Reviewing Social Services –
Guiding you through

Welsh Office
Y Swyddfa Gymreig

Social Services Inspectorate
Department of Health

Audit Commission
Promoting the best use of public money
Preface

We hope you will find this booklet a useful guide through a review of social services. It is intended primarily for those involved in the review process, especially local authority managers and councillors. It will also be of interest to politicians, auditors, inspectors, academics, and other public- and independent-sector bodies.

Reviews require considerable effort and resources from the authorities themselves, and this guide should make it easier for authorities to prepare for, project manage and benefit from a review. It sets out clearly the rationale behind the review programme, the structure of the review process, the questions asked and data required. It also describes the management of each review as a unique project with its own milestones and stages.

Aspects of reviews were piloted in ten authorities in England in 1995 and 1996 and a review methodology (Reviewing Social Services, Department of Health) was published in July 1996. The review methodology has evolved in the light of the experience of the first year of reviews, and this enabled us to publish a revised version (February 1998) which superceded both the July 1996 edition and the more detailed ringbinder that complemented it.

A programme of fifty reviews in three years was commissioned by the Department of Health in English authorities starting in August 1996.

In September 1998 the Welsh Office commissioned the Joint Review Team to undertake reviews in Wales; two in 1998/99 and four per year thereafter. This edition of Reviewing Social Services is an update of the February 1998 edition incorporating changes to the programme and review personnel. There are no changes to the methodology in this update.

We have divided the material into two parts: a guide and a pack of appendices that can be used as separate items.

This publication is a guide to the Joint Review process and rationale rather than the findings from actual reviews. Findings will be drawn together and interpreted in our Annual Report.

We hope that this document can be used not only as a guide to reviews but also as a tool for organisations to reflect on their own practice.

Finally we would like to thank our stakeholders, especially those authorities who have been reviewed, for helping Joint Reviews become established as a mechanism for improving social services and an important arbitrator for the development of best value in local authority services.

Andrew Webster, Project Director
October 1998
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Introducing Reviews

Why Social Services Matter
Social services are vital to the fabric of the communities in which we all live. Good social services enable people to live full, independent lives, be they families who need support, children who need protection, people with disabilities or in need of long-term care. Social services make an important contribution to enabling communities to prosper and care better for their fellow citizens.

Over the last 25 years society has increasingly seen the benefits of social services and invested in new services. The Children Act of 1989 brought new focus to helping and supporting families to promote children's welfare. The NHS and Community Care Act gave social services leadership in developing community care for frail or disabled people.

Who Runs Social Services?
One hundred and fifty local authorities in England and 22 in Wales are responsible for this 'fourth arm of the welfare state'. They are managing a growing and complex business on behalf of local citizens. Social services spend around £9bn of taxpayers' money, around three quarters of a million people work in social care. On average each local council responsible for social services devotes a fifth of its budget to them. Councils also regulate private businesses and voluntary organisations which run social care services. Each council determines its own priorities and spending within the framework of national legislation and guidance. To get the best deal for people who need social services, and for taxpayers who fund them, it is essential to have a better understanding of what works and how to deliver services that work efficiently.

Improving Social Services – A Joint Approach
The Social Services Inspectorates of the Department of Health and the Welsh Office report on the effectiveness of services, helping the Government to frame policy, local authorities to improve services and staff to follow best practice. The Audit Commission promotes the best use of public money by commissioning the district auditor to ensure that public money is properly spent and that good value is achieved. It helps authorities and auditors by studying how to achieve better value for money. Joint Reviews combine these approaches to look at the overall performance of each local social services authority. Reviews aim to improve social services by identifying and promoting policies, management and practice which are achieving better outcomes and better value. The Audit (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1996 established this joint approach, and the Department of Health, Welsh Office and the Audit Commission have agreed a rolling programme of reviews of all social services authorities in England and Wales. Reviews start from the experience of people who use social services, analyse the practice and management of the authorities delivering those services and assess whether they represent value for money. Their foundation is the understanding that local people will get a good deal from their social services only when authorities fit services to people rather than slot people into services; when councils can learn what works well now and reshape their services to meet needs better; when social services departments have clear standards and make sure they are met; and when every pound spent is directed at a specific purpose and costs are kept under constant scrutiny.

The Review Team is jointly managed by the Audit Commission and the Department of Health's Social Services Inspectorate in England, and the Audit Commission and the Welsh Office in Wales (the Management Protocol is set out in Appendix B).

Learning From Experience
The experience of the first 20 English reviews in the full programme has demonstrated that reviews can provide a clear reflection of an authority's strengths and weaknesses and deliver an agenda for improving performance. They could be more effective still with a closer focus on performance, more robust evidence on value for money and greater sensitivity to the very differing circumstances of different authorities. This is particularly true with respect to the balance between the council's role as a direct provider of services, and its role as a procurer of services run by other organisations. The aim is to maintain the foundations of reviews and to maintain consistency in the evidence base while building a more robust review framework for judgement and reporting.

This framework has evolved to reflect both the team's experience of the first year of reviews and comments from authorities who were involved in the process.
The Review Framework

Aims

The fundamental aims of reviews remain the same:

✦ to improve services for individuals
✦ to enable authorities to shape better services
✦ to promote better standards and improve the management of practice
✦ to secure better value for money

Principles

Reviews are guided by eight key principles:

✦ User focus – by making the primary focus of the review how well individuals are served by their authority, collecting evidence direct from users and carers, and by using this evidence to inform the management and stakeholder interviews
✦ Partnership – between the sponsoring organisations, with authorities individually and collectively, with users and carers and with people who work in social care
✦ Inclusion – of all stakeholders in social services by involving them in reviews and sharing the learning from reviews with them at various points during the review
✦ Evidence based – by rooting findings and judgements in evidence about authorities' activities and by distinguishing clearly between reporting facts and making judgements
✦ Consistency – by applying a common approach to all their work and seeking to apply the principles of best practice in the review team itself
✦ Corporacy – in looking at the performance of the whole authority, including other functions that contribute to social welfare, as well as the work of those specifically charged with social services responsibilities
✦ Development – by judging current performance in a proper historical context and weighing future potential so as to leave every authority with a clear agenda to improve performance and an appreciation of their capacity to deliver improvement
✦ Openness – by publishing our methodology, reports on individual authorities and an annual report on what we have found across all authorities reviewed.

Judging Performance

Judgements are made and evidence collected using four key domains:

✦ Are services focused on meeting individuals' needs?
✦ Can the authority shape better services for the future?
✦ Is performance effectively managed?
✦ Are resources managed to maximise value for money and quality?

These areas are reflected throughout all the stages of a review and provide a common structure for review findings, judgements and reports.

At each stage of a review the team will form judgements on the authority's performance. Inevitably these evolve and develop as more evidence is gathered and analysed.
This section is an indication of how the review team has used the framework in reviewing English authorities to make judgements on the performance of social services. The success criteria and evidence given are examples and part of an ongoing project:

Are services focused on meeting individuals' needs?

**SUCCESS CRITERIA EXAMPLES**

Ensuring that potential service users are well informed about the services available, and have good access to those services.

Extending the range of services and choices offered to users and carers; flexible services that are tailored to users' needs and circumstances; enabling users and carers to participate.

Services that make a difference to individuals' life chances.

**EVIDENCE EXAMPLES**

User views and experience collected through surveys, interviews (with users, carers, representative groups, providers, staff and managers), case records and observation.

Data from referral sampling indicating the referral and screening profile.

Trends from the published data showing the range of services.

Evidence of effective advocacy, consultation, systems and staff skills.

Can the authority shape better services for the future?

**SUCCESS CRITERIA EXAMPLES**

Understanding user needs, the provider market, corporate policy and the available resources in order to change the pattern of services.

Developing effective partnerships with a range of external organisations which deliver value-for-money services.

Identifying practical opportunities for joint commissioning that result in improved service provision.

Developing alternative services to traditional residential care.

**EVIDENCE EXAMPLES**

The extent to which planning and practice demonstrate an understanding of need; the authority's ability to learn from current practice and to change the pattern of services to better meet need.

The extent to which stated strategy and plans are reflected in local practice.

Finance and activity data showing the change in the pattern of services.

The experience of service providers and external agencies and the effectiveness of these relationships.

Trends from published data on residential care and the development of more independent alternatives.

Is performance effectively managed?

**SUCCESS CRITERIA EXAMPLES**

Quality standards and regulatory frameworks are appropriately drawn-up, consistently applied and efficiently monitored.

Services are managed effectively with clear accountability, roles and functions, target setting and appropriate development and deployment of staff.

Directly provided services are managed efficiently, represent value for money and provide services which meet individuals' needs.

**EVIDENCE EXAMPLES**

User/carer views on complaints, and evidence from the Authorities' Inspection Unit.

Standard setting; target setting; monitoring and supervision to ensure consistent application; training and development (published data, interviews).

Quality and service specifications for directly provided services; evidence that these are met and that these services are competitive for a given level of quality.
Are resources managed to maximise value for money and quality?

**SUCCESS CRITERIA EXAMPLES**

Budget and financial systems are designed and managed to fit service objectives and plans.

Systems which collect useful information and provide good finance and activity data, and managers who use this data to make better decisions.

Human resources systems which are designed and managed to ensure that the right staff are delivering the right service at the right time.

**EVIDENCE EXAMPLES**

Information and trends about activity and costs; comparative activity and costs (from published data and the finance and activity return).

Use of management information to improve resource allocation, use and control, and how activity trends are monitored (examples of information reports and observation of systems).

Presence of effective infrastructure to plan for and support a productive workforce and make the most of capital assets.

Evidence from these four areas enables the review team to make a judgement on the current performance and future prospects for the authority's social services. In reaching this judgement the review team encompasses more general questions about the authority, including:

- clear corporate leadership: to what extent does the political, corporate, and social services leadership provide a clear cohesive direction for social services and whether there is evidence that the leadership is driving and implementing this agenda

- creating a long-term agenda: to what extent the authority is able to pro-actively plan for the future and change accordingly, while still maintaining current services

- business planning approach: how well the authority integrates its policies, services and resources through active management, feedback systems and resourced service planning

- innovative culture: the extent to which staff are encouraged to innovate, criticise and take a degree of risk in their work within a supportive framework which has clear boundaries of operation.

**Review Stages**

The evolution of the review methodology has also amended the process; some adjustment to the sequence and timing of activities, and evidence collation have been made.

The review stages are explained in more detail on pages 9 to 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparing for the Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gathering Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Linking Information with Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interviewing and Observing Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Following up the Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review Resources**

Each review spans about 10-12 months from the set-up meeting to the committee presentation and requires on average 90 reviewer days. Each review costs about £50,000. Reviews are funded primarily by the Department of Health in England and the Welsh office in Wales with the Audit Commission making a contribution to management costs. The authority's contribution is a substantial one in terms of the time and effort required by existing staff to contribute to and benefit from the review.
Review Scope and Participants

The Review Programme
Reviews started in August 1996, and the programme will review 50 authorities in England by July 1999; a Welsh programme was commissioned in September 1998. The programme is established at 20 English authorities each year and 4 Welsh authorities (see Appendix I for further details of the programme). Authorities are selected randomly for review, with a spread of Counties, London Boroughs, Metropolitan Boroughs and Unitary Councils included each year. All authorities in England and Wales will be reviewed at some stage.

Joint Review Stakeholders

The Review Team
The Project Director manages the team of regional reviewers and central staff based in London. The reviewers' posts are filled by both full- and part-time staff who are based around the country. Reviewers are on short-term contracts of variable length and are seconded from local authorities, the Social Services Inspectorate or the Audit Commission. All reviewers have a background in social services management, audit or consultancy.

Contact details for the review team are at Appendix J.

The Role of the Elected Members
Elected members (councillors) have primary responsibility for the performance of local authorities' social services in their capacity as representatives of local citizens. Reviews will involve councillors and will comment on how effectively political leadership drives management action and improves services.
The Review Process

This section guides you chronologically through the review stages and activities. This is a general model and may vary from review to review because of local circumstances or unforeseen events.

Joint Review Input
- Notification letters
- Appoint reviewers
- Attend meeting

PREPARING
- Initial notification
- 3-6 months
- Set up meeting

GATHERING INTELLIGENCE
- Set up meeting
- 8-10 weeks
- Position statement

LINKING INFORMATION WITH PRACTICE
- Briefing Meetings
- 3-4 weeks
- Case file analysis

INTERVIEWING AND OBSERVING PRACTICE
- Local team offices
- 4 weeks
- HQ & external agencies

REPORTING
- Feedback to Director
- 10 weeks
- Draft of report
- 10 weeks
- Committee presentation

END OF REVIEW

FOLLOW UP
- Committee presentation
- 1 Year
- Follow up by JR Director

Authority Input
- Brief staff, Chief Executive, Councillors
- Project plan for review, allocation of tasks, etc

User/carer questionnaire – sample and dispatch
- Produce position statement (including finance and activity data and referral data)
- Organise user/carer group meeting(s)
- Organise Councillors and Chief Executive meetings
- Plan HQ and external agencies fieldwork

Management team meeting
- Planning and data meetings
- Chief Executive meeting
- Councillors meeting(s)
- Provide case files
- Brief press
- Plan local office fieldwork
- Hold local teams introduction meeting
- Finalise HQ/Local programme
- Hold local teams introduction meeting

Support interview process
- Attend interviews

Feedback meeting with Joint Review team
- Internal discussions
- Respond to Joint Review draft report
- Prepare for committee
- Press and publicity issues
- Committee
- Distribute report and summaries

Produce and agree action plan – distribute
- Meeting with JR, Inspector, Auditor
- Lead to discuss plan
- Work on actions
- Meet JR Director

Page 9
Preparing

This is a preparatory stage prior to the start of the review which begins with an official notification to authorities and ends with the set-up meeting which is the official start of the review.

Notification and Preparation

The Project Director will notify authorities of their place on the review programme (see Protocol – Appendix B). A more detailed letter and pack of information, forms and an outline timetable will be sent out a month before the start, i.e., the set-up meeting. This letter will inform authorities of their lead reviewer. The authority should nominate a link person to act as the authority’s main contact.

The authority should decide how it wishes to handle communications with staff within the authority and with its other stakeholders.

The Project Director will appoint a Lead Reviewer for each authority; other reviewer appointments will be made later before the end of stage 2.

The work of the link person is vital to ensuring the effectiveness of the review. Their role should be to:

- project manage the preparation and information-gathering activities (stages 1-2)
- plan the fieldwork programme and brief those involved
- act as a sounding board for reviewers during fieldwork

Set-up Meeting

This meeting is formally the start of the review and is attended by the Lead Reviewer and Project Manager from the Joint Review Team and the Director and nominated link person from the authority (the Director may wish to invite other social services or corporate managers).

This meeting will cover:

- an overview of the process
- the outline timetable
- the local context within which social services function (political, financial, organisational)
- the roles of the various key participants and stakeholders
- process details on completing the position statement and user/carer questionnaire
- future meeting and activity dates

REVIEW PREPARATION CHECKLIST & ACTIONS – MID-SHIRE LINK PERSON – NOV 97

| Briefing Councillors | ✓ but keep updated  
| contacted review team to get members leaflet |
| Briefing Chief Executive and corporate managers | Presentation to development sub-group |
| Briefing Staff | Send out newsletter – article addressing staff anxieties |
| Do we understand the sequence of events/timing? | Review documentation and review project plan – sorts list of questions for set-up meeting |
| What is the experience of other authorities? | Identify contacts in other authorities read previous reports |
| How does it fit with other projects? | Problem with the budget timetable |
| Position Statement Plan – allocation of work | Contact Treasurer |
| Deciding on roles of link team and others in review | Done but decide collation process (are we under or over prepared?) |
| Check out information systems | Ongoing, put outline of roles in writing sort out cover arrangements |
| How can we use the review process to best advantage as a learning opportunity? | Meeting next week |
| Sue D presenting to next mgt team | |
Gathering Intelligence

This stage is concerned with the compilation and collection of evidence on the current position of the authority's social services from a variety of sources including the authority's position statement.

Position Statement on Social Services

The position statement submitted by the authority to the review team is divided into six parts – a full specification is given at Appendix A.

1 Authority Profile
   History
   Political environment
   Operational environment
   Future direction
   This section provides background information about the context in which the authority's social services operate. It also gives the trajectory of the development of social services in the authority through an authority's overview of its recent history, current environment and future direction.

2 Authority Viewpoint
   This section allows the authority to highlight its own view of its position and future direction.

3 The Four Key Areas
   Each key area contains a series of questions divided into four parts (see below) – sixteen sections in all.
   The questions are designed to elicit the authority's view of how effectively they are performing in these areas. This structured framework can be used by authorities as a self-analysis tool to assess current performance and future actions in these sixteen areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Individuals' Needs</th>
<th>Shaping Services</th>
<th>Managing Performance</th>
<th>Managing Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and access</td>
<td>Understanding needs and resources</td>
<td>Regulating services</td>
<td>Strategic resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From referral to assessment</td>
<td>Matching need with service provision</td>
<td>Applying quality standards</td>
<td>Budget management and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of services</td>
<td>Relationships with service providers</td>
<td>Developing effective performance</td>
<td>Infrastructure and information management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the delivery of care</td>
<td>Changing the pattern of services</td>
<td>Managing directly provided services</td>
<td>Human resource management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Mapping the Authority
   Organisation chart
   Team map
   Function map
   Planning map
   These maps are intended to help the review team understand the way in which social service functions are organised and planned, and also assist with our fieldwork planning.

5 Finance and Activity Data
   A form to be returned detailing finance and activity data divided by client group for the current year (estimates) and previous two years (actuals).
   This is intended to provide local data that links costs with the frequency of defined activities; this information will assist in a greater understanding of the performance of the authority.

6 Referral Data
   A form to be returned which asks for a three-month sample of referral data divided by client group, age, ethnic origin and referral source.
   This form provides a snapshot of the broad characteristics of the workload. It also gives an indication of waiting times, referral routes and the relationship between the numbers of assessments and those receiving services.
User/Carer Questionnaire

A sample of between 300 and 450 users and carers are selected by the authority with guidance from the Joint Review Team. This sample should be representative of the mix of clients within the authority and range across both open and closed cases.

Joint Reviews provide the questionnaire materials and analyse the results. Financial assistance can be provided to help with advocacy and translation services. Some language translations and large print materials are available (see Appendix I).

The questions are listed in Appendix C.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to gain a broad picture of the views of users and carers about their experience of social services. In particular questions about how they find out about social services, how they make contact, whether they are involved in their assessment and the effectiveness of the service they received.

Please discuss any sampling issues with the Information Manager before you finalise arrangements and set out in writing for the review team how you have organised this survey.

Links with the Auditor and the Inspectorates

Joint Reviews request, from the authority's auditor and inspectorates, information relevant to social services for the last three years, notably:

- reports
- studies
- ongoing investigations
- management letters

The lead auditor (District Auditor or Partner) and lead inspector (Assistant Chief Inspector – Policy or Deputy Chief Inspector in Wales) are sent a copy of the report prior to publication for their information.

The auditor and inspectorates are closely involved in the follow-up process (see Stage 6).

Reviews in England will link with the Social Services Inspectorate of the Department of Health, and Reviews in Wales will link with the Social Services Inspectorate of the Welsh Office.

Effective relationships with the auditor and Inspectorates are essential for the review process in providing information on the authority's context and performance. For example the review team does not usually need to review areas in detail which have recently been examined by the auditor or inspector.

The lead reviewer for the authority will discuss this material and the authority context with the auditor and inspector before the observation and interview stage.

The links between Joint Reviews and the SSI/SSIW and Auditors is an area where the potential for further development is currently being explored, for example in validating local data.

Analysis of Published Data

The following published data is collected:

- Department of Health's Key Indicators
- Welsh Office Data
- CIPFA Social Services Statistics
- Audit Commission Performance Indicators
- Audit Commission Financial Profiles
- Audit Commission Key Comparisons

This data is analysed and compared with that of similar authorities to identify areas of difference and similarity. Relationships between data elements are examined and the data is also classified under the four Key Areas. This assists in drawing a preliminary picture of social services activity within the authority.

Information from the position statement, user/carer questionnaire, SSI/SSIW and auditor, and published data are collated and reviewed by the review team to form an initial view of the current position and performance of the authority's social services. This view and key data are subsequently discussed with the authority in the next stage.
Data and Information

Data and information are integral to Joint Reviews. Analysis takes place throughout the process as questions are asked, hypotheses are formed and tested, with the findings being fed back to the authority.
Linking Information with Practice

The review team's initial views are discussed with the key politicians and authority managers, and work is started to validate the user/carer focus through the meetings with user/carer groups and the case file analysis.

The sequence of the events in this stage is important:

**STAGE 2**
- Position Statement delivered

**STAGE 3**
- Mgt team meeting
- Case files intro. team meetings

**STAGE 4**
- Fieldwork

These intervals are usually 1-2 weeks.

**Briefing Meetings**

The Joint Review Team will wish to meet first the social services management team and then later to see, at separate meetings, the Chief Executive and leading Councillors.

[It would be useful to arrange the Chief Executive and Councillors meetings on the same day. We will be advised by authorities on the arrangements for briefing Councillors.]

A separate meeting with the link person or team is useful as soon as possible after the management team meeting to discuss programming arrangements. A meeting to discuss the initial data findings is sometimes held at this point.

Some authorities issue a press release prior to the fieldwork advertising the review. This release could explain that members of the public can write to the Lead Reviewer if they wish to raise specific points.

**User/Carer Groups**

As a part of the user-focused approach of the review, the team will wish to meet with user and carer advocacy groups from independent and voluntary organisations: for example, local representatives of national organisations such as MIND or Help the Aged and also smaller local groups.

The detailed arrangements are tailored to suit local circumstances: for example, meetings may be divided by broad client groups - elderly, children, other adult services. These events are organised by the authority but run by the review team; the authority is not represented. The review team are happy to fit into any existing consultation structures.

[Usually a series of two to four meetings spanning two days.]

At the management meeting the team will:
- test out their initial thoughts about social services in the authority
- discuss the key issues raised in the position statement
- share some of the main findings arising from the data analysis
- propose and agree with the authority, which local offices and teams it wishes to review during the first two weeks of the fieldwork stage

The meetings with the Chief Executive and Councillors are intended to brief them on the review process and their role in it. They will discuss the main objectives for social services and how they fit into the authority’s corporate and political agendas. The team will wish to explore the extent to which corporate and political activities provide clear leadership, corporate teamwork and are supportive of social services. The team will also wish to ask the Chief Executive and Councillors how the work of social services is evaluated.

At the meeting(s) the team will brief people on the review process and purpose and answer questions on this.

The team will then explore their views on:
- the quality and quantity of services
- the way in which the authority works with social services users and carers
- whether the authority listens to users and carers

Organisations not able to attend the meeting(s) or those who have more specific or confidential points to make may write to the Lead Reviewer.

[Groups representing service providers are seen later in the process during the fieldwork weeks.]
Case Files Analysis

From the local offices and teams selected for review, 80 case files are examined by the team. These are selected by the authority under guidance from the review team (see Appendix E):

From this set of 80 cases the review team will discuss with the link person and local managers which users and carers they wish to see in person during the fieldwork stage. These cases will also form the basis for selecting staff and managers for interview.

A checklist of the questions used by the team to examine the files is at Appendix E.

This exercise is followed by discussion with selected staff and users/carers and enables a number of essential questions to be answered in relation to the general approach to assessment, care planning, the delivery of care, reviewing and recording. The review team attaches considerable importance to the quality of case recording and supervision.

Introductory Team Meetings

About two weeks prior to the fieldwork stage, the team will wish to visit the local teams being reviewed for about half a day each. This is usually carried out at the same time as the case file analysis.

[Three days are allowed for these meetings and the case file analysis.]

The purpose of this visit is for members of the review team to introduce themselves and the review process, and answer any questions staff might have. Meetings with local managers will also enable detailed planning arrangements to take place.

Interviewing and Observing Practice (the fieldwork)

This is a fieldwork stage which continues the user/carer focus started in the previous stage and goes on to use this evidence as a base to address the more strategic questions with social services management and external agencies.

The fieldwork spans four weeks and is usually in four-day blocks. The first two weeks are spent with teams at local offices. The team will wish to interview a selection of users, carers, foster-carers, social work and administrative staff, and managers. (A guide to planning the fieldwork is given at Appendix F.)

The second two weeks are spent interviewing managers and staff in the headquarters functions, managers from other agencies and a selection of service providers or their representatives. The Assistant Directors and Director of Social Services are usually seen last. This enables some informal feedback to take place as well as a semi-structured interview.

Interviews are either conducted individually or with groups.

The link person needs to be ready to adapt the programme during the fieldwork if required, for example, arranging extra meetings.

The purpose of fieldwork is to:

- validate the evidence on performance already obtained from documents and statistical data
- collect additional evidence on performance in the four key areas
- make direct contact with those involved in the service – staff, other agencies, users and carers
- increase reviewers’ understanding of the communities served by the authority
- facilitate discussion between reviewers and staff in the authority about issues and potential improvements

The interview schedule is designed to enable reviewers to observe the impact of policies and procedures on service delivery before seeing strategic managers. The interview structure and the topics covered are also designed to fit with the four key areas of the methodology.
Reporting

This stage encompasses reporting the review, starting with feeding back the initial headline findings through to the consultation on the report and finally the report presentation.

Initial Feedback to the Authority
After the team has analysed its findings and discussed them with the Project Director, it will give an informal slide presentation of headline findings to the social services management team. This should take place about two weeks after the end of fieldwork and should be followed immediately by feedback to the Chief Executive and Councillors. How feedback to staff is organised varies and is agreed between the Director and the Lead Reviewer.

Finalising the Report
The review team will write a draft of its report and in finalising this draft may consult, in confidence, colleagues within the Audit Commission and the appropriate Inspectors. This draft report will be sent to the Director of Social Services for comment about two months after the initial feedback and will also be sent to the Chief Executive and Chair of the Social Services Committee.

An executive summary will be produced as a separate document after consultation with the Director.

Report Presentation and Publication
The Project Director is responsible for handling issues concerning the press, publication, and presentation of the report. Detailed arrangements concerning briefing the media and responding to press enquiries are dealt with by the Audit Commission Press Office (0171 930 6077).

The project director may alert the Controller of the Audit Commission, Chief Inspector of the Social Services Inspectorate and the Minister to issues within the report. In Wales, all reports will be presented to the Welsh Assembly and published in both English and Welsh.

It may be appropriate to hold other meetings with Councillors before or after the committee presentation, for example, a workshop on the issues arising.

It is important that the report and summary reach a wide readership of politicians, staff, other agencies and the public.
3.2 Information and Access

How well are people served by Social Services?

A summary of the first Review of Social Services undertaken in October and December 1996; published in May 1997.

3.4.1 Summary

The Social Services Department has established eligi

services. These criteria have been tightened recently in the interests of both careful budget management. Exhibit 4.1 Referral Routes for Routine Services

The whole care management process at the moment is only as good as the individual care manager - a social worker.

Care Plans for People with Learning Disabilities

All learning disability care managers are required to provide a number of care plan options, in order to meet assessment needs. Reviewers found evidence of this in practice and were impressed by the authority given to these care managers to put together tailored care plans which included the purchase of accommodation.

Good Poor

The essence for me was the flexibility and negotiability - a service user

There is a big problem about how people get information about what social services do provide and who is eligible - a carer.

Exhibit 1.3: Percentage difference between social services budget and social services SSA, 1996/97


Exhibit 3.1: Speed of initial response

- 0% - 5%
- 5% - 10%
- 10% - 15%
- 15% - 20%
- 20% - 25%
- 25% - 30%

Exhibit 4.1: The Case History of a 7 year old child with severe behavioural problems

- Mother rings CPIT; CPIT refers to C&F
- School rings CPIT - C&F refers to C&F
- School teacher CPIT - What is happening?
- CPIT manager contacts mother; she confirms problems
- Mother contacts C&F - What is happening?
- Managers for C&F and C&F visit family
- Allocation to social worker
- Social worker visits family

There is an enormous amount of effort going into consultation but it's not resulting in action - a voluntary organisation.

Eleven people attend a case conference. There are two social work reports. The child is not registered. There is still no arrangement for the child to be looked after.

CPIT: Child Protection Investigation Team
C&F: Children and Families Team
Following up the Review

This stage is a series of activities designed to enable the authority to implement the agreed actions arising out of the review report (see Appendix H).

Action Planning
The authority will produce an action plan based on the review report that will be presented to either the committee hearing the review presentation or the subsequent committee. Once this action plan has been approved this should be sent to the Lead Reviewer, Lead Auditor and Lead Inspector.

The authority action plan should focus on specific actions designed to address the issues identified by the report. These actions should be attributable to specific individuals within the authority, have a set timescale and be capable of evaluation by senior management and Councillors. The action plan should be available to the public.

Follow-up Meetings and Reports
The Lead Reviewer will convene a meeting involving him/herself, the Lead Auditor, the appropriate Inspector and the Director of Social Services (and other officers as the authority wishes).

The Lead Auditor and Inspector will visit the authority six months after the date of the action plan approval and issue a report to the Joint Review Project Director

The Joint Review Director will also conduct a separate follow-up visit to the authority one year after the publication of the report.

In authorities where the Minister has particular concerns, he/she will specify additional follow-up arrangements.

This meeting will discuss the approved action plan and agree the follow-up programme.

The report will examine the progress the authority has made in meeting the action plan targets and report on any other agreed pieces of work.

This visit will assess the outcome and impact of the review, and provide an opportunity for the Project Director to get feedback from the authority on its view of the effectiveness of the review process.

Background Evidence
The report is necessarily a distillation of the evidence collected by the review team. Further detail of the background evidence and their sources can be requested from the Lead Reviewer. Joint Reviews will archive key documents a year after the end of the review.
Postscript

We hope that this guide has answered some of your questions, but reviewing social services is an evolving process and so parts of the appendices will need to be continuously updated. This is partly because we are learning from experience and partly because of the changing environment: for example, it is possible that Joint Reviews will be increasing the number of reviews that are carried out per year after July 1999, in addition to the new Welsh Programme.

We aim to produce a new edition during 1999 to reflect developments in:

+ Best value
+ Department of Health Performance Framework
+ Joint Review Programme
+ Links with other Inspectorates

Change is inevitable.

Authors: Richard Elliott, Andrew Webster

Joint Reviews of Local Authorities' Social Services
35-37 Grosvenor Gardens
London SW1W 0BS

Telephone: 0171 630 0105
Fax: 0171 630 0182
E-mail: joint.reviews@audit-commission.gov.uk
APPENDIX A

Authority Position Statement on Social Services

Introduction

Contents
The Authority Position Statement is split into six parts:
1 Authority Profile
2 Authority Viewpoint
3 The Four Key Areas
   Meeting Individuals’ Needs; Shaping Services; Managing Performance; Managing Resources
4 Authority Maps
5 Finance and Activity Data
6 Referral Data

Position Statement Rationale

A primary source of information will be the authority’s own analysis of its position in relation to the four keys to effectiveness and the validity of the evidence it is able to produce.

The objective of each review will be to identify with the authority the improvements that can be made over the next few years, given the authority’s starting point and priorities.

The position statement should, therefore, aim to provide:

- evidence based answers to questions intended to identify achievements and deficits in the four areas.
- contextual information about local needs and priorities and the ways in which these link with achievements and deficits.
- development priorities arising from this - as seen by the authority prior to review.

The statement will not be published as part of the report but will be an essential review tool.

Completing the Position Statement

Some of the evidence will be contained in committee reports, planning documents and similar records. These do not need to be reproduced within the position statement but if they are used as reference documents there needs to be a brief account of how they are being used as evidence. Reference documents should be given an index number so that they can be easily identified.

If you feel that some information may be repeated you may wish to cross reference your answer to a previous question.

Documentation

The authority is asked to provide three copies (one unbound copy please) of the top document and two copies of the supporting documents: one to Grosvenor Gardens House and one kept at the Authority.

You may wish for convenience to keep the supporting documents to a minimum and list/index other documents which may be of interest if required.
PART 1

Authority Profile

This section is intended to provide background information about the context in which the authority's social services operates. It should also be used to give the trajectory of the development of social services in the authority through an overview of its recent history, current environment and future direction.

History

✦ What have been your recent achievements?
✦ Have there been significant events in the past that have affected progress on particular issues, attitudes to change and expectations of services?

Political Environment

✦ What is the political environment in which you operate?
Please provide information/charts on:
- your committee structure and overall political decision-making process.
- political composition, names and positions of the key political figures.
✦ Have there been changes in political leadership that have affected policies and priorities or any other political factors we should be aware of?

Operational Environment

Please provide an overview as the detail can be explored in Part 3

✦ Socio-economic profile.
Please include some basic demographic, health, employment and poverty indicators. It would be useful to have these split by location/area.
✦ Overview of financial situation.
✦ Overview of relationships with other agencies, in particular: health, housing and education. Please comment on any factors that impede or enhance these relationships.
✦ Are there any major service or structure changes, high profile issues, key personnel changes or difficult situations that are likely to be ‘alive’ at the time of the review and that will affect performance?

Future Direction

✦ Summarise the key factors from your past and pertaining to your current position that have influenced future strategy?
✦ What are the key corporate objectives for the Authority?
✦ How do they link to the key strategic objectives for social services over the next few years?
✦ How is social services strategy formulated and is it responsive to change?

PART 2

The Authority Viewpoint

This part of the position statement allows the Authority to highlight its own view of its position and future direction. Please structure this section as you feel appropriate.
PART 3

Key Areas Framework

The questions are designed both as a means of getting authorities to describe current activities and as a means of highlighting deficits. There are likely to be questions that cannot be answered. It is as important for the authority to identify these, and the reasons for difficulty, as it is for the authority to give answers. You may wish to cross reference your answers to other questions or documents you supply us such as your Community Care Plan or Business Plan. Please index any attachments.

Please use our headings and questions when setting out your statement.

(This document is available on disc on request)

1. Meeting Individuals' Needs

This chapter focuses on how well the needs of individuals are met by the Authority. It examines whether they receive good information about services, have easy access to those services, are assessed effectively for a service and receive a service that is tailored to their needs.

1.1 Information and Access

This section examines the extent to which all individuals with care needs who are potential users receive clear information about social services and have good access to those services.

1.1.1 How do you make information about services available to people who might need to use services and how do you explain rights and entitlements?

How do you know whether the information is understandable and whether it reaches those who need it?

Attach some examples of service information leaflets

1.1.2 What access points do you maintain?

What evidence do you have about whether they meet the requirements of users, carers and referring agencies?

1.1.3 How do you know whether or not those who have priority needs are able to access your services?

What information do you collect and how do you use it?

1.2 From Referral to Assessment

This section examines the effectiveness and efficiency of the referral, screening and assessment processes - the methods by which an Authority accepts or rejects requests for assistance in order to allocate its services to those individuals with greatest need.

1.2.1 What systems for referral, screening and assessment do your staff use?

How are duty arrangements organised?

What evidence do you have about their effectiveness?

Give examples of your eligibility criteria and priority system?

1.2.2 What do you know about referral and outcome trends over the past three years, for example:

- referral numbers by user group
- proportion that result in assessment
- proportion that result in service provision
1.2.3 How do you manage and balance risk?
   Give an example of how you handle a child protection case?

Please attach: Annual Reports of Area Child Protection Committee

1.2.4 What working arrangements are there for involving other agencies in assessment?

1.2.5 What, if any, plans do you have to make changes/improvements to screening and assessment arrangements?

   How do these changes relate to your policies, priorities and information about performance?

1.2.6 What response time targets do you set (time between referral and assessment) and how do you monitor them?

1.2.7 How do you get comments from users? and the views of carers?

   How does this feed into their assessment?

1.3 The Effectiveness of Services

This section considers service quality from a user and carer perspective in terms of their influence on the nature of the services provided and service waiting times. It also considers how the Authority monitors service quality and makes any necessary changes.

1.3.1 How do you ensure that you focus on users and carers needs when assessing and planning for the delivery of care?

   What evidence do you have that users and carers have a choice in the services offered to them and that they participate in the review of service effectiveness?

1.3.2 In terms of your policies and priorities, what are your most and least effective service responses and what evidence do you have to support these conclusions?

1.3.3 What plans, if any, do you have to deal with your less effective service responses?

1.3.4 What response time targets do you set (time between assessment and service response) and how do you monitor them?

1.3.5 How do you get comments from users and the views of carers?

   How does this feed into their service provision?

1.4 Managing the Delivery of Care

This section examines how the delivery of care is managed in terms of appropriate systems, records, financial control, planning and work allocation.

1.4.1 What proportion of people receiving services have a written care plan?

   To what extent do your staff cost all social services aspects in the plan?

   Do care plans enable you to tell whether the service provided is sufficient to satisfy client user needs?
1.4.2 How does your system aggregate information from care plans for planning purposes?
1.4.3 How are work priorities determined?
   How is workload assessed and allocated?
   What is the average workload of social workers and team managers?
   (for all client groups)
1.4.4 What reviewing system do you require staff to operate?
   What proportion of care plans are reviewed?
   What are the outcomes in terms of objectives achieved and changes to service provision?
1.4.5 What information is provided to users about the service (e.g. financial charges)?
   How do you get comments on the service from users and the views of carers?
   How does this feed into individual care plans?

2. Shaping Services
This chapter examines how the Authority shapes the pattern of its services to meet the needs of the whole population. In particular the extent to which it formulates effective plans, matches the provider market with need, builds good relationships with providers and quickly adapts to changing circumstances.

2.1 Understanding Needs and Resources
This section looks at how the strategies, policies and plans that underpin service provision are formulated, how they are matched with resources and the process by which key stakeholders are involved.

2.1.1 Do policies and strategies exist for all user groups and what stage of implementation have you reached?
   Example:
   Learning disability - recent strategic review with Health and other stakeholders; early stage of implementing joint commissioning; transfer of services from hospital base to community.

2.1.2 List your key commissioning plans.
   It is assumed that these will be set out primarily in the Community Care Plan and Children's Services Plan. Please attach.

2.1.3 How are your stakeholders, including users, involved in setting of policies and strategy?
2.1.4 To what extent are your plans jointly developed with other agencies?
   What services are jointly commissioned?
2.1.5 How does information about the effectiveness and quality of service outcomes inform the planning process, in particular feedback from:
   (a) users and carers;
   (b) 'front-line' staff; and
   (c) general public (please outline a recent public consultation exercise).
2.1.6 How are your commissioning plans linked to the financial plan and other constraints such as human resource capacity or information systems?
2.2 Matching Need With Service Provision
This section assesses how effectively information about service provider markets is collected and matched with the available resources in order to plan value for money services.

2.2.1 How do you find out about the costs, quality, skills and potential of all possible service providers?

2.2.2 What is the range of unit costs and prices paid for each main service?

2.2.3 Does this mapping of the market allow you to formulate different approaches for different client groups due to differing market conditions?

2.2.4 How is information on client need aggregated so that any mismatches with service supply can be effectively dealt with and priorities decided?

2.3 Relationships With Service Providers
This section examines the effectiveness of the processes for managing service providers

2.3.1 Outline your main commissioning and contracting arrangements.

2.3.2 Explain any differences in the commissioning and contracting process for different services or situations (e.g. contract type, volumes and duration).

2.3.3 What information or communication do providers get from you about needs, priorities and developments?
   - How do you get feedback from them?

2.3.4 In what ways do you promote effective relationships with service providers?

2.3.5 How do you ensure that directly-provided and externally-provided services are equally responsive to changes you have specified?

2.3.6 How is information about service providers and client need organised to enable managers to make the appropriate match between the two?

2.4 Changing the Pattern of Services
This section examines how and why the Authority changes the mix and type of services provided in response to changing policy, resources or local conditions.

2.4.1 In the last three years what major changes have there been in:
   (a) expenditure shifts between services;
   (b) the way in which you commission and fund all services; and
   (c) the mix of service providers for each client group.
   Please answer in terms of how these changes related to issues of cost and quality, and whether the changes were in line with your planning priorities.

2.4.2 What current services most represent best and worst value for money?

2.4.3 What services most need to change?
   What plans are there to change services or providers?
   How will any changes improve effectiveness and value for money?

2.4.4 In the next three years, how will:
   (a) changes in expenditure deliver your planning priorities;
   (b) demographic changes affect your strategy; and
   (c) unforeseen changes be managed?

2.4.5 What plans, if any, do you have to change or improve your approach to planning?

2.4.6 Give an example of your planning 'methodology' in action.
3. Managing Performance
This chapter reviews how the Authority develops a good performance culture through a robust regulatory framework, setting standards, managing team performance and improving the management of its own directly provided services.

3.1 Regulating Services
This section examines the robustness of the Authority's regulatory, accreditation and complaints procedures, and how they are used to support service quality and improvements in performance.

3.1.1 What performance indicators do your regulatory units use to report on their performance?
Do they meet their targets and if they do not meet targets, why not?
*Please attach: Inspection Unit Annual Report*

3.1.2 Have you agreed any additional, non-statutory, regulatory systems with service providers or have plans to do so (e.g. accreditation for home care providers)?
What are the main features of the system and how are you able to use it to secure service quality?

3.1.3 What performance information do you collect and publish with regard to dealing with formal and informal complaints?
How do you use information from complaints for service improvement?

3.2 Applying Quality Standards
This section looks how quality standards are set and monitored across the range of services, notably the extent to which they are consistently and equitably applied and whether appropriate action is taken to respond to any identified problem areas.

3.2.1 What are the specific standards that are set in all areas of service?
How do they relate to policies and priorities?

3.2.2 How do you decide what standards to set?
Who is involved at what stage of the standard setting process?
*Give one or two recent examples of how you set standards in an area of service*

3.2.3 What are the arrangements to monitor whether standards are met?
(please organise this by service area listing key details from contracts and service level agreements, accountable staff and titles of outcome reports).
*Attach: examples of recent outcome reports*

3.2.4 What actions do you take to deal with identified quality problems (e.g. services that do not meet standards)?
What alternative arrangements do you have in place for serious problems?
*Give one or two examples*

3.2.5 Can you demonstrate that you apply the same standards to internal and external services and that you are even-handed in dealing with internal and external providers?

3.2.6 How do you assure consistency of service provision across client groups and geographical area?

3.2.7 Have you identified any gaps in your quality management system and do you have any plans to deal with these?
3.3 Developing Effective Performance

This section examines the performance management cycle of setting team targets, developing the capability to meet those targets, monitoring operational performance against the targets and taking action to address any gaps by adjusting the targets or improving performance.

3.3.1 For each main service area:

What are your key operational targets?
How are they set?
How do they relate to the policy priorities and budget allocation?

3.3.2 How do you make sure that your workforce is developed to effectively meet the targets?
How does staff supervision support meeting these targets?
What other processes do you use to ensure that targets are met?

Please attach: Training Plan

3.3.3 How do you encourage your staff to be open, innovative and able to use initiative?

3.3.4 What information do you collect and use to monitor staff performance (productivity and quality) and service performance against these targets?

Please give titles of outcome reports and attach examples

3.3.5 What is your change process to amend practice or targets when an evaluation of performance against a target has revealed a gap?

Please give an example

3.4 Managing Directly-Provided Services

This section examines the effectiveness of those services directly-provided by the Authority and the extent to which the management of these services has recently been improved in terms of their quality or efficiency.

3.4.1 How is the budget accountability divided between staff?

3.4.2 How do you ensure that services represent value for money compared with other options?

3.4.3 How do you monitor service performance quality and what information do you collect?

3.4.4 How do user, carer and provider comments feed into future service development?

3.4.5 What measures have you taken to allow staff the opportunity, and feel confident about, voicing criticisms of the service?

3.4.6 Give an example of how you have recently improved direct service provision.
4. Managing Resources

This chapter reviews the Authority’s financial, information, infrastructure and staff resources and considers whether they are effectively managed and co-ordinated to support the implementation of its service plans.

(The financial information provided in this section will be read in conjunction with the financial cost and activity data we have requested).

4.1 Strategic Resource Management

This section reviews how the budget is planned, allocated and changed to meet service priorities. It also asks about the Authority’s income policy.

4.1.1 What proportion of your budget do you spend (net spend) in each main user group and on the main service activities?

Example:
+ spend on children’s services = 25% of total budget (£25m out of £100m)
+ spend on assessment and care management of children/social work service = 10% of total spent on children (£2.5m out of £25m)
+ spend on looked after children = 60%
+ spend on family support = 30%.

4.1.2 How much does this match your context and priorities?

Example:
+ spend on physical disability = 10% of budget
+ number of physical disability referrals = 20% of total referrals
+ demographic profile = higher than average numbers with limiting long-term illness
+ current policy = to increase spend by shifting funds from other user groups (see Committee report, ref x) and to shift from residential provision to home and day support.

4.1.3 How do you allocate money to your main budget heads (historical, needs based, activity based, a mixture of these)?

4.1.4 Do you meet your budget targets for capital and revenue accounts?

If not, what variances were there in the last financial year, what were the reasons for these variances and are there associated policy and priority issues?

Please answer this question both in relation to the overall capital and revenue budgets for social services and in relation to the major budget heads

Example:
+ Revenue budget for 96/97 met target.
+ Budget for older people overspent by 0.5m.
+ Reason for variance - overspend on residential and nursing home placements due to low turnover in homes, higher placement rate than predicted, unsuccessful fee negotiations.
+ Corrective action - reductions to home care service, transfer of funds from learning and physical disability services.
+ Policy and priority issues - revisit criteria for admission to residential and nursing home care, promote expansion of respite care market.
4.1.5 What proportion of your budget derives from charging service users?

What services do you charge for, how is the level determined (e.g. flat rate for all; means tested etc.) and how do you review policies?

*Please state any variations between different services*

4.1.6 To what extent are you securing or examining alternative funding sources and joint funding partnerships?

4.1.7 How do you handle budget changes?

4.2 Budget Management and Control

*This section examines the effectiveness of the budget management, control and information procedures to direct and sustain operational services.*

4.2.1 Who is the budget holder for each main budget head and what is their position in the organisation?

Is the budget devolved down to the decision-making points in the organisation, if not, why not?

4.2.2 How do you know that the financial information provided is accurate and timely?

4.2.3 Does your information on expenditure and income help you to meet budget targets month on month?

4.2.4 What mechanisms do you have in place to control expenditure?

4.2.5 What financial management problems have you faced and how have you dealt with them?

4.2.6 What, if any, changes or improvements are you planning in financial management and control?

4.3 Infrastructure and Information Management

*This section examines whether, in order to support its service provision, the Authority collects and uses information effectively and manages its infrastructure successfully.*

4.3.1 How do you make sure that:

(a) buildings/equipment; and

(b) information technology

are used to support your policies and priorities?

4.3.2 What information do you find it essential to collect routinely?

4.3.3 How do you collect this essential information and how do you check its reliability?

4.3.4 Who gets this information (operational and management levels) and what do they use it for?

4.3.5 What, if any, changes or improvements are you planning to your infrastructure and information strategy and systems and how do these link with your policies and priorities?

4.4 Human Resource Management

*This section looks at how the Authority ensures that it recruits, retains and deploys staff with the right mix of skills in a equitable way.*

4.4.1 How do you ensure that you recruit a workforce with the right skill mix and that staff turnover is managed to maintain this mix?
4.4.2 What is the nature of the local labour market and how does this influence your Human Resource policies such as recruitment and retention policy?

4.4.3 How do you make sure that your workforce is deployed to meet your service policies and priorities?

*Please provide data on: number of staff at each level and at team/location, any information on or formula used, to allocate staff.*

4.4.4 What do you know about the health, stability, morale and gender/ethnic mix of your workforce?

What recent initiatives have you taken in these areas?

*Please provide summary data on: sickness rates and trends, turnover rates and trends, any staff attitude surveys, gender/ethnic mix.*

4.4.5 What equal opportunities initiatives have you taken recently?

*Please attach: equal opportunities policy.*

4.4.6 What, if any, changes or improvements are you planning in human resource management and how do these link with your policies and priorities?

PART 4

Mapping the Authority

We also ask you to provide four 'maps' (these may be maps, charts or diagrams) of the authority in relation to social services:

**MAP A** Organisational structure chart.

**MAP B** Team structure: a matrix of teams/client areas against location.

Please also show locations on a geographical map with contact details.

This map is intended to help us focus on which locations to visit during the local fieldwork.

**MAP C** Function map: for each of the 4 Key Areas please give a role summary of the key players and/or teams working on these functions.

This map is intended to help us focus on who to see during the HQ weeks of the fieldwork and the possible staff interview groupings.

**MAP D** Planning Map: please provide a diagram(s) or chart(s) which shows the key planning relationships both within the authority (senior management and committees) and with other agencies, such as the health and education authorities.

PART 5

Finance and Activity Data

Finance and activity data based on the revised CIPFA format is required for the current financial year (estimates) and the previous two years (actuals).

*(A form is sent to the authority to complete.)*
PART 6

Referral Data

Purpose
The authority is required to complete a referral analysis form so that the joint review team can establish the broad characteristics of the authority’s workload in terms of:

- referral numbers - overall and by user group
- open cases
- gender and ethnic mix
- referral sources
- waiting times.

Guidance to Completion
The start date for the study period is defined as approximately 9 months prior to the date that fieldwork begins. The end date for the study period is defined as 6 months prior to the date that fieldwork begins. Match this 3 month study period to fit in with the nearest convenient dates for your information system.

The Waiting Date should be 3 months after the end date. This means that all users defined as ‘waiting for assessment/service provision at return date’ will have been waiting for 3 months.

Example: fieldwork begins 8.9.97 so the study period start date is 1.1.97 and end date is 31.3.97. The return date is 1.7.97.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>4w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Study Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start Date | End Date | Waiting Date

(A form is sent to the authority to complete).

JR Contact:
Parts 1, 2: Lead Reviewer or Project Director
Parts 3, 4: Lead Reviewer or Project Manager
Parts 5, 6: Information Manager
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Joint Reviews
Management Protocol

1 Management Framework

The review programme is jointly managed by the Audit Commission and either the Department of Health's Social Services Inspectorate (English reviews) or the Welsh Office's Social Services Inspectorate (Welsh reviews). The Project Director will inform these organisations of the findings of each review at the draft report stage. Serious failings in an authority either with regard to general management or particular aspects of practice will be passed to the appropriate Chief Inspector and the Controller of the Audit Commission. The Chief Inspector will inform the relevant minister as appropriate.

Serious failings in practice observed during fieldwork will be drawn immediately to the attention of the Director of Social Services by the Lead Reviewer.

Joint Review staff will conduct themselves with professionalism and integrity. They will evaluate authorities objectively, report honestly and communicate clearly. Staff conduct is the responsibility of the Project Director and any comments about their conduct should be addressed to him in the first instance.

2 Review Notification and Timing

Authorities will be notified of their place in the review programme at least six months prior to having to submit a position statement to the review team. More detailed timetabling of reviews should take place about two months prior to the start of the review (the set-up meeting).

The review team will liaise with the authority auditor and SSI/SSIW inspector with the aim that the respective work programmes should not usually overlap and result in an unfair burden on authorities. The review team is working towards a general rule that excludes SSI/SSIW and audit work within a period which is three months prior to the published start of a review and one year after the published fieldwork month (these are the two dates given in the notification letter to the authority).

3 Confidentiality

Confidentiality will be respected regarding anyone seen in discussion or interview, especially concerning information identifying individuals. Quotes or cases used in the published report will not be attributable to individuals.

Information about named users or carers would be disclosed only in exceptional circumstances where a matter arises regarding possible risk or personal injury, or where statutory or regulatory action is indicated.

Some information considered as part of a review may be regarded by particular agencies as commercially sensitive. Confidential details will not be disclosed without the prior agreement of the agency owning the information.

The authority will have the opportunity when commenting on the draft report to point out any potential confidentiality problems.
4 Consultation

Consultation affording authorities an opportunity to comment and contribute to the review will be offered to the Director of Social Services, Chief Executive and Chair of the Social Services Committee at the following stages:

- between the position statement submittal and fieldwork
- after the end of fieldwork
- the draft report.

5 Report Publication and Distribution

The review Project Director will have the final decision on the report content.

The final report of each review will be published by the Joint Review Team and the report will be presented to a public session of an authority's social services committee or equivalent. Reports are embargoed until the publication date.

The Joint Review Team and the authority shall exchange press releases before the committee meeting. The review team and its managing organisations may on occasions wish to hold a press conference to publicise the report.

The Joint Review Team will provide sufficient copies of the report and report summaries to enable authorities for distribution in order to inform those who participated in the review and the general public of the outcome of the review.

6 Action Plan and Follow-up Arrangements

The authority shall draw up an action plan for approval by the social services committee, with timescale setting out their responses to the report.

The Auditor and the appropriate Inspectorate will follow up each review's findings in accordance with the existing monitoring arrangements six months after the action plan has been approved.

In authorities where the Minister has particular concerns additional measures may be necessary to ensure that actions are implemented.

The review Project Director will visit the authority one year after the committee date.

JR Contact: Project Director
APPENDIX C

User/Carer Questionnaire – Questions

General Information
1. Do you get any help or service from social services?
2. Do you look after, or care for someone, who gets help or service from social services?

Finding out about social services
3. Before you started getting services, did you see, or have, any information (e.g. a leaflet or poster) about the sort of services that social services could provide?
4. Did this information tell you how to get in touch with social services?

Making contact with social services
5. Who asked social services for help for you or your family?
6. How quickly were you seen or spoken to about the services that you might need?

Assessing your needs
7. After social services were approached for help, did anyone from social services ask you what you thought you needed?
8. Do you think that you had some say in deciding what help or services should be given to you?
9. Were you given the help or services that you thought you needed?
10. Did social services staff take note of any important matters relating to your race, culture or religion?
11. Did social services staff take note of any illnesses or disabilities that you or any other member of your family had?

Arranging and receiving help or services
12. Did you get the help quickly after a decision was made to provide services?
13. Were you given details in writing of the help or services that social services were going to provide for you?
14. Were you asked to sign anything to show that you agreed with these arrangements?
15. Since receiving help, have you been asked how things are working out or whether you would like anything changed?

Complaints
16. Were you told how to complain about the services if you wanted to?
17. If you have made a complaint, did it get dealt with to your satisfaction?

Summary
18. Overall, what do you think of the help you received from social services?

Respondent
a. Are you female or male?
b. How would you describe your ethnic origin?
c. In which age range are you?

JR Contact: Information Manager
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REVIEWS OF SOCIAL SERVICES – GUIDING YOU THROUGH
APPENDIX D

Use of Data in Joint Reviews

Introduction

Data is integral to the Joint Review process. Some data is collected in the course of interviews and observation of practice, but a large amount that is already available is analysed at the start of each review. In this analysis, the review authority is compared with a group of (usually) ten others that are considered to be most similar. This comparator group is based on the group that the Audit Commission has defined in consultation with local authorities. Comparisons are also made of the authority's performance over time.

Data Sources

The data for all of these comparisons comes from the following sources:

Department of Health Key Indicators (England only): The Department publishes a volume of around 250 statistics on personal social services. The data is drawn from a variety of statutory returns to central government. The data is published in two tranches per year, in the spring and in the autumn. The data covers social profiles; finance; service coverage and intensity for each of the major user groups; staffing and unit costs. The statistics in this publication are likely to change in coming years as a result of the recent DETR efficiency scrutiny on information flows between central and local government.

Audit Commission Performance Indicators: The Audit Commission requires councils to produce data showing how they perform against a set of indicators. The Commission publishes the results for the previous financial year each March. One section of the publication is devoted to personal social services, although information published here about other council departments (such as housing and education) can be useful to reviewers. The quality of the data is generally seen as better than for other published statistics as the arrangements for producing the data are reviewed regularly by the external auditor. The Commission is committed to continuously improve these indicators and new measurements are introduced after wide consultation.

CIPFA Personal Social Services Statistics: The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) sends questionnaires to councils about a wide range of services including personal social services. Response to the questionnaire is not mandatory but more than 80 per cent of English councils respond regularly. Two questionnaires are sent out each year, one for estimated figures at the start of the financial year and one for actual figures after the year end. The replies are published in summary form each year in November (estimates) and February (actuals). The 1997/98 estimates questionnaire is in a revised format that attempts to help authorities better to link activity and finance and better represent their role as commissioners of services.

The Audit Commission produces a Financial Profile for each authority. This document is not published but is made available to the external auditor. This profile provides further analysis of the latest CIPFA statistics (see above) for the largest areas of council activity. It also includes some census data and staffing data from the Local Government Management Board (LGMB). The information on each authority is compared in this document with information from the comparator group of similar authorities.

The Audit Commission has also produced Key Comparisons for Social Services. Like the profile, a customised document is made available to each authority and their external auditor. The production of this document was prompted by the Department of Health's booklet, Better Value for Money in Social Services, which was published early in 1997. The data contained in Key Comparisons is also published in the Department of Health's Key Indicators (see above) but the document is useful in that it shows the data in the context of the comparator group and in time series. The document is also useful in that unusual or unlikely data has been excluded.
Further data about referrals and about finance and activity (based on the new CIPFA questionnaire) is currently requested as part of the **Position Statement**. This data, together with the results of the survey of users and carers, is also analysed at this stage.

**Welsh Data:** The above sources have been used to inform reviews in English authorities. In Wales the review team proposes to use data collected by the Welsh Office as well as the sources that have data for both England and Wales. However, development work will be needed in this area since data collections have not quite settled down after Local Government Reorganisation.

**Data Analysis**

All of this information is screened for unusual or unlikely elements and categorised according to whether it provides general contextual evidence or provides evidence in one of the four key diagnostic areas. Examples of how data is categorised for each of these areas are:

**Meeting Individual’s Needs:** The Audit Commission Performance Indicator on the percentage of people receiving home care on six or more visits per week.

**Shaping Services:** Finance and activity data from the authority's Position Statement that shows the trend in the balance of expenditure between residential care for older people provided by the council’s own services and that purchased from independent-sector providers.

**Managing Performance:** The Department of Health Key Indicators on the percentage of gross current expenditure that is spent on training staff.

**Managing Resources:** CIPFA statistics on occupancy rates in local authority children's homes.

It should be noted that individual indicators are rarely viewed in isolation. Further information is almost always needed to fully understand the reasons for an individual authority's position. In the examples above, reviewers would want to know for instance how long each of those home care visits was; whether the trend in the number of resident weeks was changing at the same rate as the expenditure; whether a high expenditure on training reflected an identified skill development plan; and the overall numbers of children looked after in the authority who are accommodated in residential care - perhaps there is only one children's home. Some initial analysis work is done on comparing data on the same subject but from different sources: for example, both the Department of Health and the Audit Commission publish figures for the percentage of children who are placed in foster-families. Other work is done on comparing related pieces of information: for example, comparing an analysis of referrals with data about service coverage or budget allocation.

The results of all these analyses are brought together at a meeting of the review team early in the review process. At this meeting, the team gains an understanding of the key contextual information about the authority, notes any areas of the data that seem particularly unusual and formulates initial hypotheses about the authority’s practice. The validity of the key information and unusual data is checked with the authority as soon as possible after this meeting. The hypotheses are tested and developed throughout the rest of the fieldwork.

**JR Contact:** Information Manager

---

October 1998
Joint Reviews of Local Authorities' Social Services
35-37 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0BS
Case File Analysis

The authority is required to make available 80 case files for examination by reviewers. This exercise followed up by some discussion with selected staff and users/carers should enable a number of key questions to be answered in relation both to the general approach to assessment and care management and to specific user groups:

- Are people screened into the system effectively with proper regard to urgency and complexity?
- Response times
- Are needs assessed by gathering the key information from all who have it, including users, carers and other agencies?
- Is this information used to design the service response?
- Are the types and costs of services provided commensurate with the identified levels of need?
- Do the processes used and the outcomes achieved match the authority's stated intent?
- Do plans maximise the capability of users and the responsibility of other agencies?
- Do plans specifically deal with the needs of carers whenever this is appropriate?
- Do plans deal explicitly with conflicts of interest - user v. carer, wants v. needs, eligibility v. choice, statutory responsibility v. choice?
- Do plans remain responsive and how is this checked?
- How much choice do users and carers have within the overall constraints of resources and statutory responsibilities?
- How easy is it for users and carers to understand the system and how users are experiencing it?
- Do managers monitor the way their staff operate the system and how users are experiencing it?

**Case selection:** The authority is required to submit the following case files (as a minimum):

- 10 mental health
- 10 learning disability
- 20 older people
- 10 physical disability
- 10 children with disabilities
- 5 looked-after children
- 15 children in need (including children on Child Protection Register)

The authority needs to ensure that the sample includes a balance between open and closed cases and between longer-term cases (open for more than six months) and shorter-term cases (open for less than three months).

*Theses case files should all be from the localities/sites selected for detailed study.*

Reviewers will select users, carers and social workers/care managers for individual interviews from the files examined. These interviews should be set up for the first or second week of fieldwork.

*JR Contact: Lead Reviewer*
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APPENDIX F

Interviewing and Observing Practice – A Planning Guide

(this is referred to as the fieldwork)

Fieldwork Time Blocks and Dates
The standard model envisages that the Review Team will consist of a lead and second reviewer working in the authority for four consecutive weeks, in blocks of four or three days (usually three x four days and one x three days). Larger authorities will have a third reviewer working for one or two weeks. This model is open to variation depending on local circumstances: for example, large rural counties might require a five day week because of the excess travelling, or there may be a break between local and HQ fieldwork. The project manager will advise you of these blocks at the Set-up Meeting.

With three day blocks an additional fourth day could be used for analysis time or spare slots for unforeseen interviews.

The Planning Timetable

STAGE 1 Preparing
The initial set-up meeting between the authority and Joint Reviews will discuss in outline the fieldwork programme and identify the time slots for fieldwork.

STAGE 2 Gathering Intelligence
Although the detailed local office planning cannot be finalised until the local teams are selected, teams can be warned in advance that they might be visited during the two-week local office fieldwork period. HQ staff can also be warned in advance of the fieldwork slots.

The link person will need to discuss the characteristics of the programme framework with the Lead Reviewer before beginning to plan the programme (see next section on Interview Planning, for example, start and finish times, type and time span of interview).

It may be advisable to book up with External Agencies (part of weeks three and four of fieldwork) as early as possible because of potential diary difficulties. It also may be wise to warn staff and managers of potential commitments before actual time can be confirmed. Once this has been done the HQ programme can be tackled, which is also best done as early as possible.

Please provide the Lead Reviewer and Project Manager with an outline of provisional HQ programme prior to the next planning meeting (see Stage 3).

The time slots are set by the Project Manager who should be contacted if there are any queries about the allocated dates and possible changes.

This can be done immediately after the Set-up Meeting.

Planning the HQ programme is an activity which requires significant steerage from the link person, although detailed arrangements can be handled by administrative staff.

The organisational charts will assist both the Lead Reviewer and link person to plan the fieldwork.

The authority should use the position statement specification to plan themed days and select who we need to interview to assess the questions in each area and section (a broad guide is given in the next section, but it will need to be tailored to the local organisational context).

This would usually be about one week before the management team meeting with the review team.
STAGE 3 Linking Information to Practice

The information provided in the Map section of the Position Statement will provide us with a basis to formulate ideas about which local teams/offices it may be suitable to visit and potential interview groupings of HQ staff. The local teams to be reviewed are to be agreed between the authority and Joint Reviews at the Director/Management Team meeting with the reviewers (about five to eight weeks prior to fieldwork).

In selection of teams for review we aim to get a good coverage of client groups but also some comparative studies of teams with the same client focus. The position statement will also enable us to focus on areas of particular interest and take a view of the planning practicalities. One model frequently used is for each of the two reviewers to select a primary (four-five days) and secondary site (three-two days).

The local teams form the source from which the case files are selected, which in turn form the base from which the user and carer interviews are selected.

This meeting should address:

- case file selection
- local teams' introductory meetings
- any adjustments to the provisional HQ programme (supplied prior to the meeting)

The Lead Reviewer may wish to theme certain days according to, for example, client groups.

STAGE 4 Fieldwork

The review team will wish to meet the link person during fieldwork to discuss any adjustments to the programme, act as a sounding board for issues arising and help smooth out any administrative difficulties.

Participants should be warned that the planned schedule may need to be amended at short-notice. The Lead Reviewer may also ask the link person to arrange additional meetings. This flexibility is important as it is not always possible to foresee all the key avenues of inquiry.

There should be a meeting between the Lead Reviewer and link person as soon as possible after the Management Team meeting to discuss planning issues, preferably on the same day.

Detailed arrangements for the local programme can be discussed between the Lead Reviewer and the local managers.

In selection of teams for review we aim to get a good coverage of client groups but also some comparative studies of teams with the same client focus. The position statement will also enable us to focus on areas of particular interest and take a view of the planning practicalities. One model frequently used is for each of the two reviewers to select a primary (four-five days) and secondary site (three-two days).

The local teams form the source from which the case files are selected, which in turn form the base from which the user and carer interviews are selected.

This meeting should address:

- case file selection
- local teams' introductory meetings
- any adjustments to the provisional HQ programme (supplied prior to the meeting)

The Lead Reviewer may wish to theme certain days according to, for example, client groups.

Participants should be warned that the planned schedule may need to be amended at short-notice. The Lead Reviewer may also ask the link person to arrange additional meetings. This flexibility is important as it is not always possible to foresee all the key avenues of inquiry.

In selection of teams for review we aim to get a good coverage of client groups but also some comparative studies of teams with the same client focus. The position statement will also enable us to focus on areas of particular interest and take a view of the planning practicalities. One model frequently used is for each of the two reviewers to select a primary (four-five days) and secondary site (three-two days).

The local teams form the source from which the case files are selected, which in turn form the base from which the user and carer interviews are selected.

This meeting should address:

- case file selection
- local teams' introductory meetings
- any adjustments to the provisional HQ programme (supplied prior to the meeting)

The Lead Reviewer may wish to theme certain days according to, for example, client groups.

Participants should be warned that the planned schedule may need to be amended at short-notice. The Lead Reviewer may also ask the link person to arrange additional meetings. This flexibility is important as it is not always possible to foresee all the key avenues of inquiry.
General Notes on Interview Planning

The next section is a checklist guideline to planning a programme which may be of assistance. Please adapt it to local circumstances.

1 HQ Programme: Interviewees and Themes

At HQ the team will wish to see:
+ service heads for the main client, provider or geographical divisions
+ commissioning and planning managers/teams
+ resource and performance specialists, such as the manager and key staff in Finance, Inspection Unit, Performance or Quality, Information, Human Resources.

We wish to see Assistant Directors and the Director at individual interviews after the HQ manager and teams listed above.

During the two HQ weeks we will wish to see the following External Agencies:

Health: Health Authority Chief Executive and/or Lead. Key Leads in Health Trusts (linked to the local teams' areas if possible).
Housing: Director of or District Council Lead (linked to the local teams' areas if possible).
Education: Director and/or Lead.
Police: Child Protection Lead and Youth Justice Lead (if possible).
Probation: Youth Justice Lead.

The team will also wish to see:
+ a selection of representatives from the independent, voluntary and private service providers
+ Trade Union Representatives (if not seen previously)

The HQ programme should aim to theme days (this should not be at the expense of excessive travel time which should be kept to a minimum) around the four Key Areas and the sixteen sections these are divided into (see position statement specification).

For example, Finance and Information (probably about 1.5 days) at HQ might consist of:
+ group meeting on Financial Management and Control (preceded by a review of financial systems)
+ group meetings on Information Management (preceded by a review of information systems), possibly one used-focused and one strategy-focused
+ group meeting on Budget Management Issues
+ individual meeting with Head of Finance
+ a meeting with internal audit
2 Local Teams

In local offices the team will wish to see:

+ individual users and carers identified from the case file analysis (between 10-20) and in addition a selection of foster-carers (usually in a group)
+ key workers and managers associated with the above cases
+ service providers in addition to any seen while visiting users/carers in order to incorporate a range of client groups
+ office managers, administrators and receptionists

Note: On average this is fitted into a seven-day programme

3 Interview Planning Details

Please consult the Lead Reviewer on this section.

Interviews and visits time: should take between 0.75 to 2 hours. A crude guide is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>local office key workers, administrators, users/carers:</th>
<th>0.75 - 1</th>
<th>hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>local office managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>HQ managers</td>
<td>1.25 - 1.5</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>HQ group interviews, External agencies</td>
<td>1.5 - 2</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewers: A,B,C will usually be handled by one reviewer and D by both reviewers. Allow 15 minutes plus travel time between interview slots.
 Allow some spare slots in the programme for unplanned interviews and analysis.

Individual interviews are used where:

+ a personal viewpoint is sought e.g. from a user about his/her experience
+ a senior staff member is being asked to represent the views of a specific agency
+ a staff member is the main person accountable for a particular area of work

Group interviews are used where:

+ several people are involved in the same area of work
+ linkages need to be made between different areas of work
+ the group or team is key to overall performance in the area of work

The link person should discuss with the Lead Reviewer the following detailed arrangements:

+ start and finish times (times on arrival and departure days may vary)
+ parking slots, security passes, lunch arrangements, travel within the authority
+ a base for reviewers which could act as an interview room
+ availability of link person and Director during the fieldwork

Joint Reviews (project secretary) will deal with any hotel and travel arrangements to and from the Authority.
Core Questions

The content of interviews will vary according to the role and responsibilities of the person being interviewed, but will always be related to aspects of the four key activity areas and thereby to the review questions about impact on users and carers and value for money. There are core questions for each category of interviewee, but the full content of interviews will vary according to the particular issues that require closer examination in each authority.

Users and Carers
1. What was it like to use the services?
2. Did they help?
3. What improvements could be made?

Social Workers/Care Managers
1. What is their experience of using the care management system?
2. What services are they able to get for users/carers?
3. How is their practice managed and improved?

Reception and Local Administration Staff
1. How is information to the public managed?
2. What are the systems for managing access, referrals and co-ordination of care?
3. How are their skills managed and improved?

Operational Managers
1. What do they know about the effectiveness of the care management system?
2. How well do services meet needs?
3. How are resources managed?
4. What do they do to ensure performance?
5. How do they contribute to service planning and commissioning?

Head of Inspection Unit
1. How even-handed is regulation of internal and external services?
2. How well do the processes for setting standards work?
3. What are the feedback mechanisms between commissioners and regulators?
4. What are the problem areas and how are they being tackled?
5. What are their targets and are they achieved?

Providers (Internal and External)
1. What is their experience of working with assessors and care managers?
2. How are quality/cost issues negotiated and monitored?
3. Are they well informed about needs and plans?
Strategic Managers - Human Resources
1. How are linkages made between operational requirements and skills development?
2. How is the workforce information being used?
3. What are the problem areas and how are these being tackled?

Strategic Managers - Information Management
1. How are you linking policies and objectives with information requirements?
2. Are your systems working well?
3. Who gets information and what do they do with it?
4. What are the problem areas and how are these being tackled?

Strategic Managers - Planning and Commissioning
1. How robust is the information you have available?
2. How do you assess overall need?
3. How do you map market opportunities and constraints?
4. What are the partnership issues and how are these being tackled?
5. How are you achieving changes in the overall pattern of services?
6. What are the problem areas and how are these being tackled?

Strategic Managers - Financial and Infrastructure Management
1. How robust are your systems - actuals, commitments and forecasts?
2. Can you model changes in activity and resources?
3. Are you able to compare expenditure with activity and needs?
4. How are budgetholders supported by systems?
5. What are the problem areas and how are these being tackled?
6. Are assets, systems and information providing best value?

Director, Assistant Director
1. How does social services fit into the corporate and political context and how well do social services managers, corporate managers and Councillors work together?
2. How are resources, policy and frontline services integrated into an effective strategy?
3. What the future priorities and challenges?
4. What are the problem areas and how are these being tackled?

JR Contact: Project Manager and Lead Reviewer
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REVIEWING SOCIAL SERVICES - GUIDING YOU THROUGH
Committee Date

It is important to set this date as early as possible. The date is agreed between the Director of Social Services and the Project Manager (who will consult the Lead Reviewer). Once the presentation arrangements have been agreed, these should be notified to the review team in writing.

This date should be about five months after the completion of fieldwork.

Timescales

The diagram below gives an indication of the timescales between the date on which the Director of Social Services receives an initial feedback from the review team and the committee. These dates are set by the Project Manager who will send the link person a production plan; the Project Manager will discuss any potential changes to the plan with the authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feedback to Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Report Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internal Editing/Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Authority comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Internal Editing/Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation and Information

The draft report will be sent to the Director of Social Services, Chief Executive and Chair of the Social Services Committee; they will have at least two weeks to respond. This response should be channelled via the Director of Social Services. Copies for information are also sent in strict confidence to senior managers within the appropriate Inspectorate and the Audit Commission.

The Director will be sent the final version of the report before it is printed about one month prior to the committee. Copies will also be sent at this stage to the District Auditor or Partner and the appropriate Inspector.

It is intended to get the printed colour copies to the Director two weeks prior to the committee.

A draft of the report summary will be sent to the Director of Social Services for comment prior to publication.
Press and Publication Issues

The review Project Director will have the final decision on the report content.

The final report of each review will be published by the Joint Review Team and the report will be presented to a publicly open session of an authority's Social Services Committee or equivalent. Reports are embargoed until publication date. The publication day for the report is the day after the committee presentation.

The review team and the authority will exchange press releases before the committee meeting. However, no press releases should be issued in advance of publication. The Joint Review Team and its managing organisations may on occasions wish to hold a press conference to publicise the report. Briefing the press and responding to press enquiries are handled by the Audit Commission Press Office (0171 930 6077) under the direction of the Project Director.

The Joint Review Team will provide sufficient copies of the report and report summaries to enable authorities for distribution in order to inform those who participated in the review and the general public of the outcome of the review.

Distribution

Each authority will receive 300 reports and 1200 report summaries.

It is intended to deliver the printed reports two weeks prior to the committee date – the summaries may be finalised and distributed after the action plan has been finalised. If there are production difficulties, a black and white version of the report will always be issued in time for the distribution of committee papers.

The authority should distribute these documents to the following people:

- **Report**
  - Councillors, corporate senior managers, external agencies, selected social services managers and staff, user-carer groups, public information points

- **Summary**
  - All those who took part in the review including users and carers, staff, local offices

JR Contact: Project Manager
APPENDIX H

Joint Review Follow-Up

**Audit Commission, Auditors, JR Team**
- Lead Auditor (DA or Firm)
- Audit Commission
- JR Team

**Final Draft Report & Summary**
- Handling Issues
- JR Director (3 weeks)
- JR Director

**Colour Copies of Report**
- Distribution as before plus Press Office & AC Directors
  - ADSS, LGA, JR Team
- 1-2 weeks

**Committee Presentation**
- Publication Date (1 Day after)
- District Audit via Bristol AC Managers
- Other Organisations
- 0-3 months

**Committee Approved Action Plan**
- 1-4 weeks

**Handover Meeting**
- Authority, SSI/SSIW, Auditor,
- JR Lead to discuss Action Plan and agree follow-up programme
- 6 Months
- 1 Year

**JR Internal Debriefing Meeting**
- to assess pluses and problem areas
- 1-2 weeks

**Auditor/SSI/SSIW Follow-up**
- to assess progress on Action Plan
- Report to JR Director

**Follow-up by JR Team**
- to review the Authority's experience

**Department of Health (SSI), Welsh Office (SSIW), Local Authority**
- SSI/SSIW
  - Director of Social Services
  - Chief Executive
  - Chair of Social Services

**Distribution as before plus Press office**
- Further meeting if Authority perceived as not serving the population well
- Press & Publicity Issues

**SSI/SSIW Managers**
- Welsh Assembly
- Local Authority
- Extra meeting if Authority perceived as not serving the population well
## Joint Review Programme and Publications Details

The table below gives information on reviews completed to date and which councils are in the programme in 1998/99. Authorities are listed by type: County Council, London Borough, Metropolitan Borough, Unitary Authority and Welsh Authority.

### Review Programme and Publication Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Councils</th>
<th>Year Rev.</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire CC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall CC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon CC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire CC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire CC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire CC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire CC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Yorkshire CC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire CC</td>
<td>97-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland CC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire CC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset CC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk CC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey CC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Sussex CC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire CC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Borough Councils</th>
<th>Year Rev.</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkling &amp; Dagenham LBC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet LBC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley LBC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden LBC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield LBC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney LBC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham LBC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey LBC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow LBC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Upon Thames LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham LBC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Upon Thames LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark LBC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton LBC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets LBC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest LBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth LBC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster LBC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan District Councils</td>
<td>Year Rev.</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley MDC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley MDC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Tyneside MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Upon Tyne MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Tyneside MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell MDC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selton MDC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield MDC</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull MDC</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport MDC</td>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan MDC</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral MDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welsh Authorities</th>
<th>Year Rev.</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitary Authorities</th>
<th>Year Rev.</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath &amp; N E Somerset UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell Forest UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton &amp; Hove UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol City Council UA</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Riding of Yorkshire UA</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Council UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight Council UA</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Upon Hull UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester UA (City)</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesborough UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N E Lincolnshire UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lincolnshire Council UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Somerset Council UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester &amp; Gillingham UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Gloucestershire UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend on Sea UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindon UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wrekin UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbay UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York City Council UA</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1 Report available.

2 Report published but currently out of stock.

- The Joint Review Team produces a public report and summary of each local review. Review reports are available (price £15) from Audit Commission Publications, Bookpoint Ltd, 39 Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4TD, Telephone 0800 502030.

- Pilot reviews preceded the first year of reviews and no reports were published.

APPENDIX J

Joint Reviews Contact Details

Central Team
Joint Reviews of Local Authorities' Social Services
35-37 Grosvenor Gardens
LONDON SW1 O8S
Tel: 0171-630-0105
Fax: 0171-630-0182
Email: joint.reviews@audit-commission.gov.uk

The Joint Review Team will also be using other office bases including one in Cardiff.

Project Director Andrew Webster
✦ overall management, conduct and quality control of the Joint Reviews
✦ editorial decisions regarding report content, publicity and handling
✦ report presentation

Project Manager Richard Elliott
✦ review preparation and set-up meeting
✦ time slots for the review activities and report production
✦ programme and methodology queries

Information Manager Lloyd Davis
✦ user/carer questionnaire and referral analysis
✦ review finance and activity data, information sources and statistics
✦ data-based evidence used in report

Administration Team Phillip McCaughan
✦ location of Joint Review staff
✦ distribution and receipt of materials
✦ travel and accommodation arrangements

Reviewers

Lead Reviewer
✦ management of review in the authority
✦ decisions on review content and detailed planning arrangements (see Fieldwork Guide)
✦ feedback to authority on progress, initial findings and report draft

Other Reviewers
✦ responsibility for areas of case and fieldwork allocated by the Lead Reviewer
✦ providing concise findings and analysis in a format agreed by the Lead Reviewer
✦ assisting with feedback and reporting as required

Reviewers are best contacted via their mobile telephones which have a messaging service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mobile Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Ashcroft</td>
<td>0467-298-918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Mead</td>
<td>0385-724-751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Davies</td>
<td>01642-262-849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Oulton</td>
<td>0468-035-470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Horne</td>
<td>0117-941-6508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Smith</td>
<td>0370-647-339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Gosling</td>
<td>0370-542-075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Welch</td>
<td>0797-080-7116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Mansell</td>
<td>0468-035-467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Shuttleworth</td>
<td>0467-382-406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Simpson</td>
<td>0468-035-466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 1998
Joint Reviews of Local Authorities' Social Services
35-37 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0BS