

Harrow Social Care Contracts Risk Matrix		
Provider name		
Contract Number		
Service Name		
Level of risk scored Low 1, Medium 2, High 3,		
Type of service	Low	Low = Supported housing, Day Care, with no personal care support, medium = supported housing, day care, residential with personal care support, High = nursing, specialist residential & supported housing, about 30 beds
Previous CQC Inspection / Rating	High	Low = demonstration of continuous improvement and compliant in all areas, Medium = previous history of non compliance or no improvement / and or non compliant in 1 area, warning notice served, High = history of non compliance in previous CQC inspections, non compliant in 2 or more areas in most recent report, enforcement action taken
Level of engagement with Contracts Team	Medium	Low= provider regularly updates team, attends provider forum, complies with requests for information, Medium= provider engages on occasions, periodic attendances at provider forum, occasionally supplies information, High.= Rarely / never updates team, never attends provider forum, does not compile with information requests.
Service user group / number of Harrow funded service users	High	Low =mostly statutory service users, provider admits / supports appropriate service group, service users move on either to supported living or high support services as identified, medium = mostly statutory service users, mostly admits service users it is able to meet the needs of, some evidence that service users are supported to move on when support needs change / increase, although this may not be as quickly as it should be, .High = provider history of admitting service users it does not have the skills to support appropriately, provider holds onto service users who support needs have changed/ increased, complex / concerns re compatibility of service users, range of needs within the service e.g., dementia, challenging behaviour, few if any statutory funded service users, mostly self funders, limited family involvement, high needs, (dementia, challenging behaviour, PMLD, MH, high risk service users)
viability of Provider	Low	Low = large provider with contingency cover ; other services in local area for same provider Medium = medium sized provider, other services for same provider within WLA, ; High = small provider = x staff & services, no other services, owner / manager
SGA meetings / concerns	Medium	Low = no incidents, or incidents managed / reported appropriately, staff are all trained, able to use SGA policy (Medium = up to 3 SGAs in a 12 month period and provider dealt with issues quickly and effectively & notified all required parties, evidence of staff training re SGA's, High =1 major incident, instutional SGA, More than 3 SGA's in a 12 month period and / or provider does not deal with incidents quickly and effectively, provider does not recognise incidents as SGA's or notify required parties, little of evidence of training or use of SGA policy (Where no SGA reports occurring please confirm with Provider at meeting that relevant Safeguarding procedures are in place and are being rolled out across service / organisation),
Complaints Management	High	Low = low levels complaints both in term of areas of complaint & volume, evidence provider welcomes /actions complaints, notifies local authority on a monthly basis, Medium, some evidence that provider actions complaints, some evidence of learning from complaints, provider generally notifies council as required, High = high volume of complaints for size of service, same areas of concerns, little / no evidence provider learns / improves quality of service, provider does not notify council of complaints, complaints come directly to the council via members, complaints team, care managers or other parties.
Business Continuity	Medium	Low = Service has a robust , regular updated BC plan in place, which they have shared with the local authority, service has access to suitable resources, (part of larger organisation, proactive smaller provider) Medium = Service has some understanding around BC, but service is at risk due to lack of engagement, BC plan requires work from the provider as to what it would do to secure BC in the event of a major issue, High = Service / organisation, no understanding re need for BC, concern re lack of awareness of what to do in the event of BC incident, provider is a small service, no other input, owner / manager.
Number of untoward incidents /CQC notifications	Medium	Low = none / low level of incidents recorded, all notifications notified to council within expected time frame (Medium = 2/3 untoward incidents in a 12 month period and provider dealt with incident/ reason for notification quickly and effectively, expected notifications due to level of needs within service, High = 1 major notification, major SGA, more than 4 untoward incidents in a 12 month period and / or provider does not deal with incidents quickly and effectively, notifications unexpected / above what would be expected for level of need. (high notifications levels for deaths, falls, medication errors, pressure sores, unexplained bruising) (please confirm with Provider at meeting that relevant procedures are in place and are being rolled out across service / organisation, this will be relevant to size of service / provider)
Use of QA to improve service delivery	Low	Low = provider undertakes regular & meaningful QA work / questionnaires with service users, families & professionals, Medium = providers undertakes some QA work, but is not always able to demonstrate service improvement following QA work, High = Provider does not undertake or understand the importance of QA work, to improve service improvements, little / no evidence that provider has skills, ability to improve standards.
Progress against action plans from previous contract monitoring and CQC	Medium	Low = small number of action points from last visit, met action plan points within timescale set, Medium = some action plan points met within timescale however some still outstanding, High = no response to monitoring report, no action plan points met within timescale set, provider not accepting areas of concerns raised by team or others. (For provider not previously monitored score medium)
Compliance against Contract & Specification	Low	Low = Provider requires no assistance to carry out contractual obligations as set out in the contract and specification, Medium = Provider requires some assistance to carry out contractual obligations as set out in the contract and specification, High = Provider unable or unwilling to met its contractual obligations against the contract and specification, Provider continually requires assistance to meet contractual obligations in the contract & specifications, Provider has been subject to default / embargo / suspension of placements
Staffing issues recruitment, retention, sickness, staff conduct, use of agency staff	High	Low = no concerns re level of staff turnover/sickness/little or no use of agency staff including senior / nursing, low levels of staff misconduct, any issues dealt with appropriately, good management / oversight of the service, Medium = occasionally issues re turnover / sickness/ level of agency staff used, including senior & nursing staff, low levels of staff misconduct, any issues, managed appropriately, oversight / management may not always be effective High = high turnover, sickness / use of agency staff, regular issues of staff misconduct within the service, poor management & oversight of the service
Staffing issues Supervision, training, team meetings,	High	low= All staff have regular, meaningful supervision, written records on file, evidence of regular team meetings staff receive regular training both mandatory and specialist in order to meet service users needs including night, junior staff, medium = most staff have regular supervision, some staff meetings (may not included night staff, some training undertaken, but needs to establish more specialist training, there may be a gap in knowledge e.g. dementia, High= little evidence of supervision across the staff team, limited staff meetings, limited or poor quality training both mandatory and specialist, provider places little value on training, or all training provided in house by manager/owner
Annual Contract Value (Service / Provider)	Medium	Low = value of up to £70k, Medium = value between £70k and £1200k, High = value greater than 120k. These levels do not have any bearing on quality as many high quality services are still high value and therefore high risk
Funding Financial Concerns	Low	Low = prices are realistic as evidenced re APC or use of CFC, Medium = some fees above CFC range or APC due to specialist needs of service users & provider is able to provide evidence to support higher fees, High = Little engagement re fees, especially when funding stream changes (e.g. self funders coming under local authority funding criteria), refuses to use CFC, APC, does not provide evidence to justify fees charged, approaches families for top ups etc
Financial concerns re service/ Provider, recent change of owner	Low	low = Low turnover of service users, beds filled on a regular basis, popular with service users, families & professionals, medium = turnover on a regular basis, partly due to needs of service user group, service is able to fill voids beds in a acceptable period of time, voids have limited impact on financial sustainability on the provider (part of larger group), recent change of owners, notified to council, DON in place High = high turn over of service users, not linked to needs of service, long term voids, difficulty in filling beds due to quality of service, building standards, small provider / or larger provider with a large number of voids beds across provision, voids place the service in financial difficulties, recent change of owner, Council not informed prior to event, DON not signed
Service criticality	Medium	Impact of service closure, low impact / medium impact / high impact defined at local or sub-regional level - must be evidenced. Examples = high risk client group / large number of units / makes up a large part of provision in local or sub region area / only service of it's kind in Borough
WLA accredited provider		
Total		Date
OVERALL RISK IS LOW - 0 visit per year	18-26 Low	C Officer
OVERALL RISK IS MEDIUM - 1 visits per year	27-42 medium	C Manager sign off
OVERALL RISK IS HIGH - 2 + visits per year	43+ High	
Services risk assessed at High end of medium or High, monitoring visit to be undertaken by two staff		