Finance - Summary

For each contributing organisation, please list any spending on BCF schemes in 2014/15 and the minimum and actual contributions to the Better Care Fund pooled budget in 2015/16.

| Organisation | Holds the pooled budget? (Y/N) | Spending on BCF schemes in 14/15 | Minimum contribution (15/16) | Actual contribution (15/16) |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Local Authority #1 | PCC | 661 | 11,643 | 11,643 |
| CCG #1 | | | | |
| CCG #2 | | | | |
| Local Authority #2 | | | | |
| etc | | | | |
| BCF Total | | | | |

Including capital

Approximately 25% of the BCF is paid for improving outcomes. If the planned improvements are not achieved, some of this funding may need to be used to alleviate the pressure on other services. Please outline your plan for maintaining services if planned improvements are not achieved.

The full implementation of schemes wil take place in 2015-16. It is anticipated that through the remainder of 2013-14 and 2014-15 schemes will be developed into full business cases so that planned improvements will be substantiated. Robust programme management is being put in place to ensure this is achieved. As part of the planning process, contingency arrangements will developed to cover the possibility and these will be outlined more specifically in the April submission.

| Contingency plan: | | 2015/16 | Ongoing |
|-------------------|---|---|---------|
| | Planned savings (if targets fully achieved) | To be completed for the April submission - see comment above. | |
| Outcome 1 | Maximum support needed for other services (if targets not achieved) | To be completed for the April submission - | |
| | Planned savings (if targets fully achieved) | To be completed for the April submission - | |
| Outcome 2 | Maximum support needed for other services (if targets not achieved) | To be completed for the April submission - | |

DRAFT

| BCF Investment | Lead provider | | 2014/15 spend | | 2014/15 benefits | | | 2015/16 spend | | 2015/16 benefits | |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | Recurrent | Non-recurrent | Recurrent | Non-recurrent | | Recurrent | Non-recurrent | Recurrent | Non-recurrent |
| Scheme 1 - Protecting Social Care | PCC | | | | | | | 3405 | | 1700 | |
| Scheme 2 - Enhanced Reablement Service | | | | | | | | 4427 | | 4427 | |
| Scheme 3 - Enhanced Psychiatric Liaison and | | | | | | | | 633 | | 475 | |
| Community Support | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scheme 4 - Prevention and Community | | | | | | | | 1264 | | 1264 | |
| Interventions | | | | | | | L | | | | |
| 2014-15 Schemes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BCF Programme Manager | PCC | | 100 | | 0 | | | 100 | | 0 | |
| BCF Programme Support | PCC | | 61 | | 0 | | | 61 | | 0 | |
| Assistive Technology | PCC | | 150 | | 75 | | | 150 | | 250 | |
| Rehabilitation / Reablement (Friary Court) | CCG | | 100 | | 50 | | | 100 | | 100 | |
| Falls Prevention | CCG | | 100 | | 50 | | | 100 | | 100 | |
| Reablement | PCC | | 150 | | 200 | | | 150 | | 250 | |
| Capital schemes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DFG capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Adults | PCC | | | | | | | 661 | | 661 | |
| - Children Services | PCC | | | | | | | 150 | | 0 | |
| Capital Grant - various schemes | PCC | | | | | | | 442 | | 0 | |
| Total | | | 661 | | 375 | | | 11643 | | 9227 | _ |

10390 If excluding capital

Notes

- 1. Benefits figures are rough indicative figures only and will be revised for the April submission, when more work on business cases for each scheme has been done.
- 2. Benefits on capital are not assumed for 2015-16, since there will be a time lag from use of capital to delivery of benefit.

9

Outcomes and metrics

For each metric other than patient experience, please provide details of the expected outcomes and benefits of the scheme and how these will be measured.

Permanent admissions of older people into residential care. Peterborough has very low rates of supported admissions. During 2012-13 150 people were supported into permanent residential care - 498.5 per 100,00 of the population, just over half the rate in Cambridgeshire (818.9 per 100,000). Although the evidence shows that Peterborough has successfully minimised avoidable admissions to care homes, there is evidence of capacity issues within the system, particularly in relation to specialist dementia care and nursing care. It is projected that the trend of decline in admissions will not continue in future years – but a stable level of admissions is the goal. The care bill will bring an increase in numbers supported with the introuduction of higher capital thresholds and a cap on self- funders contributions

Proportion of older people (65 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement / rehabilitation services - Reablement packages have been provided by PCC for the last three years, with intermediate care and hospital at home having been in place longer. Currently the 91 day outcome measure is only collected for the intermediate care service and this has shown an increase in people receiving the service but a deterioration in independence outcomes. The BCF proposal is to develop and enhance the reablment service and to build in a measure of the outcome at 91 days for this service also. The target is to have a greater percentage of people receiving reablment services following a stay in hospital but also to avoid hospital admissions and an increase in the percentage still living at home after 91 days.

Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 population (average per month) - Peterborough has a very low rate of delayed transfers of care for social care reasons for 2012/13 there were 0.6 per 100,000 all of which were from non acute mental health beds, we were ranked 8th nationally. All reason delays are higher Published figures for 2012/13 indicate that 6.8 per 100,000 adults aged 18+ living in Peterborough had delayed transfer of care — an average of 10 every week. Comparison to other geographies indicate lower rates of delayed transfers relative to the rest of the country, the region, UA which were 9.4, 10.5 and 9.1 per 100,000 respectively, Peterborough ranks 53/150. Proposals within the BCF to align front door land reablement pathways should help to reduce all reason delays whilst maintaining minimal social care delays.

Avoidable emergency admissions (composite measure) - per 100,000 population - Emergency admissions rates can be reduced by effective collaboration across the health and care

system. A key factor for Peterborough will be the current procurement of community health services, and the new older peoples outcomes framework. We are also proposing to increase quality monitoring and professional support into care homes with a view to reducing the number of admissions from care provision. In 2012/13 out of 151 PCTs in England, where the top anking (1st) performed best with lowest emergency bed days and admissions, Peterborough Peterborough ranked:

- ranking (1st) performed best with lowest emergency bed adays and admissions, Peterborough Peterborough Tanked:

 1 of 108th / 151 for mean length of stay for emergency inpatient admissions (5.1 days compared to 4.8 nationally) and SHA);

 1 of 151 for mean length of stay for long term conditions per 1000 (425.2 per 1000 population compared to 458 per 1000 nationally);

 2 of 151 for the average rate of occupied bed days by patients admitted as emergencies per 1000 population +. For ambulatory care conditions, standardised admission rates per 1,000 population and declined over the last five years from 18.2 to 15.2 per 1000 between 2008/9 and 2012/13: comparisons to the rates for England, the regional SHA, and its peers indicate admissions remained consistently higher in Peterborough over the same period.

For the patient experience metric, either existing or newly developed local metrics or a national metric (currently under development) can be used for October 2015 payment. Please see the technical guidance for further detail. If you are using a local metric please provide details of the expected outcomes and benefits and how these will be measured, and include the relevant details in the table below.

We propose to use the national metric currently under development. In 2012/13, 64.2% of adult social care clients' were satisfied with the care and support they received from the PCC. which is similar to the satisfaction levels across the country. It is slightly but not significantly above satisfaction rates measured for the region.

The first carers' survey was carried out in 2012/13, and the findings indicate that 42.2% of carers' were satisfied with the level of social services, similar to that at national level (42.7%), and slightly above that for the region (40%).

For each metric, please provide details of the assurance process underpinning the agreement of the performance plans

The work programmes aligned to BCF are under development as part of he finalisation of the programmes targets will be set for the programmes, aligned to the BCF metrics

If planning is being undertaken at multiple HWB level please include details of which HWBs this covers and submit a separate version of the metric template both for each HWB and for the

his template provides the detail for the Peterborough HWB.

| Metrics | | Current Baseline (as at) | Performance underpinning April 2015 payment | Performance underpinning October 2015 payment |
|--|--------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Permanent admissions of older people (aged 65 and over) to residential and | Metric Value | (as at) 498.50 | April 2015 payment | October 2013 payment |
| nursing care homes, per 100,000 population | Numerator | 125 | | |
| g, p, p | Denominator | 25075 | N/A | |
| | Benominator | (April 2012 - March 2013) | | (April 2014 - March 2015) |
| Proportion of older people (65 and over) who were still at home 91 days | Metric Value | 78.6% | | (April 2014 - Waren 2013) |
| after discharge from hospital into reablement / rehabilitation services | Numerator | 158 | | |
| · · | Denominator | 201 | N/A | |
| | Donominator | (April 2012 - March 2013) | | (April 2014 - March 2015) |
| Delayed transfers of care from hospital per 100,000 population (average per | Metric Value | 6.80% | | (April 2014 Water 2015) |
| month) | Numerator | 10 | | |
| | Denominator | 140.415 | | |
| | | (April 2012-March 2013) | (April - December 2014) | (January - June 2015) |
| Avoidable emergency admissions (composite measure) - per 100,000 | Metric Value | 2198.3 | , | , |
| population | Numerator | 4097 | | N/A |
| | Denominator | 186372 | | 1 |
| | | (April 2012 - March 2013) | (April - September 2014) | (October 2014 - March 2015) |
| Patient / service user experience ASCOF 3A Overall satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support | Metric Value | 64% | , | , |
| T. T | Numerator | 327 | | |
| | Denominator | 510 | | |
| | | ASCOF Provisional April 2012 - | (April - September 2014) | (October 2014 - March 2015) |
| | | March 2013 | | |
| [local measure - please give full description] | Metric Value | | | |
| | Numerator | | | |
| | Denominator | | | |
| | | (insert time period) | (insert time period) | (insert time period) |

This page is intentionally left blank