

# Performance Management Framework for Enhanced Public Health Programmes

## Purpose of this Report:

To provide a set of proposals for a complete performance management framework (PMF) for monitoring and managing the Enhanced Public Health Programmes (EPHP)

## Recommendations:

1. The PHPB agree the complete PMF proposal (see general proposal)
2. The PHPB agrees to discuss the new headline mandatory indicators with GOYH (see specific issues)
3. The PHPB agree that the mandatory indicators relating to NRF and Teenage Pregnancy will be monitored by the Successful Neighbourhoods and Children and Young People blocks so do not need to be incorporated within the Healthier Community block headline indicators (see specific issues)
5. The PHPB consider how to incorporate the Public Health Observatory work (see specific issues)
4. The PHPB agree to ask the Health Partnership Team and EPHP Working Group to produce proposals for directional indicators to be considered by the PHPB at the next meeting (see specific issues)

## Background:

Some elements of the PMF for the EPHP have already been developed, however it is currently incomplete, particularly around targets and actions for the PHPB to monitor and manage the EPHP's.

At the same time, the Government has recently released new LAA guidance with mandatory indicators and there is a strong drive to link action to impact. Locally, there needs to be a balance between being accountable and evidence-based in decision making and ensuring that the PMF does not create additional and time consuming bureaucracy for delivery individuals and agencies.

### Already agreed are:

- Governance roles and responsibilities
- Timescales
- Headline target indicators
- Use of basket of indicators to give a picture of health inequalities at a neighbourhoods level
- Three year overarching delivery plan
- Use of logical framework process to develop business cases

### Still required:

- Targets for monitoring and managing EPHP's
- Delivery actions for monitoring and managing EPHP's
- Clarity over roles and timescales below PHPB level

## General Proposal for the PMF:

The table in appendix one summarises a full set of indicator/activity monitoring tools to act as the PMF for the EPHP including:

- Identifying the level of accountability at which the tool is aimed at, e.g. SFHW, PHPB etc
- Clarifying the purpose of the tool
- Identifying who is responsible for collation and how it is collated

## Specific Issues:

1. MANDATORY HEADLINE INDICATORS: The new LAA guidance includes mandatory indicators according to 'spearhead' status and funding. For Sheffield there is a mandatory requirement to include:

*'Reduce health inequalities within the local area, by narrowing the gap in all-age, all-cause mortality'*

This is different to our current indicator in that it measure proportion per population and all ages instead of age of death. This requires further investigation with GOYH to find out if we have to change our headline indicator. Given that the refresh has already been agreed with our existing indicators we should be able to continue with the current approach.

2. NRF/TEENAGE PREGNANCY MANDATORY INDICATORS: In addition, as a recipient of NRF and Teenage Pregnancy funding we are also required to use:

*'Reduce premature mortality rates from heart disease and stroke and related diseases so that the absolute gap between the national rate and the rate for the district is reduced by x% by 2010 (x to be agreed as part of the contribution to the reduction in the gap between the Spearhead Group and the England average (national PSA target)'*

*'Reduce the gap in premature mortality rates between the most deprived 20% of wards/neighbourhoods and the least deprived 20% of wards/neighbourhoods with a particular*

These targets will be measured within the relevant other LAA blocks.

3. PHO FRAMEWORK: The Public Health Observatory's have an evolving role in supporting the government with the performance managing the LAA's. They have developed a framework set of indicators (see appendix two) at a local authority wide level which GO's will use to challenge local areas. The PHPB need to consider how they wish to incorporate this into the PMF.
4. DIRECTIONAL INDICATORS: There are currently no agreed targets to enable the PHPB to guide, monitor and manage the EPHP's. It is suggested that a small menu of 'directional' targets which can be monitored over the time period of the LAA are developed and that EPHP are asked to choose from this menu and identify how they will contribute. 'Directional Indicators' are indicators which measure impact which is known to have a longer term positive impact on life expectancy/mortality rates, e.g. giving up smoking, i.e. they show progress (or not) in the right direction within the lifetime of the LAA.

The PHPB is asked to note that this tool is for PHPB use only and that it should be a flexible tool which evolves as we learn from the experience of delivering the EPHP's.

It is suggested that the following criteria is used to identify the targets:

- o Fitting under the two headings of Choosing Healthy Lifestyles or Managing Major Conditions
- o Easily measurable
- o A mixture of inputs and output measures as appropriate
- o Covering priority public health topics, e.g. Smoking, Obesity, COPD, Diabetes, Mental Health
- o Should include investigating the potential of Quality Outcome Framework data

### Illustrative Example

Whole EPHP Priority Target Outcomes for EPHP		
Choosing Healthy Lifestyle	Managing Major Conditions	Root Cause
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reducing Smoking (x 4 Week Quitters)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Managing Diabetes (x No. of people going through management activities)</li> </ul>	Whole LAA work

Burngreave EPHP Contribution				
Outcomes	Targets			
	Sept 06	Mar 07	Sept 07	Mar 08
4 Wk Quitters	0	10	5	5
No. of people going through DB activities	0	0	2	5

## Appendix One: Performance Management Framework Tools for Enhanced Public Health Programmes

Tool	Level of Accountability	Purpose	Indicators	How	Who	When
<b>Headline Indicators</b> Target Outcomes	GOYH/SFAB/ SFHW/ PHPB/EPHPWG	Target Indicators to measure progress in achieving the overarching ambition of reducing health inequalities within the city	Currently: 1. Reducing the gap in life expectancy comparing 36 neighbourhoods against city average and bottom quintile against city average  2. Rate of Infant Mortality	Calculated by HIS	HIS	Annually – to be provided to PHPB in November and fed into end of year annual review process
<b>Basket of Indicators</b> General Outcomes	GOYH/SFAB/ SFHW/ PHPB/EPHPWG	To give a general picture of health inequalities in each of the target neighbourhoods in comparison with the city average	See basket of indicators tool for previously agreed full set of indicators	Calculated by HIS	HIS	Annually – to be provided to PHPB in November and fed into end of year (March) annual review process
<b>Healthier Communities Delivery Plan</b> Actions	GOYH/SFAB/ SFHW/ PHPB/EPHPWG	Set of agreed actions and milestones to monitor overarching Healthier Communities block progress	See three year plan for full set of agreed actions	Assessment against three year plan	Health Partnership Team	Bi-annually – to be provided in September and March
<b>EPHP Shared Directional Indicators</b> Target Outcomes	PHPB/EPHPWG	Set of target directional indicators, which show the impact of the activities being undertaken in each neighbourhoods to enable the PHPB to monitor and manage the EPHP's.	To be agreed	Dependent upon target.	Dependent upon target  EPHPWG and Health Partnership Team will collate and input into review process	Bi-annually – to be provided in September and March
<b>EPHP Action Plans</b> Actions	PHPB/EPHPWG	Set of agreed actions for each of the EPHP's to enable the PHPB to monitor and manage activity progress	To be agreed – compiled from business cases	Public health leads to feed into EPHPWG	EPHPWG and Health Partnership Team will collate and input into review process	Bi-annually – to be provided in September and March
<b>EPHP Log Framework</b> Target Outcomes/ Actions	PHPB/EPHPWG	Individual log frameworks for each of the EPHPB to use to monitor and manage progress at a neighbourhoods level	See individual log frameworks	Dependent upon individual neighbourhoods partnerships	Led by Public Health Leads	At least bi-annually to allow feeding into the review process

**Accountability Key:** Purple: GOYH/SFAB/SFHW level    Green: PHPB level    Blue: Neighbourhood Partnership level

## Appendix Two: Public Health Observatory Framework

Domain	ID	Indicator	Number	Ind. Value	Measure	Sheffield	Period	Notes
Our communities	1	Deprivation	184890	38.0	%		2001	1
	2	Air quality		0.3			2001	1
	3	Poor quality housing	39315	74.9	%		01/04/05	2, 9
	4	Children in poverty	25094	25.6	%		2001	1
	5	GCSE achievement (A*-C)	2671	46.6	%		2004-05	
	6	Violent crime	8159	15.8	CR1		2004-05	
	7	Older people supported at home	6953	83.3	CR2		31/03/05	3
Giving children and young people a healthy start	8	Smoking in pregnancy						4
	9	Breast feeding						4
	10	Obese children						4
	11	Physically active children						4
	12	Teenage pregnancy	1408	54.0	CR3		2001-03	
The way we live	13	People who smoke		28.2	%		2000-02	5
	14	Binge drinking		21.9	%		2000-02	5
	15	Healthy eating		19.2	%		2001-02	5
	16	Physically active adults						4
	17	Obese adults		22.4	%		2000-02	5
How long we live and what we die of	18a	Life expectancy-Male	7517	76.1	yr		2002-04	
	18b	Life expectancy-Female	8695	80.5	yr		2002-04	
	19	Deaths from smoking	2546	135.9	D&R1		2002-04	
	20	Deaths from heart disease and stroke	1593	98.0	D&R2		2002-04	
	21	Deaths from cancer	2027	127.8	D&R2		2002-04	
	22	Infant deaths	116	6.6	CR4		2002-04	
	23	Road injuries and deaths	140	11.2	CR5		2003-04	6
Health and ill health in our community	24	Feeling "in poor health"	5995	9.8	D&R3		2001	
	25	Mental health treatment	2870	52.8	%		2005	7
	26	Alcohol related hospital stays	3993	154.6	D&R4		1998-03	
	27	Drug misuse treatment	1663	733.6	CR6		2004-05	8
	28	People with diabetes	18011	3.3	%		2005	8
	29	Children's tooth decay		1.8	Teeth			9
	30	Sexually transmitted infections		82.0	CR7		2003	9

England Worst      England Average      England Best

+ Regional Average    — Cluster Range