## **APPENDIX 1:**

#### HOME CARE CONTRACTS DATA.

# **Contract usage**

1. Tables 1 and 2 show the usage of the contracts based on commissioned care packages from July 2012 to June 2013. The numbers are taken at month end for each month.

Table 1: Number of service users

Month	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June
MiHomecare	388	402	417	426	432	436	441	458	446	468	479	467
London Care	322	314	314	307	307	290	293	295	306	302	304	289
Total	710	716	731	733	739	726	734	753	752	770	783	756

Table 2: Number of hours of care commissioned

Month	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	Totals
MiHomecare	20,500	21,717	22,093	22,604	22,853	22,911	23,129	24,583	24,107	24,672	24,660	24,347	278,175
London Care	15,059	15,137	15,353	14,879	15,048	14,382	15,447	15,754	16,905	15,663	15,658	14,764	184,048
Total	35,559	36,854	37,446	37,483	37,901	37,292	38,476	40,337	41,012	40,334	40,318	39,111	462,223

#### **Service Quality alerts**

- 2. The council routinely collects day to day service delivery concerns, referred to as 'Service Quality Alerts', which are a good way to identify issues at an early stage way that can inform service improvement and ensure that the delivery of care is personalised to individual needs and wishes.
- 3. These are distinguished from formal safeguarding alerts and investigations, and can range from minor concerns to more substantial concerns. Minor concerns would include issues such as poor communication. More substantial concerns would include issues such as timeliness of care worker attendance, missed visits, or ensuring dignity and respect at all times.
- 4. In some instances more substantial concerns raised through the service quality alerts are also recorded and reported as formal Safeguarding investigations so may be counted in both.
- 5. Raising service quality alerts is encouraged by both the council and providers as a mechanism to inform and support continuous improvement. All alerts are logged and followed up by contract monitoring officers in conjunction with social workers and other relevant stakeholders.
- 6. For the period July 2012 to June 2013 there have been a total of 63 alerts received with 25 relating to London Care and 38 relating to MiHomecare (down from 102 in the first year). This equates to 13.6 service alerts per 100,000 care hours. The overall average of 13.6 alerts per 100,000 care hours when set against a total of 756 users at a June 2013 gives a figure of 0.02 alerts per user.

#### Safeguarding

7. Summary data in relation to safeguarding alerts for the main home care contracts is detailed below. This is where an allegation is received that someone is subject to abuse, which can be financial abuse, physical abuse, neglect etc. It may be an allegation related to a care worker or an allegation related to a third party or a family member.

- 8. From July 2012 to June 2013 there has been a total of 19 safeguarding alerts with 10 relating to London Care and 8 relating to MiHomecare. This equates to 4.1 safeguarding alerts per 100,000 care hours (down from 8 in the first year), which as a percentage of service users equates to less than 1% per hour for both providers when calculated as a percentage of hours delivered. The performance indicator for this is less than 1% so both providers are meeting this standard. Of the 18 safeguarding allegations received, 6 have been found to be unsubstantiated, 4 were not determined / inconclusive, 6 have been substantiated, and the remaining 2 have not yet had an outcome recorded.
- 9. All safeguarding and quality alerts are fully investigated and adult commissioning monitor any action points arising from these. Management also have oversight of these and meet regularly with both providers.

#### **Complaints and compliments**

- 10. Formal complaints regarding home care services can be received directly by the Council but are also received by the home care providers themselves. Generally but not exclusively in the first instance complaints would be raised with the provider for them to resolve and respond to and this is reflected in the complaints data reported under the contract.
- 11. During the period covered by this report there was one representation raised with the council's complaints team for MiHomecare. This was not actually a complaint although handled by the complaints team as the query sought to understand the process for quality alerts and the quality assurance / contract management processes. This was clarified and nothing further was received.
- 12. In addition to complaints received by the council, both providers actively encourage service users to use their complaints and compliments process so they can identify areas for improvement and understand what is working well for people. From July 2012 to June 2013 there has been a total of 39 complaints received directly by providers with 5 received by London Care and 34 received by MiHomecare (of these 11 have not been upheld and 2 are still outstanding). From July 2012 to June 2013 there has been a total of 42 compliments received directly by providers with 10 received by London Care and 32 received by MiHomecare.
- 13. Both providers are meeting the contract key performance indicator for complaints which is less than 1 upheld complaint per 10.000 hours delivered.

### **Regulatory Compliance**

- 14. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) undertakes regulatory inspections of registered services and inspect service delivery against a number of broad headings within which there are 28 outcome measures. Full details of the CQC Essential standards of quality and safety are available as a background document or at <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/documents/qac dec 2011 update.pdf">http://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/documents/qac dec 2011 update.pdf</a>
- 15. The following is a summary of the main headings under which the outcomes are grouped
  - Personalised Care, treatment and Support
  - Safeguarding and safety
  - Suitability of staffing
  - Quality and management
  - Suitability of management
- 16. The CQC makes an assessment against a selection of the outcome domains and report these as compliant, or having minor, moderate, or major concerns.
- 17. In November 2012 (report published January 2013) London Care Wandsworth were inspected and found to be compliant in all domains. This is the branch that provides care to Southwark clients, however it is noted that London Care have just opened a branch in Southwark and will be managing care for Southwark clients out of this branch from July 2013 therefore future CQC reports will be from this branch not the Wandsworth office.
- 18. In April 2013 (report published June 2013) MiHomecare Brockley were inspected and found to be compliant in all domains. This is the branch that provides care to Southwark clients.
- 19. Overall the assessment of contract delivery, performance and quality taking account of the key measures summarised in this report is that quality and performance indicators have been met over the period covered.