrals, Assessments and Packages of care (RAP) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2012/13 proforma			
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One			
Longer-term development options	As above, this measure will be revised 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.					
options		al care data. Revisio	d is being taken forward as part of the ns to this measure are contingent on the sed review.			
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the social care collection page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/collections by clicking on the year.					

¹⁰ (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)

^{11 (}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)

¹² 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)

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

(1D) Carer report	ed quality of life
Domain / Outcome	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs. Carers can balance their caring roles and maintain their desired quality of life.
Rationale	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.
	This measure will be deferred in 2013/14.
	This is a composite measure which combines individual responses to six questions measuring different outcomes related to overall quality of life. These outcomes are mapped to six domains (occupation, 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 six questions, drawn from the Carers Survey, are:
	 Occupation – Q7: Which of the following statements best describes how you spend your time? Control - Q8: Which of the following statements best describes how much control you have over your daily life?
	 Personal care - Q9: 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 – Q10: Thinking about your personal safety, which of the statements best
Definition / Interpretation	 describes your present situation? Social participation - Q11: 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 - Q12: Thinking about encouragement and support in your caring role, which of the following statements best describes your present
	situation? Each of the questions has three possible answers, which are equated with having: no unmet needs in a specific life area or domain (the ideal state); some needs met, and; no needs met.
	Responses to the questions indicate whether the carer has unmet needs in any of the six areas. The measure gives an overall score based on respondents' self-reported quality of life across the six questions. All six questions are given equal weight.
	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 services towards those outcomes.
Alignment	This measure is complementary with Measure 2.4 (health-related quality of life for carers) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 38). Health related quality if life is measured using the EQ5D tool.
	A range of factors may be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are:
Risk adjustment	 The intensity of the caring role Age of carer Characteristics of the cared for person

		The Aut	iii Sociai Ca	re Outcomes r	ramework for 201
Each of the question Scores are assigne No needs make Some needs No unmet needs No unmet needs The numerator is the questions. Y: The number of received Exclusions Any respondents we	ns has three d to answers et (the last an met (2nd an eeds (1st ansen a sum of espondents who failed to a	answers. He as follows: nswer option nswer option swer option) the scores f	igher scores on for each que) = 1 = 2 or all responded ed all six ques	are assigned to bestion) = 0 dents who have a stions.	better outcomes,
Occupation Control Personal Care Safety Social Participation Encouragement and Support Total Scores are assigne No unmet ne Needs adec No needs me Higher scores are a the average social of	No unmet needs 45 33 65 85 58 22 308 d as follows: eds (1st ans juately met (3rd ans et (the last ans et (the last are related of the measure of the measur	Some needs met 45 52 38 20 35 36 226 swer option) 2nd answer swer option nswer option etter outcon quality of life is [(308*2)+ re is 105.	No needs met 15 20 2 0 12 47 96 = 3 option) = 2) = 1 n for each quenes so the high. (226*1)+(96*)	Total 105 105 105 105 105 105 106 107 108 109 109 109 109 109 109 109	
		city ^{**} , Religi	on [*] , Sexual o	rientation	
	Where: X: Each respondent Each of the question Scores are assigned. No needs make Some needs. No unmet needs. No unmet needs. The number of respondents with the calculation of the calculation of the calculation of the calculation of the calculation. The table below reputable below reputable below reputable below reputable below reputable calculation of the calculati	Where: X: Each respondent is assigned Each of the questions has three Scores are assigned to answers No needs met (the last at Some needs met (2nd ar No unmet needs (1st ans No unmet needs (1st ans No unmet needs) Y: The number of respondents of the calculation of the measure. The table below represents the No unmet needs Occupation 45 Control 33 Personal Care 65 Safety 85 Social Participation 58 Encouragement and Support 22 Total 308 Scores are assigned as follows: No unmet needs (1st ans No unmet needs) Scores are assigned as follows: No unmet needs (1st ans No unmet needs) Higher scores are assigned to be the average social care related of the numerator for the measure. The denominator for the measure The denominator for the measure value is	Where: X: Each respondent is assigned a score base Each of the questions has three answers. H Scores are assigned to answers as follows: No needs met (the last answer option) Some needs met (2nd answer option) No unmet needs (1st answer option) The numerator is then a sum of the scores of questions. Y: The number of respondents who answer exclusions Any respondents who failed to answer any of the calculation of the measure. The table below represents the responses of the calculation of the measure. No unmet Some needs need	Where: X: Each respondent is assigned a score based on their at Each of the questions has three answers. Higher scores Scores are assigned to answers as follows: No needs met (the last answer option for each questions) and the scores for all respondents who unmet needs (1st answer option) = 2 The numerator is then a sum of the scores for all respondents who answered all six questions. Y: The number of respondents who answered all six questions. Y: The number of respondents who answer any of the six questions. Any respondents who failed to answer any of the six questions are all responses of 105 carers of the calculation of the measure. The table below represents the responses of 105 carers of the calculation of the measure. No unmet Some No needs met	

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

Frequency of collection	Biennial (Carers Survey to be next conducted in 2014/15)	Data source	Carers Survey
Return format	Numeric	Decimal places	One
Longer-term development options	There remains potential for moving to an annual Carers Survey if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to the agreement of local government. The research project to develop a value added measure for social care-related quality of life for users will also investigate whether it is possible to develop a value added measure for carer-reported quality of life. However, a value added measure for carers' quality of life is likely to be a longer-term piece of development beyond 2014.		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/article/2213/User-survey-guidance-2012-13		

(1E) Proportio	n of adults with a learning disability in paid employment
Domain /	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs.
Outcome	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 the employment outcomes for adults with a learning disability, 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 ¹³ and financial benefits ¹⁴ .
	The measure shows the proportion of all adults with a learning disability who are known to the council, who are recorded as being in paid employment. The information would have to be captured or confirmed within the reporting period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
	The definition of individuals 'known to the council' is restricted to those adults with a learning disability (with a primary client group of LD) 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.
	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:
Definition / Interpretatio	 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).
n	A 'paid employee' is one who works for a company, community or voluntary organisation, council or other organisation and is 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.

¹³ Vigna, E., Beyer, S. and Kerr, M. (2011) The role of supported employment agencies in promoting the health of people with learning disabilities. Cardiff: Welsh Centre for Learning Disabilities.

¹⁴ Beyer, S. (2008) *An evaluation of the outcomes in supported employment in North Lanarkshire*. North Lanarkshire Social Work

Service

Alignment	This measure is complementary with Measure 1.6 (improved functional ability, and ability to work, in people with long-term conditions) in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod consum dh/groups/dh digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh 132558.pdf page 14) and Measure 2.2 (employment of people with long-term conditions) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 33). Although the Public Health Outcomes Framework and the ASCOF both include measures connected with employment for people with a learning disability and people with mental health problems, the Public Health Outcomes Framework measures the gap between the employment rate for those groups and the overall employment rate. This reflects the approach taken in the NHS Outcomes Framework for a complementary measure on employment of people with long term conditions. Although aligning the ASCOF with the other two frameworks was considered, in developing the framework with local government, it was agreed that this would not support local interpretation and benchmarking, and so the ASCOF will retain the current definitions. Furthermore, although the Public Health Outcomes Framework uses the same data sources for rates of employment for these group as the ASCOF, the NHSOF uses the Labour Force Survey. This source cannot be used for the ASCOF because it does not provide robust results at the local authority level.		
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	 Where: X: All people within the denominator, who are in employment. The numerator should include those recorded as in paid employment irrespective of whether the information was recorded in an assessment or review. However, the information would have to have been captured within the current financial year. Source: Table L1, ASC-CAR¹⁵ 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, and; those who should have been reviewed in the financial year but were not. In other words, this is a count of eligible adults with learning disabilities (aged 18-64), without duplication, who are assessed, or reviewed (regardless of whether they have received a service), or should have been reviewed during the year; i.e. they are recorded within an A or P table within the RAP return. Source: Table L1, ASC-CAR¹⁶		
Worked example	Adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs = 722 Of those adults with learning disabilities known to CASSRs, those who are recorded as being in paid employment within the current financial year = 134 The measure value = $(134/722) \times 100 = 18.6\%$		

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

Disaggregati	Equalities: Gender Client groups: Learning disability (18-64)		
on available			
Frequency of collection	Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR)) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2012/13 proforma.		Activity Return (ASC-CAR)) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One
Longer-term development options	The 2012/13 ASCOF included a placeholder on employment for all people with a disability, which would replace the existing measure for adults in contact with secondary mental health services and for adults with a learning disability. This placeholder was to combine all adults into a single measure for employment status. This placeholder has been removed for the 2013/14 ASCOF, as, in consultation with local authorities, it was agreed that it would be too onerous to collect additional information on people with physical disabilities in employment in order to populate the proposed measure.		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the social care collection page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys by clicking on the year.		

(1F) Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment		
Domain / Outcome	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 of improved employment outcomes for adults with mental health problems, reducing their risk of social exclusion and discrimination. Supporting someone to become and remain employed is a key part of the recovery process 17. Employment outcomes are a predictor of quality of life, and are indicative of whether care and support is personalised. Employment is a wider determinant of health and social inequalities.	
Definition/ Interpretatio n	A number of changes have been proposed to the Mental Health Minimum Data Set which underpins this measure. The rationale behind the proposed changes is (i) to take into account a more frequent collection of these data (monthly instead of quarterly) and (ii) to ease replication of the methodology locally to improve consistency in reporting and so better support locally-led improvement. Implementation of these changes will require a revision to ASCOF measure 1F (and 1H). Discussions are currently taking place between the Department, the HSCIC and the sector on the detail of this revision. Once agreed, the new definition of 1F and 1H will be published within this handbook. If possible, we will also aim to make available time series data on the new definition agreed.	

¹⁷ Waddell, G. & Burton, A. (2006). *Is Work Good for your Health and Well-being?* London: TSO

(1G) Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family 1. Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs. Domain / People are able to find employment when they want, maintain a family and social life and **Outcome** contribute to community life and avoid loneliness or isolation. The measure is intended to improve outcomes for adults with a learning disability by demonstrating the proportion in stable and appropriate accommodation. The nature of Rationale accommodation for people with a learning disability has a strong impact on their safety and overall quality of life and the risk of social exclusion. The measure shows the proportion of all adults with a learning disability who are known to the council, who are recorded as living in their own home or with their family. The information would have to be captured or confirmed within the reporting period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014. The definition of individuals 'known to the council' is currently restricted to those adults with a learning disability (with a primary client group of LD) 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. '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 they 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': Owner occupier or shared ownership scheme; Tenant (including local authority, arm's-length management organisation, registered social landlord, housing association); Definition / Tenant - private landlord Interpretatio Settled mainstream housing with family/friends (including flat-sharing); Supported accommodation/supported lodgings/supported group home (i.e. n 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.

Alignment	This measure is shared with Measure 1.6i (people with a learning disability in settled accommodation) in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh_132558.pdf page 12).		
Risk adjustment	It is not clear whether any factors	should be considered for	risk adjustment for this measure.
Formula	Where: X: All people within the denominator who are living in their own home or with their family. The numerator should include those living in their own home or with their family irrespective of whether they have had a review during the year, but the information would have to be captured within the current financial year. Source: Table L2, ASC-CAR ¹⁸ 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; ethose 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 ¹⁹ In other words, this is a count of eligible adults with a learning disability, without duplication (aged 18-64) who are assessed, or reviewed (regardless of whether they have received a service), or should have been reviewed during the year; i.e. they are recorded within an A or P table within the RAP return.		
Worked example	Adults with a learning disability known to CASSRs = 722 Of those adults with a learning disability known to CASSRs, those who are recorded as living in their own home or with their family within the current financial year = 455 The measure value = (455/722) x 100 = 63.0%		
Discourse	Equalities: Gender	100 - 00.070	
Disaggregati on available	Client groups: Learning disability (18-64)		
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2012/13 proforma.
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards ca http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/co		

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) sum of rows 12 to 20 column 3 ¹⁹ (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

(1H) Proportion or without support (1981)	on of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with opport
Domain / Outcome	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 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.
Definition / Interpretatio n	A number of changes have been proposed to the Mental Health Minimum Data Set which underpins this measure. The rationale behind the proposed changes is (i) to take account of a more frequent collection of these data (monthly instead of quarterly) and (ii) to ease replication of the methodology locally to improve consistency in reporting and so better support locally-led improvement. Implementation of these changes will require a revision to ASCOF measure 1H (and 1F). Discussions are currently taking place between the Department, the HSCIC and the sector on the detail of the revision. Once agreed, the new definition of 1H and 1F will be published within this handbook. If possible, we will also aim to make available time series data on the new definition agreed.

New measure	for 2013/14
(1I) Proportion	of people who use services and their carers, who reported that they had as much social by would like.
Domain / Outcome	Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs.
Rationale	There is a clear link between loneliness and poor mental and physical health. A key element of the Government's vision for social care is to tackle loneliness and social isolation, supporting people to remain connected to their communities and to develop and maintain connections to their friends and family. This measure will draw on self-reported levels of social contact as an indicator of social isolation for both users of social care and carers.
Definition / interpretatio n	The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is question 8a – "Thinking about how much contact you've had with people you like, which of the following statements best describes your social situation?" - I have as much social contact as I want with people I like - I have adequate social contact with people - I have some social contact with people, but not enough - I have little social contact with people and feel socially isolated The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is question 23 – "By thinking about social contact you've had with people you like, which statement best describes your present social situation?" - I have as much social contact as I want - I have some social contact but not enough - I have little social contact and I feel isolated The measure is defined by determining the percentage of users responding "I have as much contact as I want with people I like" and carers choosing "I have as much contact as I want". Measures for users and carers will be presented separately. These responses have been chosen to focus the measure on individuals achieving the best outcomes, to allow for better

	use in benchmarking.
	Interpretation
	The measure gives an overall indication of the reported outcomes for individuals – it does not at present identify the specific contribution of councils' adult social care towards the outcome (see longer term development below).
Alignment	This measure is shared with Measure 1.18 (social connectedness placeholder) in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh_132558.pdf page 25)
Risk adjustment	There are a range of factors which are likely to have an impact on this measure – for example the severity of needs of users or the amount of care provided by carers.
Formula	Where, for 1I part 1 (users): X: In response to Question 8a of the ASCS, those individuals who selected the response "I have as much social contact as I want with people I like". Those respondents who were sent the version of the questionnaire for people with learning disabilities will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version. Y: All those that responded to the question. For both the numerator (X) and denominator (Y), weighted data should be used to calculate the measure. The data from the survey will be weighted by the Health and Social Care Information Centre to take account of the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey. For 1I part 2 (carers) X: The sum of all those who in response to question 23 of the Carers Survey, selected the response "I have as much social contact as I want". 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. Y: The sum of all those that responded to the above question of 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 of the denominator.
Worked example	1I part 1 – users The number of users who said "I have as much social contact as I want with people I like" was 242.

		The Madit Goodal Gal	e Outcomes Framework for 201
	In total the number of users who responded to the question was 548. (Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey). The indicator value is [(X/Y)*100] = 44.2%		
	1I part 2 – carers		
	The number of carers who said "I have as much social contact as I want" was 197. In total the number of carers who responded to the question was 420. (Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey). The indicator value is [(X/Y)*100] = 46.9%		
Disaggregati	Equalities : Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation*		
on available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)**, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Mental Health (all ages), Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**		
Frequency	Annual for social care users		Adult Social Care Survey
of collection	Biennial for Carers (Carers Survey to be next conducted in 2014/15)	Data source	Carers Survey
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One
Longer-term development options	Initially, this measure will focus on social care users and carers, rather that the broader population. However, the problems of loneliness and social isolation are not limited to these groups, and all parts of the health and care system have a role to play in preventing and reducing social isolation and loneliness in the boarder population. Work will continue to pursue the development of a population based measure of loneliness, with a view to including this in both the ASCOF and the Public Health Outcomes Framework in future years. Develop a 'value-added' measure which quantifies the contribution of social services to quality of life as described for Measure 1A.		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys		

_

^{*} Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Domain 2 – Delaying and reducing the need for care and support

(2A) Permaner	nt admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population
Domain / Outcome	Delaying and reducing the need for care and support. (Overarching measure)
Rationale	Avoiding permanent placements in residential and nursing care homes is a good measure of delaying dependency, and the inclusion of this measure in the framework supports local health and social care services to work together to reduce avoidable admissions. Research suggests that, where possible, people prefer to stay in their own home rather than move into residential care.
Definition / interpretation	This is a two part-measure reflecting the number of admissions of younger adults (part 1) and older people (part 2) to residential and nursing care homes relative to the population size of each group. The measure compares 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; Registered care homes for nursing care; and, 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 2013 (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. Interpretation Analysis shows that older people have a higher rate of permanent admissions than younger adults. Using a two-part measure means that we can separate age as a factor in the level of admissions and focus on the contribution of services to reducing admissions. It will also help highlight, both nationally and locally, the separate issues that relate to the rates of permanent admissions for younger adults and for older people.
Alignment	ASCOF measure only
Risk adjustment	Analysis identified age as a factor that influenced the rate of admissions. Instead of applying risk adjustment, the measure has been expressed separately for those aged 18-64 years, and those aged 65 years and over. There were no other influencing factors identified from the data available.

	The Addit Godial Care Odtcomes I famework for 201
Formula	Where: for 2A part 1 (younger adults): X: Number of council-supported permanent admissions of younger adults (aged 18-64) to residential and nursing care during the year (excluding transfers between residential and nursing care). Source: Table S3, ASC-CAR ²⁰ Y: Size of younger adult population (aged 18-64) in area (ONS mid year population estimates). Source: Office of National Statistics For 2A part 2 (older people): X: Number of council-supported permanent admissions of older people (aged 65 and over) to residential and nursing care during the year (excluding transfers between residential and nursing care). Source: Table S3, ASC-CAR ²¹ Y: Size of older people population (aged 65 and over) in area (ONS mid year population estimates). Source: Office of National Statistics Exclusions People funding their own residence in a care home with no support from the council are excluded.
Worked example	2A Part 1 (younger adults) Suppose the number of permanent admissions to residential or nursing care for younger adults (aged 18-64) during the year was 26. Suppose the population of younger adults in the area is 153,471 The measure value is [((26)/153,471) *100,000] = 16.9 2A Part 2 (older people) Suppose the number of permanent admissions to residential or nursing care for older people (aged 65 and over) during the year was 312. Suppose the population of older people in the area is 43,384 The measure value is [((312)/43,384) *100,000] = 719.2
Disaggregation Available	Equalities: Age (18-64, 65 and over) Client groups: Physical Disabilities (18-64), Mental Health (18-64), Learning Disabilities (18-64), Substance misuse and other vulnerable people (as one group)**, Not allocated by client group**

(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 14, sum of columns 1 to 3
(Number of LA supported permanent admissions to residential and nursing care during 1 April to 31 March

²¹ (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 15, sum of columns 1 to 3

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2012/13. Office of National Statistics
Return format	Rate per 100,000 population	Decimal places	One
Longer-term development options	The data collections required for the current measure have been reviewed as part of the 'zero-based review'. Work is ongoing to understand whether and how the new ZBR collections, which are yet to be finalised, will impact on this measure. If the new collections are implemented for 2014-15 this will be made clear in the handbook for 2014-15 measures.		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the social care collection page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys by clicking on the year.		

Rationale When approx There for mand mand mand mand mand mand mand mand	elaying and reducing the need for care and support. In people develop care needs, the support they receive takes place in the most repriate setting and enables them to regain their independence. The is strong evidence that reablement services lead to improved outcomes and value money across the health and social care sectors. Reablement seeks to support people maximise their level of independence, in order to minimise their need to ongoing port and dependence on public services. The improved outcomes and value money across the health and social care sectors. Reablement seeks to support people maximise their level of independence, in order to minimise their need to ongoing port and dependence on public services. The improved outcomes and value money across the benefit to individuals from reablement, intermediate care and abilitation following a hospital episode, by determining whether an individual remains go at home 91 days following discharge – the key outcome for many people using element services. It captures the joint work of social services and health staff and ices commissioned by joint teams, as well as adult social care reablement.
Rationale Rationale This rehabilitying reable	money across the health and social care sectors. Reablement seeks to support people maximise their level of independence, in order to minimise their need to ongoing port and dependence on public services. measures the benefit to individuals from reablement, intermediate care and abilitation following a hospital episode, by determining whether an individual remains g at home 91 days following discharge – the key outcome for many people using element services. It captures the joint work of social services and health staff and ices commissioned by joint teams, as well as adult social care reablement.
Definition / interpretation Definition / interpretation Those with a nume 2B Pa	is a two-part measure which reflects both the effectiveness of reablement services to 1), and the coverage of the service (part 2). Part 1: proportion of older people aged 65 and over discharged from hospital to their own e or to a residential or nursing care home or extra care housing for rehabilitation, with a rintention that they will move on/back to their own home (including a place in extra housing or an adult placement scheme setting), who are at home or in extra care sing or an adult placement scheme setting 91 days after the date of their discharge hospital. See who are in hospital or in a registered care home (other than for a brief episode of ite care from which they are expected to return home) at the three month date and e who have died within the three months are not reported in the numerator. collection of the denominator will be between 1 October 2013 and 31 December 2013, a 91-day follow-up for each case included in the denominator to populate the erator i.e. the numerator will be collected from 1 January 2014 to 31 March 2014. Part 2: proportion of older people aged 65 and over offered reablement services following harge from hospital. measure will take the denominator from part 1 as its numerator (the number of older

	The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013
	people discharged from hospitals based on Hospital Episode Statistics (HES).
	The collection of the numerator and the denominator will be from 1 October 2013 to 31 December 2013.
	Interpretation
	The rationale for a two-part measure is to capture the volume of reablement offered as well as the success of the reablement service offered. This will prevent areas scoring well on the measure while offering reablement services to only a very small number of people.
	The measure includes social care-only placements. Therefore, those that were assessed just on social care needs would now be included in the data collection.
	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 2013/14. 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.
Alignment	This measure is shared with Measure 3.6i (the proportion of older people aged 65 and over who were still at home 91 days after discharge into rehabilitation) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 61).
Risk adjustment	None.
Formula	Where, for 2B part 1 (proportion of successful reablement): 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 91 days after the date of their discharge from hospital. This should only include the outcome for those cases referred to in the denominator. Source: Table I1, ASC-CAR ²² 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 ²³ For 2B part 2 (coverage of reablement services):
	X: 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 11,

²² (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 ²³ (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

	ASC-CAR ²				
	Y : Total number of people, aged 65 and over, discharged alive from hospitals in England between 1 October 2013 and 31 December 2013. This includes all specialities and zerolength stays. Data for geographical areas is based on usual residence of patient. <i>Source: Hospital Episode Statistics</i>				
	HES data for the full calendar year of 2012 will be provided to local authorities via the HSCIC website. The data will be broken down by month as well as by local authority, and could be used as a proxy for 2013 data to estimate monthly measure values.				
	2B Part 1				
	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 = 217.				
	And if the number of people discharged from hospital aged 65+ and entering into joint 'intermediate care' or a 'rehabilitation service' = 306.				
Worked example	Therefore the percentage achieving independence = (217 /306) x 100 = 70.9%				
example	2B Part 2				
	If the number of people discharged from hospital aged 65+ and entering into joint 'intermediate care' or a 'rehabilitation service' = 306 (using same figure as above).				
	And if the total number of people aged 65+ discharged from hospital = 6,857. Then, the proportion offered reablement services = (306/6,857) x 100 = 4.5%				
Disaggregation	Equalities : Age (65-74, 75-84, 85+), Gender				
available	Client groups: Older people (65+)				
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) – table, page and cell references given here are based on the 2012/13 proforma Hospital Episode Statistics		
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One		
Longer-term development options	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.				
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the social care collection page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/collections by clicking on the year. Guidance for HES data can be found at: http://www.hesonline.nhs.uk				

New measure for 2014/15		
(2D) The outcome of short term services: sequel to service		
Domain / Outcome	2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support. Earlier diagnosis, intervention and reablement means that people and their carers are less dependent on intensive services.	
Rationale	This measure will reflect the proportion of those people who received short-term services during the year, where no further request was made for ongoing support. Since the aim of short-term services is to reable people and promote their independence, this measure will provide evidence of a good outcome in delaying dependency or supporting recovery – short-term support that results in no further need for services.	
	In this context, short-term support is defined as 'short-term support which is designed to maximise independence', and therefore will exclude carer contingency and emergency support. This prevents the inclusion of short-term support services which are not reablement services.	
	This measure will be included when the proposals of the zero-based review are fully implemented.	
	Once implemented, this measure should be viewed in the context of a second new measure in this domain, 2E – the effectiveness of reablement services - to understand whether there are any unintended consequences of the decision to provide no further services. Measure 2E is still to be developed.	
	Further work is needed to develop the detailed definition for this measure which is subject to the development of the new data collections. However the definition is likely to be along the lines of the following:	
Definition /	Percentage of those that received a short term service during the year where the sequel was no ongoing support = numerator divided by denominator	
interpretation	Where:	
	Numerator: Those with a sequel to short-term service where no services were provided (none offered/individual not eligible). Those where no services were provided but where the individual went on to purchase services because they fund their own care should be subtracted from this total.	
	Denominator: Number of people who had a short-term support to maximise independence. Those with a sequel of either early cessation due to a life event, or those with no services provided (individual declined), should be subtracted from this total.	
	The numerator and denominator would be summed for new and existing clients.	
	Comment	
	The definition above would include those that fund their own care in the measure – but would ensure that where the intervention was not successful they were identified and excluded from the numerator. This approach would be reliant on councils properly recording those that leave short term services but go on to purchase their own care.	
Alignment	ASCOF measure only	

New placeholder for 2013/14 (2E) The effectiveness of reablement services			
Domain / Outcome	2. Delaying and reducing the need for care and support Earlier diagnosis, intervention and reablement means that people and their carers are less dependent on intensive services.		
Rationale	This placeholder signals intent to measure the effectiveness of short-term services, to be viewed in the context of Measure 2D, to understand whether there are any unintended consequences of the decision to provide no further services, Measures 2D and 2E, once implemented alongside the current measure of outcomes from reablement/rehabilitation services (Measure 2B), will provide a more comprehensive view of the effectiveness of reablement care and support.		
Definition / interpretation	Under development.		
Alignment	ASCOF measure only		

(2C) Delayed transfers of care from hospital, and those which are attributable to adult social care per 100,000 population				
Domain / Outcome	2. Delaying and reducing the need for care When people develop care needs, the supappropriate setting, and enables them to r	oport they receiv		the most
Rationale	This measures the impact of hospital service community-based care in facilitating timely adults. This indicates the ability of the who hospital for the entire adult population. It is of local partners, and is a measure of the social care services. Minimising delayed to independently at home is one of the desire	y and appropriat ble system to en- s an important m effectiveness of ransfers of care	e transfer from a sure appropriate narker of the effe the interface bet and enabling pe	all hospitals for all transfer from ctive joint working tween health and
Definition / interpretation	This is a two-part measure that reflects be (2C part 1) and, as a subset, the number of care services (2C part 2). A delayed transfer of care occurs when a but is still occupying such a bed. A patient is ready for transfer when: (a) a clinical decision has been made that (b) a multi-disciplinary team decision has be AND (c) the patient is safe to discharge/transfer Set out below is a table showing UNIFY2 of or delay:	patient is ready the patient is re been made that	which are attributed for transfer from ady for transfer the patient is reason.	table to social a hospital bed, AND ady for transfer

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. $ \frac{X}{Y} \times 100,000 $ Where, for 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		A. Awaiting completion of assessment	✓	✓	✓	
C. Awaiting further non-acute (including community and mental health) NHS care (including intermediate care, rehabilitation services etc) Di). Awaiting residential home placement or availability Dii). Awaiting nursing home placement or availability E. Awaiting care package in own home F. Awaiting community equipment and adaptations G. Patient or family choice					<u> </u>	
placement or availability Dii). Awaiting nursing home placement or availability E. Awaiting care package in own home F. Awaiting care package in own home F. Awaiting community equipment and adaptations G. Patient or family choice \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark H. Disputes I. Housing – patients not covered by NHS and Community Care Act 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. Alignment 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		C. Awaiting further non-acute (including community and mental health) NHS care (including intermediate care,				
or availability E. Awaiting care package in own home F. Awaiting community equipment and adaptations G. Patient or family choice H. Disputes I. Housing – patients not covered by NHS and Community Care Act 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. ASCOF measure only 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):			✓	✓	×	
I. Housing – patients not covered by NHS and Community Care Act 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. Alignment ASCOF measure only 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		or availability E. Awaiting care package in own home F. Awaiting community equipment and adaptations	*	*	✓ ✓	
NHS and Community Care Act 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. Alignment ASCOF measure only 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		H. Disputes	✓	✓	×	
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. Alignment ASCOF measure only 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		I. Housing – patients not covered by	✓	×	×	
balancing this with a measure that focuses more closely on the specific contribution of social care services. Alignment ASCOF measure only 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 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):						
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. $ \frac{X}{Y} \times 100,000 $ Where, for 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):		balancing this with a measure that focuse	balancing this with a measure that focuses more closely on the specific contribution of			
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. $ \frac{X}{Y} \times 100,000 $ Where, for 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):	Alignment	ASCOF measure only				
$\left(\frac{1}{Y}\right) \times 100,000$ Where, for 2C part 1 (total delayed transfers):	Risk adjustment	delayed transfers of care are minimised.	he factors affe	ecting whether th		
Source: ONS mid year population estimates ²⁴ For 2C 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	Formula	Where, for 2C 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). Source:Unify2 Y: Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over) Source: ONS mid year population estimates ²⁴ For 2C 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: UNIFY2 Y: Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over)				ne 12 monthly sn	ap shots is 812.	
Source: UNIFY2 Y: Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over) Source: ONS mid year population estimates ²⁵	Worked example	Divide this by 12 for a monthly figure.				
Y: Size of adult population in area (aged 18 and over) Source: ONS mid year population estimates ²⁵ Suppose the total number of delayed discharges from the 12 monthly snap shots is 812. Norked Divide this by 12 for a monthly figure.	•	And if the ONS mid-year population estimate = 570,562				

²⁴ If a population estimate does not exist for the current year then the previous year's estimate will be used.
²⁵ If a population estimate does not exist for the current year then the previous year's estimate will be used.

	Therefore the average rate of delayed	transfers is calculated as:		
	((812 /12) /570,562) *100,000			
	= 11.9			
		le to social care or jointly to social care an nsfers of care attributable to social care o		
	= 4.0			
Disaggregation	Equalities: Age (18+)			
available	Client groups: Adults aged 18+			
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	UNIFY2 (DH) Office of National Statistics	
Return format	Numeric Decimal places One			
Longer-term development options	None identified			
	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the social care collection page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/social-care/social-care-collections by clicking on the			
Further guidance	Guidance on UNIFY2 can be found at: http://transparency.dh.gov.uk/2012/06/21/dtoc-information/			
J	Delayed discharges data can be found at: http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Statistics/Performancedataandstatistics/AcuteandNon-AcuteDelayedTransfersofCare/index.htm			

New placeholder for 2013/14 (2F) Dementia a measure of the effectiveness of post diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life			
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	The Care and Support White Paper reinforced the Prime Minister's 'Challenge on Dementia,' which sets out a renewed ambition to go 'further and faster', building on progress made through the National Dementia Strategy to secure greater improvements in dementia care. The placeholder signals the intent to develop a measure to assess the impact of this challenge, which will focus on the effectives of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life.		
Alignment	This measure is shared with Measure 2.6ii (effectiveness of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence for people with dementia) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 42).		

Domain 3 – Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care and support

(3A) Overall satis	faction of people who use services 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)
Rationale	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 reported satisfaction with services is a good predictor of people's overall experiences of services.
Definition / interpretation	The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 1: "Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied 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 I am neither satisfied I am very dissatisfied I am very dissatisfied I am extremely dissatisfied I am wery happy are you with the way staff help you?", to which the following answers are possible: I am very happy with the way staff help me, it's really good I am quite happy with the way staff help me The way staff help me is OK I do not think the way staff help me is that good I think the way staff help me is really bad 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", and of those responding to the Easy Read questionnaire, who choose the answer "I am very happy with the way staff help me, it's really good".
Alignment	ASCOF only measure
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 ten 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	

Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys				
Longer-term development options	None identified				
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One		
Frequency of collection	Annual	Data source	Adult Social Care Survey		
Disaggregation available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages**), Learning Disability (all ages**), Mental health (all ages)**, Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**				
Discognostion	Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation*				
	(Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey.) The measure value is [((217 + 30)/398)*100] = 62.1%				
Worked example	In total the number of users who responded to the question (including the easy read questionnaire) was 398.				
	satisfied" or "I am very satisfied" was 217 appy with the way staff help me, it's really ead questionnaire was 30.				
	For both the numerator (X) and denominator (Y), weighted data should be used to calculate the measure. The data from the survey will be weighted by the HSCIC to take account of the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey.				
	Y: All those that responded	to the question.			
			o select the response "I am very happy with nse to Question 1 of the Easy Read		

^{**} This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns, however it is part of the publication of the data source

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

(3B) Overall satis	sfaction of carers with social services
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 reported satisfaction with services is a good predictor of the overall experience of services and quality.
	This measure will be deferred in 2013/14
	The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is question 4: "Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied 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:
Definition / interpretation	 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 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".
Alignment	ASCOF measure only
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 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.
	$\left(\frac{X}{Y}\right)$ x100
	Where:
Formula	X: In response to the question above, those individuals who selected the response "I am extremely satisfied" or "I am very satisfied".
- Ciliwid	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 measure value is [(112/(160-7))*100] = 73.2%			
Disaggregation	Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation			
available	Client groups: Carers			
Frequency of collection	Biennial (Carers Survey to be next conducted in 2014/15) Data source Carers Survey			
Return format	Percentage Decimal places One			
Longer-term development options	There remains potential for moving to an annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to the agreement of local government.			
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys .			

New placeholder for 2013/14				
(3E) Improving people's experience of integrated care				
Domain / Outcome	3. Ensuring that 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.			
Rationale	As highlighted by the NHS Future Forum, 'integration is a vitally important aspect of the experience of health and social care for millions of people. It has perhaps the greatest relevance for the most vulnerable and those with the most complex and long-term needs'. However, at present, no direct measurement of people's experience of integrated care exists.			
	The Care and Support White Paper restated the Department's commitment to a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to drive further improvements in people's experience of integrated care.			
Alignment	This placeholder is shared with measure 4.9 (people's experience of integrated care) in the NHS Outcomes Framework (https://www.wp.dh.gov.uk/publications/files/2012/11/121109-Technical-Appendix.pdf page 86).			

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns, however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

(3C) The proportion about the person	on of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussion 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.			
Rationale	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.			
	This measure will be deferred in 2013/14.			
	The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is Q15: "In the last 12 months, do you feel you have been involved or consulted as much as you wanted to be, in discussions about the support or services provided to the person you care for?", to which the following answers are possible:			
Definition / interpretation	 There have been no discussions 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 			
	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".			
Alignment	ASCOF measure only			
Risk adjustment	None			
	$\left(\frac{X}{Y}\right)^*$ 100 Where:			
Formula	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.			
	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	The number of carers who said "I always felt involved or consulted" (and "I usually felt involved or consulted") was 129.			
example	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 measure value is [(129/(160-7))*100] = 84.3%			

Disaggregation	Equalities : Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion*, Sexual Orientation*			
available	Client groups: Carers			
Frequency of collection	Biennial (Carers Survey to be next conducted in 2014/15) Data source Carers Survey			
Return format	Percentage Decimal places One			
Longer-term development options	There remains potential for moving to an annual collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to the agreement of local government.			
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwa		a the user survey guidance page at -collections/user-surveys.	

(3D) The proportion of people who use services and carers who find it easy to find information about services			
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 in two parts and uses questions in the Adult Social Care Survey and Carers Survey. The question from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 12: "In the past year, have you generally 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 Very difficult to find Very difficult to find Very easure is defined by determining the percentage of all those responding who select the response "very easy to find" and "fairly easy to find". The relevant question drawn from the Carers Survey is Question 13: "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		

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

	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
	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".
	The measure is then 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.
Alignment	ASCOF only measure
Risk adjustment	None
Formula	Where: For 3D part 1 (users): X: In response to Question 12 of the ASCS, those individuals who selected the response "very easy to find" and "fairly easy to find". Those respondents who were sent the version of the questionnaire for people with learning disabilities will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version. Y: All those that responded to the question. For both the numerator (X) and denominator (Y), weighted data should be used to calculate the measure. The data from the survey will be weighted by the Health and Social Care Information Centre to take account of the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey. Where: For 3D part 2 (carers): X: 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. Y: The sum of all those that responded to the above question of the Carers Survey. Exclusions
	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. Y: The sum of all those that responded to the above question of the Carers Survey.

	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	The number of respondents to the Adult Social Care Survey who select the response "Very easy to find" or "fairly easy to find" was 191. In total the number of users who responded to the question was 350 of whom 8 gave a response of "I've never tried to find information or advice". The score for the ASCS is [(191/(350-8))*100] = 55.8% (Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey) 3D Part 2 (carers) 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 [(93/(220-8))*100] = 43.9%		
Disaggregation available	Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation* Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)**, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Mental Health (all ages)**, Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable people (all ages)**, Carers		
Frequency of collection	Annual (ASCS) Biennial (Carers Survey to be next conducted In 2014/15)	Data source	Adult Social Care Survey Carers Survey
Return format	Percentage	Decimal places	One
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. There remains potential for moving to an annual carers collection if burden can be reduced significantly, subject to the agreement of local government.		
Further guidance	Guidance for 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys		

*

^{*} Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Domain 4 – Safeguarding adults whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm

(4A) The proportion of people who use services who feel safe		
Domain / Outcome	Safeguarding people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm. (Overarching measure)	
	This measures one component of the overarching 'social care-related quality of life' measure. It provides an overarching measure for this domain.	
Rationale	Safety is fundamental to the wellbeing and independence of people using social care, and the wider population. Feeling safe is a vital part pf users' experience of their care and support. 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.	
	The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 7a: "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".	
Definition / interpretation	Those respondents who were sent the version of the questionnaire for people with learning disabilities will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version.	
	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 measure will measure those choosing the most positive response - "I feel as safe as I want" - it will be 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 measure) but also has a relatively high proportion of respondents selecting "I don't feel at all safe", this could reflect gaps in safeguarding services.	
Alignment	This measure is complementary to measure 1.19 (older people's perception of community safety placeholder) in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh_132558.pdf page 25).	
Risk adjustment	A range of factors will be considered to adjust the measure to improve comparability between councils. Some example are: Age of users Needs of users Client groups of users	

Formula	Where: X: In response to Question 7a, those individuals who selected the response "I feel as safe as I want". Those respondents who were sent the version of the questionnaire for people with learning disabilities will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version. Y: All those that responded to the question. For both the numerator (X) and denominator (Y), weighted data should be used to calculate the measure. The data from the survey will be weighted by the Health and Social Care Information Centre to take account of the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey.		
Worked example	The number of users who said "I feel as safe as I want" was 214. In total the number of users who responded to the question was 345. (Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey) The measure value is [(214/345)*100] = 62.0%		
Disaggregation	Equalities: Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual Orientation*		
available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)**, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Mental Health (all ages)**, Substance misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**		
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	We will consider whether and how the development of a broader 'value-added' measure for measure 1A, which quantifies the contribution of social services to social care related quality of life, can or should be applied to this measure.		

* Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns, however it is part of the publication of the data source.

(4B) The proport	tion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe
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 in the way that they wish.
Rationale	Safety is fundamental to the wellbeing and independence of people using social care, and the wider population. Feeling safe is a vital part of users' experience and their care and support. There are legal requirements about safety in the context of service quality, including CQC essential standards for registered services. This measure supports measure 4A by reflecting the extent to which users of care services feel that their care and support has contributed to making them feel safe and secure. As such, it goes some way to separate the role of care and support in helping people to feel safe from the influence of other factors, such as crime levels and socio-economic factors.
Definition / interpretation	The relevant question drawn from the Adult Social Care Survey is Question 7b: "Do care and support services help you in feeling safe?" To which the following answers are possible: Yes No Those respondents who were sent the version of the questionnaire for people with learning disabilities will be treated in the same way, as this questionnaire has been designed to be equivalent to the non-learning disabilities version. Interpretation Whilst the overarching measure (4A) indicates a higher-level individual perspective on feeling safe, this measure complements this with a specific response on the impact of services on this outcome.
Alignment	ASCOF measure only
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.
Formula	

	when conducting the survey. The weights are automatically calculated within the survey data return along with the ASCOF outcome measures. Further details of how to use the weights when analysing the survey data are available in Appendix I of the guidance for the 2012-13 Adult Social Care Survey.		
	The number of users who said services had helped them feel safe was 197.		
Worked	In total the number of users who r	responded to the question	was 345.
example	(Data weighted to reflect the stratified sampling technique that has been used when conducting the survey.)		
	The measure value is [(197/345)*100] = 57.1%		
Disaggregation	Equalities : Age, Gender, Ethnicity**, Religion*, Sexual orientation*		
available	Client groups: Physical Disability (all ages)*, Learning Disability (all ages)**, Mental health (all ages)**, Substance Misuse (all ages)**, Vulnerable People (all ages)**		
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 2012/13 onwards can be found via the user survey guidance page at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/article/2213/User-survey-guidance-2012-13.		

New placeholder for 2013/14		
(4C) Proportion	of completes safeguarding referrals where people report that they feel safe	
	Safeguarding adults whose circumstances make them vulnerable and protecting from avoidable harm.	
Domain / Outcome	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 injuries People are supported to plan ahead and have the freedom to manage risks the way that they wish	
Rationale	A high-quality service must be one which keeps people safe from harm and the area of safeguarding is one of the core priorities of adult social care. This area remains one of the critical developmental priorities for the future of the ASCOF, and as part of the zero-based review, work has been taken forward to develop a potential measure of the outcomes of safeguarding interventions.	
	This placeholder signals the Department's intention to measure the proportion of completed safeguarding referrals where service users reported they felt safe. To develop this	

-

^{**} This information is not published as part of the adult social care outcomes returns; however it is part of the publication of the data source.

Although the underlying 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/medium term. This reflects the content of records held locally by councils.

The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework for 2013/14

	measure, further work and piloting is required. Should a pilot be successful, this measure will be included in a future ASCOF.
Definition / interpretation	Under development.
Alignment	ASCOF measure only

Appendix 1: The Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework 2013/14 at a glance

Enhancing quality of life for people with care and support needs

Overarching measure

1A. Social care-related quality of life * (NHSOF 2)

Outcome measures

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.

18. Proportion of people who use services who have control over their daily life To be revised from 2014/15: 10. Proportion of people using social care who receive self-directed support, and those receiving direct payments

Carers can balance their caring roles and maintain their desired quality of life.

Carer reported quality of life " (NHSOF 2.4)

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.

Proportion of adults with a learning disability in paid employment *** (PHOF 1.8, NHSOF 2.2)
 Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment **** (PHOF 1.8, NHSOF

2.5) 14. Proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family** (PHOF 1.6) 14. Proportion of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with of without support ?? (PHOF 1.6)

New measure for 2013/14: 11. Proportion of people who use services and their carers, who reported that they had as much social contact as they would like, ** (PHOF 1.18)

Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care and support

Overarching measure

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

Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support 88

Overall satisfaction of carers with social services

New placeholder 3E Improving people's experience of integrated care ** NHS OF 4.9

Carersfeel that they are respected as equal partners throughout the care process

The proportion of carers who report that they have been included or consulted in discussions about the person they

People knowwhat choices are available to them locally, what they are entitled to, and who to contact when they

3D. The proportion of people who use services and carers who find it easy to find information about support

People, including those involved in making decisions on social care, respect the dignity of the individual and ensure support is sensitive to the circumstances of each individual.

This information can be taken from the Adult Social Care Survey and used for analysis at the local level.

At a glance

Delaying and reducing the need for care and support

N

Overarching measures

29. Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 1,000 population

Outcome measures

Exerybody has the opportunity to have the best health and wellbeing throughout their life, and can access support and information to help them manage their care needs.

Earlier diagnosis, intervention and reablement means that people and their carers are less dependent on intensive services.

Proportion of older people (®S and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation services *** (NHSOF 3.6)

New measure for 2014/15; 2D. The outcomes of short-term services; sequel to service. New placeholder 2E: Effectiveness of reablement services

When people develop care needs, the support they receive takes place in the most appropriate setting, and enables them to regain their independence.

2C. Delayed transfers of care from hospital, and those which are attributable to adult social care

New placeholder 2F: A measure of the effectiveness of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life, "* (NHSOF-2.6%)

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

Overarching measure

44. The proportion of people who use services who feel safe" (PHOF 1.19)

Outcome measures

Everyone enjoys physical safety and feels secure.

People are free from physical and emotional abuse, har assment, neglect and self-harm.

People are protected as far as possible from avoidable harm, disease and injuries.

People are supported to plan ahead and have the freedom to manage risks the way that they wish.

4B. The proportion of people who use services who say that those services have made them feel safe and secure

New placeholder 40: Proportion of completed safeguarding referrals where people report they feel safe

Aligning across the Health and Care System

- * Indicator complementary

*** Indicator complem entary with the Public Health Outcomes Fram ework and the NHS Outcomes framework

Shared indicators: The same indicator is included in each outcomes framework, reflecting a shared role in making

progress Complementary indicators: A similar indicator is included in each outcomes framework and these look at the same issue

Appendix 2: The Public Health Outcomes Framework 2013-16 at a glance

VISION

To improve and protect the nation's health and wellbeing and improve the health of the poorest fastest

Outcome 1) Increased healthy life expectancy, i.e. taking account of the health quality as well as the length of life

communities (through greater improvements in more disadvantaged communities) Outcome 2) Reduced differences in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy between

Alignment across the Health and Care System

*Indicator shared with the NHS Outcomes Framework

Public Health Outcomes

Framework 2013-2016 At a glance (Autumn 2012)

** Complementary to indicators in the NHS Outcomes Framework

Indicator shared with the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework

** Complementary to indicators in the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework

Indicators in italics are placeholders, pending development or identification

4

Reduced numbers of people living with preventable ill health and people dying prematurely, whilst reducing the gap between communities

Infant mortality* (NHSOF 1.6i) Tooth decay in children aged 5

Under 75 mortality rate from all cardiovascular diseases (including heart disease and stroke)* Mortality rate from causes considered preventable ** (NHSOF Ia)

Under 75 mortality rate from cancer* (NHSOF (NHSOF 1.1)

4.5

Under 75 mortality rate from liver disease* 4.6

Under 75 mortality rate from respiratory (NHSOF 1.3) 4.7

Mortality rate from infectious and parasitic diseases* (NHSOF 1.2)

Excess under 75 mortality rate in adults with serious mental illness* ($NHSOF\ 1.5$)

Emergency readmissions within 30 days of discharge from hospital* (NHSOF 3b) Preventable sight loss

Health-related quality of life for older people Hip fractures in people aged 65 and over Excess winter deaths

Estimated diagnosis rate for people with dementia *(NHSOF 2.6i)

Improvements against wider factors which affect health and wellbeing and health inequalities

Objective

School readiness (Placeholder) Children in poverty 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5

First time entrants to the youth justice system

16-18 year olds not in education, employment

Adults with a learning disability / in contact with secondary mental health services who live in stable and appropriate accommodation

People in prison who have a mental illness or a Employment for those with long-term health significant mental illness (Placeholder) (ASCOF 1G and 1H)

disability or who are in contact with secondary mental health services *(i-NHSOF 2.2) *†(ii-ASCOF 1E) **(iii-NHSOF 2.5) *† (iii-ASCOF conditions including adults with a learning

Killed and seriously injured casualties on Sickness absence rate

England's roads

Re-offending levels 1.11 1.12 1.13 1.14

Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise

Social isolation (Placeholder)[†] (ASCOF II) Older people's perception of community safety (Placeholder)^{††} (ASCOF 4A)

People are helped to live healthy lifestyles, make healthy choices and reduce health inequalities

Low birth weight of term babies

Smoking status at time of delivery

Child development at 2 - 2.1/2 years Under 18 conceptions (Placeholder)

Excess weight in 4-5 and 10-11 year olds

unintentional and deliberate injuries in under 18s

Emotional well-being of looked after Smoking prevalence - 15 year olds

Self-harm (Placeholder) (Placeholder)

Proportion of physically active and inactive Excess weight in adults

dependence issues who are previously not Successful completion of drug treatment 2.14 Smoking prevalence – adults (over 18s)2.15 Successful completion of drug treatment2.16 People entering prison with substance People entering prison with substance

2.17 Recorded diabetes
2.18 Alcohol-related admissions to hospital known to community treatment

Cancer diagnosed at stage 1 and 2 Cancer screening coverage

Take up of the NHS Health Check programme – by those eligible Self-reported well-being

Indicators

Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate

Population vaccination coverage 3.3 3.4 3.4

Treatment completion for TB

approved sustainable development

Comprehensive, agreed inter-agency plans for responding to public health incidents and emergencies (Placeholder)

Domestic abuse (Placeholder) Violent crime (including sexual violence)

The percentage of the population affected by

Statutory homelessness 1.15 Fuel poverty (Placeholder)

Injuries due to falls in people aged 65 and

The population's health is protected from major incidents and other threats, whilst reducing health inequalities

Chlamydia diagnoses (15-24 year olds)

People presenting with HIV at a late stage of

Public sector organisations with board

Appendix 3: The NHS Outcomes Framework 2013/14 at a glance

Overarching indicators

1a Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL) from causes considered amenable to

Adults ii Children and young people 1b Life expectancy at 75

Improvement areas

Reducing premature mortality from the major causes of death 1.1 Under 75 mortality rate from cardiovascular disease* (PHOF 4.4) 1.2 Under 75 mortality rate from respiratory disease* (PHOF 4.7)

1.3 Under 75 mortality rate from liver disease* (PHOF 4.6)

iii One- and iv Five-year survival from breast, lung and colorectal cancer Under 75 mortality rate from cancer* (PHOF 4.5) i One- and ii Five-year survival from all cancers

Reducing premature death in people with serious mental illness 1.5 Excess under 75 mortality rate in adults with serious mental illness* (PHOF 4.9)

Reducing deaths in babies and young children

Neonatal mortality and stillbirths

iii Five year survival from all cancers in children

Reducing premature death in people with a learning disability 1.7 Excess under 60 mortality rate in adults with a learning disability

Enhancing quality of life for people with long term

Overarching indicator

2 Health-related quality of life for people with long-term conditions ** (ASCOF 1A)

Improvement areas

Ensuring people feel supported to manage their condition 2.1 Proportion of people feeling supported to manage their condition**

Improving functional ability in people with long-term conditions 2.2 Employment of people with long-term conditions** (ASCOF 1E PHOF 1.8)

Reducing time spent in hospital by people with long-term conditions 2.3 i Unplanned hospitalisation for chronic ambulatory care sensitive conditions (adults)

Unplanned hospitalisation for asthma, diabetes and epilepsy in under

Enhancing quality of life for carers 2.4 Health-related quality of life for carers** (ASCOF 1D)

2.5 Employment of people with mental illness **** (ASCOF 1F & PHOF 1.8) Enhancing quality of life for people with mental illness

Enhancing quality of life for people with dementia

2.6 I Estimated diagnosis rate for people with dementia* (PHOF 4.16) ii A measure of the effectiveness of post-diagnosis care in sustaining independence and improving quality of life*** (ASCOF 2F)

Helping people to recover from episodes of ill health or following injury

Overarching indicator

3b Emergency readmissions within 30 days of discharge from hospital* (PHOF 4.11) 3a Emergency admissions for acute conditions that should not usually require hospital admission

mprovement areas

Improving outcomes from planned treatments
3.1 Total health gain as assessed by patients for elective procedures
thip replacement if Knee replacement iff Groin herma Iv Varicose veins

Psychological therapies

Preventing lower respiratory tract infections (LRTI) in children from becoming

3.2 Emergency admissions for children with LRTI

Improving recovery from injuries and trauma

3.3 Proportion of people who recover from major trauma

3.4 Proportion of stroke patients reporting an improvement in activity/lifestyle on the Modified Rankin Scale at 6 months

Improving recovery from fragility fractures

Proportion of patients recovering to their previous levels of mobility/walking ability i 30 and ii 120 days

Helping older people to recover their independence after illness or injury 3.6. I Proportion of loder people (8.5 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/ rehabilitation service***

Proportion offered rehabilitation following discharge from acute or community hospital

NHS Outcomes Framework 2013/14

at a glance

Alignment across the Health and Social Care System

Indicator shared with Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) Indicator complementary with Adult Social Care Outcomes

Indicator shared with Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework Indicator complementary with Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework and Public Health Outcomes Framework

4

Ensuring that people have a positive experience of care

Overarching indicators

Patient experience of primary care

GP Out of Hours services

iii NHS Dental Services Patient experience of hospital care Friends and family test

Improvement areas

Improving people's experience of outpatient care

Improving hospitals' responsiveness to personal needs

4.2 Responsiveness to in-patients' personal needs

Improving people's experience of accident and emergency services 4.3 Patient experience of A&E services

Improving access to primary care services 4.4 Access to i GP services and ii NHS dental

Improving women and their families' experience of maternity services 4.5 Women's experience of maternity services

Improving the experience of care for people at the end of their lives 4.6 Bereaved carers' views on the quality of care in the last 3 months of life

Improving experience of healthcare for people with mental illness 4.7 Patient experience of community mental health services

Improving children and young people's experience of healthcare 4.8 An indicator is under development

Improving people's experience of integrated care 4.9 An indicator is under development *** (ASCOF 3E)

Treating and caring for people in a safe environment and protect them from avoidable harm 2

Overarching indicators

5a Patient safety incidents reported 5b Safety incidents involving severe harm or death 5c Hospital deaths attributable to problems in care

Improvement areas

Reducing the incidence of avoidable harm 5.1 Incidence of hospital-related venous thromboembolism (VTE) 5.2 Incidence of healthcare associated infection (HCAI)

5.3 Incidence of newly-acquired category 2, 3 and 4 pressure ulcers 5.4 Incidence of medication errors causing serious harm ii C. difficile

Improving the safety of maternity services 5.5 Admission of full-term babies to neonatal care

Delivering safe care to children in acute settings 5.6 Incidence of harm to children due to 'failure to monitor'

Appendix 4: Interpretation of social carerelated quality of life measure

The social care related quality of life score for an individual is a composite measure using responses to questions from the ASCS covering eight domains (control, dignity, personal care, food and drink, safety, occupation, social participation and accommodation). The ASCOF measure provides a social care related quality of life score averaged across each of the users who responded to the Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS) in an authority i.e. it's an average quality of life score for those that responded to the ASCS.

The score will be influenced by a range of factors, one of which is the services provided by the authority. Some of the other factors that are likely to have had an influence are the needs of individuals, age and whether people receive informal care. Therefore, in its current form this measure does not solely reflect the impact of social care services but does capture people's experience in aspects of life relevant to social care.

The social care related quality of life measure tells us about outcomes for social care users but does not isolate the impact that care and support services have on those outcomes. The Department has commissioned research from the Quality and Outcomes of Person Centred Care Policy Research Unit to identify a way of generating a social care related quality of life 'value added' measure, which would allow us to identify the impact of adult social care on people's quality of life. This research is due to report its findings in summer 2014. If successful, this will allow us to develop a new or additional measure for the ASCOF.

How can the measure be used?

If using the measure for benchmarking, then it is important that comparisons are made with authorities that have similar characteristics. A starting point might be the standard comparator groups as otherwise comparisons can be misleading.

At a local level the score for each of the questions that measures outcomes across the eight domains could be investigated. Comparing this to a national average or similar councils would help understand whether scores on any of the individual domains are better or worse than would be expected.

Also at a local level it may be useful to look at the distribution of scores of individuals on the social care related quality of life measure. This would help understand whether most people's scores are around the average or are distributed widely. This analysis could be repeated by service user characteristics such as primary client group, or services being used.

When the survey is repeated, time series comparisons can be made and a change in the level of the measure should be investigated. Reasons for the change in the level of the measure may be a change in the impact of service but could also be related to changes in the needs of the local population etc.

However when making comparisons it's important to remember that the results are estimates from survey data and so there will be a degree of uncertainty which will be greater as the results are broken down further and therefore based on fewer service users. The level of uncertainty is commonly represented by a confidence interval which gives a range around the estimate in which you can be reasonably confident that the true figure lies.

If you would like more information on calculating confidence intervals please see the links under "Helping you make better use of the results from User Surveys" on the following page of the Information Centre website http://www.ic.nhs.uk/socialcare/usersurveys.

Appendix 5: 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'.

MHMDS Code	Accommodation type	Settled accommodation status
	1 = Settled accommodation	Status
	0 = Non-settled accommodation	
Mainstrear	n Housing (MA00)	
MA01	Owner occupier	1
MA02	Settled mainstream housing with	1
	family/friends	
MA03	Shared ownership scheme e.g. Social	1
	Homebuy Scheme (tenant purchase	
	percentage of home value from landlord)	
MA04	Tenant - Local Authority/Arms Length	1
	Management Organisation/Registered	
14405	Landlord	
MA05 MA06	Tenant – Housing Association Tenant – private landlord	1 1
	·	
MA09	Other mainstream housing	1
Homeless (HM00)		
HM01	Rough sleeper	0
HM02	Squatting	0
HM03	Night shelter/emergency hostel/Direct access hostel (temporary accommodation accepting self referrals, no waiting list and relatively frequent vacancies)	0
HM04	Sofa surfing (sleeps on different friends floor each night)	0
HM05	Placed in temporary accommodation by Local Authority (including Homelessness resettlement service) e.g. Bed and Breakfast	0

accommodation

HM06	Staying with friends/family as a short term guest	0
HM07	Other homeless	0
Accommo	dation with mental health care support (MH00)	
MH01	Supported accommodation (accommodation supported by staff or resident caretaker)	1
MH02	Supported lodgings (lodgings supported by staff or resident caretaker)	1
MH03	Supported group home (supported by staff or resident caretaker)	1
MH04	Mental Health Registered Care Home	0
MH09	Other accommodation with mental health care and support	1
	Acute/long stay healthcare residential facility/hospital (HS00)
HS01	NHS acute psychiatric ward	0
HS02	Independent hospital/clinic	0
HS03	Specialist rehabilitation/recovery	0
HS04	Secure psychiatric unit	0
HS05	Other NHS facilities/hospital	0
HS09	Acute/long stay healthcare residential facility/hospital	0
	Accommodation with other (not specialist mental health) care s	upport (CH00)
CH01	Foyer – accommodation for young people aged 16-25 who are homeless or in housing need	1
CH02	Refuge	0
CH03	Non-Mental Health Registered Care Home	0
CH09	Other accommodation with care and support (not specialist mental health)	1

Appendix 5: 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'.

CJ01	Bail/Probation hostel	1
CJ02	Prison	0
CJ03	Young Offenders Institution	0
CJ04	Detention Centre	0
CJ09	Other accommodation with criminal justice support such as ex-offender support	1

Sheltered Housing (accommodation with a scheme manager or warden living on the premises or nearby, contactable by an alarm system if necessary) (SH00)

SH01	Sheltered housing for older persons	1
SH02	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.)	1
SH03	Nursing Home	0
SH09	Other sheltered housing	1
	Mobile accommodation	
ML00	Mobile accommodation Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller community)	1
ML00	Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma	1
ML00 OC96	Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller community)	1
	Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller community) Other codes	1
OC96	Mobile accommodation (for Gypsy/Roma and Traveller community) Other codes Not elsewhere classified	1