**ASC CLD Q&A Session 4- Answers**

*On behalf of the CLD team, we wanted to thank you for your time and input in the Review’s Q&A session. We have been working through the feedback and additional questions from this session.*

*Please see the questions and corresponding answers below:*

**Locally the question regarding Review Outcomes Achieved (fully met/partially met/not met) is not specifically asked review form and captured within freetext fields. The question asked in the majority of forms is regarding continued eligibility. In many cases the review outcome that is captured is to maintain or vary services. Can the answer be inferred from these options e.g. services maintained = fully met / service variation = partially met?**

‘Review Outcomes Achieved’ refer to personal outcomes that the adult wishes to achieve in day-to-day life. It is included as an overview of whether support services have enabled the client to achieve their stated outcomes. The answer should not be inferred from subsequent events such as whether services have been maintained or varied. We will clarify in the guidance that this field should be populated for planned reviews, and can be left blank for unplanned reviews.

The recording of outcomes will vary between LAs, as will the evaluation of whether those outcomes have been achieved. At the review stage, the adult or their representative and the assessor should identify and agree the extent to which their outcomes have been met. In the guidance, we have laid out how to distinguish between review outcomes being fully met, partially met or not met (Please see P.g. 39 in Release 1 for guidance on this).

Not all case management systems capture ‘Review Outcomes Achieved’ in an easily reportable format. It is an example of a mandatory field where not all LAs will be able to provide data from April 2023. Please notify AGEM if you anticipate that this will be the case.

**Are we only submitting new client Financial Assessments or should we be submitting the Financial Reviews, Financial Re-assessments?**

There are three types of individual financial assessment/review for new and existing clients that should be recorded as assessment events:

* new client Financial Assessment
* planned Financial Annual Review (statutory requirement)
* ad-Hoc Financial Re-assessment (when circumstances change i.e. client moves from Community to Residential)

Annual updates connected to uprating at the beginning of the financial year should not be included.

**How is a Re-assessment being defined? Is this not a review?**

A review event should be an examination of an existing care and support plan. This may be planned as a regular event or initiated by a change in circumstance.

Where it is found that there is a change of circumstance that affects a care and support plan, this may trigger a re-assessment of needs, carer’s assessment, short term assessment and/or financial assessment. These should be recorded as separate assessment events in addition to the review event.

Where a review and re-assessment is recorded on case management systems as a single combined event, this should be submitted as a review.

**Should carer reviews (SALT LTS 0003) and any reviews of short-term services (SALT STS 002) be counted, as well as reviews of long-term services (SALT LTS 002)?**

All reviews of client or carer needs should be recorded as review events in CLD. This covers people receiving long-term support (SALT LTS002), people receiving short-term services (STS002) and unpaid carers (LTS0003).

SALT reviews (LTS002b) are limited to reviews of those who are in receipt of long-term support or who are carers. Inclusion of other reviews in CLD will allow existing metrics to derived, as well as collecting additional new insight on LA ASC activity.

**In event outcomes, how should you record an increase/decrease in services? Does this simply go under the event outcome “progress to support planning / services”?**

**If the plan is to derive this information from services, it won’t always be possible as not all services are purchased after the review (retrospective purchasing for complex funding issues/self-funding pick-ups). Should all the current SALT outcomes around packages increasing such as move to nursing etc be mapped into the single outcome in CLD on support planning/services.**

For an increase/decrease in services:

* When it follows a review, use the ‘Progress to Support Planning/Services’ event outcome in the review/assessment event record.
* Where there is a change without a review, use the ‘Provision of Service’ event outcome in the preceding service event record.

Unlike SALT sequels, there is no specific event outcome in CLD to indicate an increase, decrease or change in services.

We are exploring ways of inferring service changes using event linkage and a range of fields such as service type and component and the service costs fields. Feedback from this session will be useful to inform this work, including situations where it won’t be possible to identify service changes.

**There is an outcome of NFA – deceased. Previously we have assumed that if a person dies before a review is ended then this is terminated before completion. Does this outcome now imply that partially completed reviews should be included?**

Review events should only be submitted if they are completed. Reviews that are terminated before completion should not be submitted.

NFA- deceased can be used following a completed event if no further action has been taken due to the client dying or if a service has ended due to a death of a client.

We will update the guidance to clarify this point.