Audit Commission Value for Money profiles

Introduction

The purpose of the following sections is to analyse the AC profiles. The results are then summarised for each primary service areas in terms of cost and performance and a VFM self-assessment with an overall conclusion on VFM cost and performance.

The profiles that have been included below are all unitary comparison as the sample sizes (45 councils) allow us to draw valid comparisons for all the AC profiles for cost and performance.

Neighbourhood – General Fund

Service	Cost direction of travel & overall cost assessment (NB If relative costs are reduced cost DoT shows increase)	Performance direction of travel & overall performance assessment	VFM self assessment
Adult Social Care	↑ (AC profiles superceded as CSCI Group 3 comparator shows very low cost)	↔	
Housing GF	↓ NB third quartile cost is still relatively low	↑	

Key

> ➢ Direction of travel arrow: if performance is improved over 2004/05 arrow points up, if cost ranking is reduced over 2004/05 then arrow points up (i.e. moved to lower relative cost)

The Audit Commission profiles look at 19 areas that fall within the Neighbourhood Directorate. Below these indicators are listed by category, with further information given for the two indicator area of possible concern.

Top Quartile (based on cost):

- Social Care - £ per head– rank out of 100
- Older people - £ per head 65+ – rank out of 100
- Physical disability - £ per head 18-64 – rank out of 100
- Mental health - £ per head 18-64 – rank out of 100
- Older people - Gross cost per hour of home care compared to the number of hours of home care that councils purchase or provide
- Older people - The number of residents that councils support in residential/ nursing care compared to the gross cost per week of accommodation.

- Adults with a learning disability - Balance of service between residential and home care
- Adults with a physical disability - Balance of service between residential and home care
- Adults with mental health problems - Balance of service between residential and home care
- Community Housing – Supporting People - £spend per head

Satisfactory (based on cost):

- Learning Disability - £ per head 18-64 – rank out of 100
- Other SSD - £ per head – rank out of 100
- Other social services – Social services strategy - £ per head – rank out of 100
- Other social services – Supported employment – £ per head – rank out of 100
- Other social services – £ per head – rank out of 100
- Housing –General Fund - Community Housing total spend - £spend per head
- Community Housing – Discretionary rent rebates and rent allowances - £spend per head

Bottom Quartile (based on cost):

Service Area	Comparator	Commentary
Community Housing - Homelessness	£spend per head	Performance in Milton Keynes on homelessness has improved dramatically in the last three years. Numbers of households in temporary accommodation also continues to fall. The number is inflated by clients placed in MKC properties. As a result of a change of policy we have been able to offer many of these households permanent secure tenancies. We have already provided secure accommodation for a significant number of households as a consequence. The use of a prevention agenda and better use of housing options, including the use of the private rented sector, has significantly reduced the number of households in temporary

Service Area	Comparator	Commentary
		accommodation. Performance on B&B usage and hostel usage have improved. Prevention and options work has also lead to a significant fall in the number of people who have been accepted as homeless; from 913 in 2003/4 to 366 in 2005/6; a reduction of nearly 600 These achievements have been formally recognised by the Homelessness Directorate who in July 2006 awarded MKC regional centre of excellence in tackling homelessness.
Community Housing – other Housing	£spend per head	Currently investigating the level of spend taken into account for this indicator. Affordable housing - Net annual completion figures for new homes in 2005/06 was 1,795. Of these 739 were affordable homes. This represents 40% of the total, substantially exceeding the target of 30%.