



# **Social Care & Health Quality Framework    Quality Ratings Guidance**

**(Care Homes With and Without Nursing)**

**April 2018**



# 1. Introduction

## **2. Quality Framework Principles**

### **2.1. Principles**

The framework is underpinned by a set of overarching principles:

- The delivery of outcomes for service users and citizens are at the forefront of care delivery.
- Care providers are responsible for ensuring they deliver good quality care.
- The Council has a duty to provide assurance of and to drive up the overall quality of care in the city.
- The Council aspires only to do business with good quality providers. It does not intend to contract with those providers that are unable to sustain consistently good quality services.
- The Council will provide a range of support to providers to improve services but not indefinitely.
- The Council will incentivise high quality provision.
- The Council will measure the overall quality of provision by taking into account a range of opinions to provide a balanced view.
- Quality will be measured against contractual terms and conditions, core standards and the delivery of outcomes.
- The quality assurance framework mechanism and how it operates is transparent and clear.

#### **2.1.1. Outcomes**

The Quality Assurance framework is focussed on the delivery of outcomes to both citizens and commissioners of care and support. In order to ensure that the framework is consistent with the key priorities of national and local government, it has been aligned to the 4 outcome domains detailed within the Department of Health's Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework ( e

### **2.1.3. Taking a balanced view**

The Quality Assurance Framework aims to capture a range of views on the quality of services and use them to produce a single quality rating that can be used to inform care commissioning processes and facilitate service users and citizens to make informed choices. The rating system will therefore draw upon a balanced range of data sources:



The table below sets out how the outcomes of the 3 quality monitoring regimes align.

<b>Overall Quality rating</b>	<b>CQC inspection outcome</b>	<b>Council audit outcome</b>	<b>NHS audit outcome</b>
Gold	Outstanding	Gold	Bright Green (best achievement)
Silver	Good	Silver	Green (compliance)
Bronze	Requires Improvement	Bronze	Amber (partial compliance)
Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate	Red (minimal compliance)

### **3.2. Annual Quality Assurance Visit**

The most recent visit carried out by either the Council, the CQC or the NHS shall determine the provider's quality rating. For example, a visit carried out by the CQC in August 2017 will be superseded by a visit carried out by the Council in June 2018.

#### **3.2.1. CQC Inspection**

The CQC shall use its outcomes framework to rate the quality of service. Full details of this are available on the CQC's website.

#### **3.2.2.**

#### **Visit**

*Exceptional (Gold)*. The full list of criteria and their rating scope can be found in **Appendix 1 – Criteria and example evidence requirements**.

The rating applied shall be based upon the evidence seen on by the officer carrying out the quality assurance visit. The evidence considered shall be comprised of documentation, observation and feedback from discussions with services users and employees. Examples of the types of evidence needed to demonstrate achievement against the criteria can be found in **Appendix 1 - Criteria and example evidence requirements**.

The tables below describe how the score for each of the criteria is combined to provide rating for each of the 5 domains.

## **Involvement and Information**



<b>Suitability of staffing</b>	
Total standards	3
Total criteria	19
Mandatory criteria	4
Advanced criteria	5
<b>Gold</b>	<b>Silver</b> <b>Bronze</b> <b>Inadequate</b>

At least 4 of the 5 advanced criteria are rated *Exceptional* and

Further details of the JQAF audit, including how provision will be managed when it is judged to be non-compliant, can be found in **Appendix 3 - Joint Quality Assurance Framework**.

### **3.3. Provider Quality Assurance Statement (PQAS)**

The PQAS is the means for providers to present to the Council their formal evaluation of the quality of their service. In advance of the annual monitoring visit the Council shall request the provider to complete and submit their PQAS. The information submitted in the PQAS will be evaluated by the Council officer in advance of them undertaking the monitoring visit of the respective service. As such, a key part of the monitoring process will be the verification of the PQAS evidence submitted by the provider.

The PQAS will mirror the tool that the Council's officers use when undertaking a monitoring visit. The care home PQAS lists the 92 criteria by which the provider will be required to assess their service

The provider will determine if they have *Fully* achieved (Silver), *Partly* achieved (Bronze), or *Not* achieved (*Inadequate*) against each of the 92 criteria. The provider shall also be able to determine an additional level of achievement against Advanced criteria – *Exceptional* (Gold rating).

The scores applied to each of the criteria shall be combined in the same way as the Council's monitoring visit process to produce an overall rating. The provider will submit its PQAS to the Council within the timescale requested.

#### **3.3.1. Late submissions and failures to submit the PQAS**

Failure to submit the PQAS within the timescales requested will result in an Inadequate rating. As a result, the provider will become subject to the process for managing provision judged to be 'Inadequate'.

Consistent failure to submit the PQAS within the timescales requested will result in an 'Inadequate' rating being awarded and may result in action being taken to terminate the contracting arrangement.

#### **3.3.2. Misreporting, over-reporting and falsification of data submitted in the PQAS**

It is assumed that data submitted in the PQAS is an evidence-based, honest and true statement of service delivery by the provider.

If the Council is unable to validate a significant body of evidence or the provider is judged to have significantly falsified its PQAS submission then this will result in an 'Inadequate' rating being awarded and the provider will become subject to the process for managing provision judged to be Inadequate.

If the Council is unable to validate a significant body of evidence or the provider is judged to have significantly falsified its PQAS submission on more than one occasion, the Council may take action to terminate the contracting arrangement.

### **3.4. Customer Feedback**

Customer feedback shall be assessed in 3 ways and incorporated into the overall rating of the provider.

#### **3.4.1. Customer feedback data gathered through the social work review**

During social work reviews social workers shall ask service users and/or their representative(s) to decide whether they feel the service is delivering the outcomes identified within their support plan, and also whether they would recommend the service to a friend or family member if they needed similar care and support





The Council shall also use the provider's quality rating in the supplier selection process. During this process where there are multiple offers the care package shall be awarded to the provider with the highest quality rating. Where more than one provider has the same rating, the citizen will be invited to choose their preferred offer. Where the citizen does not or cannot exercise choice then the Council will use customer feedback to determine the successful offer.