

**Putting People First
Personalisation Toolkit**

**Measuring the Cost Effectiveness
of Support Planning and Support
Brokerage: a tool for councils**



Gateway ref 9878

This document is part of the Personalisation toolkit, which can be seen in full at www.toolkit.personalisation.org.uk

Contents

Introduction	3
How we developed this guide	4
Support planning and brokerage activities	5
Assessing service quality	6
Activity and cost measures	7
Data collection – frameworks and standards	9
Cost measures for support planning and brokerage	10
Understanding support planning & brokerage performance	13
Next steps	14

Authors: Joy Harris, Institute of Public Finance and Martin Cattermole, Care Services Improvement Partnership. Thank you to the Individual Budget Pilot councils who have contributed to this report.

Introduction

***Putting People First*¹ sets a clear direction and statement of intent for self directed support in England. This builds upon over two years of social care policy promoting self directed support including, *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People*², the *Green Paper, Independence Well-being and Choice*³ and the *White Paper, Our Health, Our Care, Our Say*.⁴**

The recently published local authority circular, *Transforming Social Care*⁵ sets out, in greater detail, how the whole sector will need to change to make sure this vision becomes a reality. In particular, it highlights the importance of brokerage and advocacy services if people are truly to be In Control and at the centre of things.

The Care Services Improvement Partnership publication *Good Practice in Support*

Brokerage and Support Planning gives a definition of these activities and detailed advice for councils. Learning from the Individual Budget Pilot Programme and In Control has shown that support planning and brokerage are key elements of a personalised social care system.

One of the challenges that councils face is how to ensure that these activities can become sustainable. This document aims to help councils achieve this by providing a framework to measure the costs and outcomes of support planning and brokerage. It is intended to help councils to learn from experience so far. It suggests a range of local performance measures from which councils can choose, should they wish. Nothing in this tool overrides existing statutory responsibilities or policy guidance.

1 Putting People First: a shared vision and commitment to the transformation of Adult Social Care, Department of Health, 2007.

2 Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People, Cabinet Office, 2005.

3 Independence, Well-being and Choice: Our Vision for the Future of Social Care for Adults in England, Department of Health, 2005.

4 Our health, our care, our say: a new direction for community services, Department of Health 2006

5 LAC (DH) (2008) 1, Transforming Social Care

How we developed this document

This document draws on existing practice for understanding and measuring councils spending. Several councils worked with us to develop the tool, including individual budget pilot sites and councils taking part in In Control (see Appendix 1). The people taking part included commissioners, providers, finance staff, support planners and brokers and people leading on the development of self-directed support. This has helped help us to make sure that the advice in this guide will be practical and relevant to self-directed support.

Defining support planning and brokerage

It can be difficult to measure the costs of new methods of service delivery. Early on, people will have different views about the range and scope of activities that will make up the new arrangements. It is essential to have a clear definition for each activity and to understand what is and is not included.

We have proposed a core set of activities about which there is common agreement as the basis for the early collection of costs. We have based this on the definitions set out in the CSIP publication *Good Practice in Support Brokerage and Support Planning*.

At this stage we have not included the following in the scope of this guide:

- Workforce development

Workforce issues concerning both professional roles and market development, which are part of the personalisation agenda to which self-directed support contributes, are not covered in this guide.

- Resource allocation

It is possible that in future councils may include the costs of support planning and brokerage in their resource allocation system. This would enable people to use part of their personal budget to pay for support planning and brokerage. In this document we have assumed that these costs are not included in the resource allocation system, and that these activities will be commissioned or provided by councils. However, this is an option councils may wish to explore.

Support planning and brokerage activities

Set out below are a core set of four support planning and brokerage activities about which the collection of cost information is considered to be both practical and useful. These may be delivered by the council directly or by another organisation funded by the council.

Organising support for planning – This is the provision of support to enable the person to decide whether they want to develop their own support plan drawing entirely on their own resources or whether they will need support to develop their plan.

Creating the support plan – The support plan sets out the intended use of the person's budget in line with the needs assessment and the outcomes the person wants to achieve. The council will need to have in place a process to agree the support plan and the person's budget.

Administration of the budget – During the development of the support plan, the person

will need to choose the way in which their budget will be administered and may need assistance to do this. The options can include a direct payment, payment to a provider, payment to a broker, an individual service fund or a combination of these.

Purchasing and organising support – At this stage service providers need to be identified, support purchased and its day to day organisation managed.

These activities may not always result in direct costs to the council. For example, a person might write their support plan alone or with help from friends and family.

These activities will take place following initial assessment and may happen again after a review if there is a need to change the support arrangements. However, a person may decide to make changes to their support arrangements at any time, and this will not need a formal review process.

Assessing service quality

An important part of measuring the cost effectiveness of a service is assessing service quality. This assessment needs to be based on the principles guiding service delivery. In Control has set out seven principles for self-directed support⁶. The principles encompass independence, a personalised budget; self-determination, an accessible system, flexible funding, being accountable and the recognition of a person's capacity to contribute.

In this guide we have set out eleven activity and cost measures which councils may find useful. We have also included a short questionnaire which councils could use to collect feedback about people's experience of support planning and brokerage (see Appendix 3).

A system for measuring the quality and cost of support planning and brokerage needs to be proportionate and meaningful. Councils can choose from the set of measures in this guide, using all or part of them, depending on local circumstances. It will be important to avoid imposing excessive monitoring requirements on external organisations, such as organisations led by disabled people.

⁶ In Control 'Keys to Citizenship – A guide to getting good support for people with learning disabilities' by Simon Duffy

Activity and cost measures

Data collection needs to be proportionate. Collecting very detailed data gives more opportunity for analysis, but takes time and money.

In practice it is likely to be difficult and expensive to collect separate activity and cost data for the four categories of support planning and brokerage activity listed above. We suggest that councils collect data on support planning and brokerage activities as a single function.

Below we set out a number of activity and cost measures. Councils can use these to collect information about in-house support planning and brokerage services or about services provided by another organisation.

Costs

Costs can be categorised using the CIPFA standard revenue expenditure analysis. Staffing costs are likely to make up most of the total.

Hours of support available and hours of support provided

Hours of support are not the same as total staff hours. They are the staff hours provided directly to support the person. They do not include administrative hours which are not directly attributable to a person's support.

Councils may need to collect two different measures. The first is the total hours of support available. The second is the actual support hours provided to people. These will not be the same. Total available hours is a measure of capacity. Support hours provided is a measure of service delivered. The distinction is important because it provides a way to understand the efficiency of the support planning and brokerage service.

People supported

This is the number of people supported, divided by user group.

We recognise that there are concerns about the appropriateness of using user group categorisations for self-directed support. However, these categories are widely used by councils for financial and performance reporting, and this is likely to continue in the future. Councils are likely to find it useful to analyse support planning and brokerage activity by user group.

Efficiency measures based on full time equivalent (FTE) support hours

Ratios are a useful way of measuring efficiency. The suggested efficiency measures in the section below are based on a calculation of full time equivalent support hours. An approach to calculating this is set out in Appendix 2.

Support plans completed

The purpose of support planning and brokerage is to enable people to put in place their self-directed support arrangement. From April 2008, councils will report social care performance against a new set of national indicators⁷. From April 2009 this will include an indicator on the number of people directing their own support using a direct payment or other form of personal budget.

The number of support plans completed is therefore an important performance measure. We recommend that the total is broken down by user group.

⁷ Department for Communities & Local Government 'The New Performance Framework for Local Authorities & Local Authority Partnerships: Single Set of National Indicators' – October 2007

Data collection – frameworks and standards

Councils report social care performance within a statutory framework which includes mandatory financial reporting standards. These are set out in the Best Value Accounting Code of Practice and the CIPFA Service Expenditure Analysis.

Major changes are under way in the arrangements for measurement and assessment of council performance. The Department of Health and Communities and Local Government have published *Delivering Health and Well-being in Partnership: The crucial role of the new local performance framework* (December 2007), which summarises these changes. These include the new national indicator set introduced from April 2008, with 198 indicators replacing around 1,200.

Councils now have fewer national reporting requirements, which gives more scope to develop local measures of outcomes and costs. The measures suggested in this guide are intended to help councils to do this. The measures need to comply with the financial reporting standards set out above.

Cost measures for support planning and brokerage

Collecting cost data can help councils to get better value for money from support planning and brokerage. Assessing value for money means looking at both cost and quality. The Audit Commission's basic criterion for assessing value for money is that 'overall costs and unit costs for key services are not significantly higher than other councils providing similar levels and standards of services, allowing for the local context.'

There are three types of value for money measures: economy, effectiveness and efficiency measures. Economy measures focus on issues of affordability – what it costs. They are broad measures of unit cost, for example cost per head of population. Effectiveness measures focus on outcomes (the impact and the volume of service provided and the satisfaction with it) and efficiency measures focus on issues of productivity (how much is produced for what is put in). All three types of measure can be used together with

information on customer satisfaction. Value for money is achieved when the optimum balance between economy, efficiency and effectiveness (relatively low costs, high productivity and successful outcomes) is achieved. When organisations compare their cost performance with others and track them over time they also support strategies for improving value for money.

The following table sets out suggested cost measures for support planning and brokerage. These include all three types of value for money measures. To maximise their usefulness we suggest that councils collect this information regularly, and not less than annually. Councils could include all or some of the measures in service level agreements where support planning and brokerage is carried out in-house and in contracts where it is commissioned externally. The method of calculation of each measure is set out in Appendix 2.

Table 1:
Activity and cost measures for support planning and brokerage services

Local performance measure	What is measured and rationale for collection
Economy Measures	
PM1 Service expenditure per head of population	This measure is a calculation of the cost of the service per head of the population of the council area. It is a commonly used measure of affordability. It provides a way of comparing the cost of a service between councils at a point in time and of changes in the cost burden for a council when collected over time.
PM2 Service expenditure per person	This measure is a calculation of the average cost of the service per person. It does not take account of user group or differences in the amount of service received by a user group. It provides a measure of the affordability of the service as a whole.
PM3 Cost per support hour	This measure is a calculation of the average cost of an hour of support for a person. It provides a measure of the service efficiency in delivering hours.
PM4 Cost of support hour by type of provider	This measure is a calculation of the average cost of an hour of support to people by type of provider. Three provider types are suggested – in-house; voluntary organisation; private.
PM5 Service cost per support plan completed	This measure is a calculation of the average cost of establishing a support plan. This is the outcome sought of the service.
Effectiveness Measures	
PM6 Support hrs per support plan completed	This measure is a calculation of the average hours required to establish a support plan.
PM7 Support hrs per support plan completed by user group	This measure is a calculation of the average hours required to establish a support plan for a user group.

Local performance measure	What is measured and rationale for collection
PM8 Support hrs per support plan completed by type of provider	This measure is a calculation of the average support hours input by different providers to establish a support plan. It can help compare performance of different providers.
Efficiency Measures	
PM9 Ratio of FTE supporters to individuals	This measure is a calculation of the number of people supported by a FTE supporter. It focuses on the productivity of a service.
PM10 Ratio of FTE supporters to individuals by user group	This measure is a calculation of the number of people supported by a FTE supporter. It focuses on the productivity of support per person by user group.
PM11 Ratio of FTE supporters to support plans completed by user group	This measure is a calculation of the number of support plans completed per FTE supporter by user group. It is an aid to assessing the productivity of support provided for each user group.

This set of measures is weighted towards the issues of economy. This is appropriate given the emerging nature of the service and the need to ensure that resources are not unnecessarily deployed on a support service at the expense of front line service delivery. Overall, there is a good balance between economy, effectiveness and efficiency measures. Taken together they will help managers and decision makers understand the value for money of the service.

Understanding support planning & brokerage performance

Understanding the meaning of the local performance measures produced requires some interpretation and a wider understanding of the council profile. This includes the issues which may drive support planning and brokerage costs locally. Four issues relevant to self-directed support were highlighted by participants from contributing councils. Understanding them will throw light on the reason for particular cost levels as well as help to inform action.

A person's circumstances – The councils who contributed to this guide considered this to be the most significant factor affecting the costs of support planning and brokerage. People's circumstances cover issues such as transition from a residential to a community setting, the availability of family and informal support networks, and major changes in a person's life such as bereavement or transition to adulthood.

Choice of support planning and broker providers – The lack of a choice of providers of support planning and brokerage services was seen as a significant factor affecting costs. Nearly as many participants rated this issue as a significant cost driver as a person's circumstances. Choice of provider included the availability of voluntary and other third sector providers as well as council and private providers.

The person's capacity for planning – The most frequently cited capacity issue was communications particularly the communication support required for some people with learning difficulties and some people with physical and sensory impairments.

Availability of local user support groups – This includes the availability of generic support and community groups as well as user group specific support groups.

More generally in interpreting cost measures and particularly in making comparison between councils, **the geography, demography and economy of the area** need to be taken into account. These issues include the population and ethnicity profile of the area, transport infrastructure, population density and competition for staff.

Next steps

Given the emerging nature of self-directed support it is expected that approaches to it will develop over time. Cost and outcome measures including those described in this guide will also need to develop further, as councils begin to use these approaches in practice.

Appendix 1

Contributing Councils

London Borough of Barking & Dagenham

Bath & North East Somerset Council

Coventry City Council

Norfolk County Council

Somerset County Council

West Sussex County Council

Appendix 2

Local performance measures

Description	Calculation	Unit of Measure
PM1 Service expenditure per head of population	Total service cost ÷ council Population	£ per head of pop
PM2 Service expenditure per person	Total service cost ÷ total Number of people served	£ per individual
PM3 Cost per support hour	Total service cost ÷ total support hours	£ per hour support
PM4 Cost of Support Hour by type of provider*	As PM3 calculated for each provider	£ per hour support
PM5 Service Cost per support plans completed	Total service cost ÷ total support plans completed	£ per Plan completed
PM6 Support Hrs per support plans completed	Total support hours ÷ total support plans completed	Hrs per self-directed support plan completed
PM7 Support Hrs per support plans completed, by user group	Total support hours per user group ÷ support plans completed, by user group	Hrs per self-directed support plan completed per user group
PM8 Support Hrs per support plan completed, by type of provider*	Total support hours per provider ÷ total support plan completed, by provider	Hrs per self-directed support plan completed by provider
PM9 Ratio of FTE Supporters to people served	Total people served ÷ (support Hours ÷ 1 FTE year)	1 FTE : X plans
PM10 Ratio of FTE Supporters to people served by user group	(Support hours per user group ÷ 1 FTE year)	1FTE : X clients
PM11 Ratio of FTE Supporters to support plans completed, by user group	Support plans completed per user group ÷ (support hours per user group ÷ 1 FTE year)	1FTE : X people by user group

+ This calculation is based on an assessed number of Support Hours per FTE year as follows: (52wks x 5 days p/wk) – Bank Holidays – Annual Leave) x Hours per day = 1 FTE year

* 3 provider types are suggested – In-house; Voluntary Organisation; Commercial. The PSSEX1 where it currently collects information on providers uses only 2 categories – ‘own provision’ and ‘provision by others’. The suggestion here provides more information and is not incompatible with the PSSEX1.

Appendix 3

Support Planning & Brokerage Service – Customer Feedback

Please tell us which of our services you used by ticking ✓ the relevant boxes below:

- Support to organise my planning
- Support to create my plan
- Support to choose and set up the administration of my budget
- Support to purchase and organise my support

We would like to know what you think of these services. You can tell us by ticking (✓) ONE of the following.

- The service enabled me to plan and/or purchase support for myself.
- The service supported me with assistance to plan and/or purchase support.
- The service carried this planning and/or brokerage on my behalf
- The service did not help me plan and/or purchase support.

We would also like to know if you would use our services again.

Please tick (✓)

- Yes or No

Finally, we would like to know if you would prefer different types of support. If you would please tell us in the space below what you would have preferred.

I would have preferred _____
