



Developing new success reporting measures for the Care Inspectorate

Report to: Board
Date: 24 June 2016
Report by: Rami Okasha, Executive Director of Strategy and Improvement
Report No: B-07-2016
Agenda Item: 11

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To advise members of progress around the development of new success reporting measures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Board

1. Notes the work to date
2. Notes and discusses each of the key discussion questions under section 7.0
3. Agrees suitable amendments and to develop a revised success reporting framework for future Board meetings.

Version: 3.0	Status: <i>Final</i>	Date: 17/06/2016
--------------	----------------------	------------------

Version Control and Consultation Recording Form

Version	Consultation	Manager	Brief Description of Changes	Date
	Short Life Working Group	R Okasha	Extensive discussions across four meetings	Dec 2015 to Apr 2016
	Audit Committee	M Cairns	Discussion of progress	March and May 2016
	Partnership Forum (in correspondence)			April 2016
	All staff consultation (in correspondence)		Various changes and suggestions incorporated	April 2016

Equality Impact Assessment

Confirm that Involvement and Equalities Team have been informed
 YES NO

EIA Carried Out
 YES NO

If yes, please attach the accompanying EIA and appendix and briefly outline the equality and diversity implications of this policy.

If no, you are confirming that this report has been classified as an operational report and not a new policy or change to an existing policy (guidance, practice or procedure)
 Name: R Okasha
 Position: EDS&I

Authorised by Director Name: Date:

1.0 BACKGROUND

Performance reporting measures play an important role in the governance and public accountability of the Care Inspectorate. They contribute to public transparency about our work and impact, and allow the Board to exercise a governance role and assess organisational performance.

At the Board Strategic Event on 30 October 2015, significant work was undertaken to understand why performance against some KPIs had been consistently limited. The performance measures themselves were not seen to be telling the full story about the Care Inspectorate's range of work and the potential impact on people who use services. There was a strong desire to ensure that new measures were more clearly focused on outcomes and continuous improvement in the work of the Care Inspectorate. In December 2015, the Executive Director of Strategy and Improvement convened a short life working group to recommend new, more holistic performance measures.

2.0 CHANGES TO PERFORMANCE REPORTING DURING 2015/16

Two problems were identified in relation to our current performance framework. First, the nature of the reporting has, in some cases, led to over emphasis on statistical interpretations and not always allowed us to demonstrate the breadth of our work. Over the course of 2015/16, we changed the format of our Board reports to place more emphasis on including case studies which illustrate impact. Second, the current KPIs, MMs and QIs have, themselves, been largely quantitative which has resulted in a drive to meet targets, rather than to give sufficient prominence to the quality, impact and outcomes of our work. The revised measures are designed to address this.

3.0 APPROACH TAKEN BY THE SHORTLIFE WORKING GROUP

The group paid attention to recommendations by the Audit Commission that performance measures should have clarity of purpose, focus, alignment, balance, regular refinement, robust performance indicators. The group felt we should ensure our framework measures what we value, rather than value what we measure. This means seeking to demonstrate outcomes and impact where possible, with balance between short and long-term indicators, and a clear link to organisational values and objectives. The group also examined performance reports from other organisations, including the CQC, and the views of the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts on their approach.

4.0 THE NEED FOR A SINGLE REPORTING FRAMEWORK

The group noted that there is not a single performance reporting mechanism in the Care Inspectorate: some performance is reported through quarterly performance reports, some financial and workforce performance through the Resources Committee and some other reporting on statutory duties is

Version: 3.0	Status: <i>Final</i>	Date: 17/06/2016
--------------	----------------------	------------------

undertaken annually or biennially in discrete ways. The group recommends combining these into one reporting framework.

5.0 IMPROVING PERFORMANCE REPORTS

The group recommends that quarterly performance reports for the Board are improved by:

- ensuring they are strategic in nature, using a one-sheet scorecard with indicators to show Board members how our performance and success is going, as well as to help navigate through the document, and align to the Care Inspectorate's transformation plan
- expanding the range of case studies beyond care service inspection to include, for example, the impact of a complaint investigation, the impact of a strategic inspection, the impact of the work of a contact manager etc, and ensuring the reports more effectively illustrate our work in influencing external policy and demonstrate impact over time, not just a reporting cycle.
- aligning quarterly and annual reporting to show how we are meeting our corporate plan and the strategic objectives
- stating the executive or SMT level accountability and ownership of each aspect of our performance, including photos to make reporting and case studies more personal, and ensuring the reports are easily accessible to a range of audiences.
- demonstrating a golden thread to our strategic objectives throughout all aspects of our work from the corporate plan to directorate plans, team plans, and individual plans
- better incorporating financial and organisational development measures, including Best Value, but the group recognises that further work is necessary to incorporate these measures into a success reporting framework
- ensuring appropriate links between strategic and regulated care performance measures, so the measures should reflect the impact of both regulated care services scrutiny and joint strategic inspections so, unless defined differently, all suggested measures refer to both.

After discussion at the Audit Committee, it is also proposed to include illustrative information around the download of good practice guides on the Hub, a much stronger link to our strategic scrutiny work, and information on any information governance breaches that may have occurred.

6.0 PROPOSED MEASURES FOR 2016/17 AND BEYOND

The Policy Committee has recommended changing our six strategic objectives in the corporate plan into four and has agreed to recommend this approach to the Board in the June 2016 meeting. In order to future-proof the new performance measures, the group structured the proposed new measures around each of the four new strategic objectives. These are set out in

Version: 3.0	Status: <i>Final</i>	Date: 17/06/2016
--------------	----------------------	------------------

Appendix 1. Where challenges to the implementation have been identified, these have been noted also. A change to the language we use is also proposed, so that we refer clearly to “success measures” rather than the more deficit-based phrase “performance measures”.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

No additional financial resources are needed to collect data against most aspect of the proposed success framework, but investment in some areas may improve the quality of data and can be considered in due course. Some KPIs/ MMs will require development of new approaches and cannot be introduced for Q1. Indicative timescales are provided. Some organisational processes will need to be aligned to allow a single organisational-wide performance reporting framework to be developed.

8.0 BENEFITS FOR PEOPLE WHO USE SERVICES AND THEIR CARERS

Ensuring that the Care Inspectorate is open and transparent about our successes (or otherwise) is essential to maintaining credibility as a highly-performing scrutiny body able to support improvement. Ensuring that the Board is able to discharge its governance role requires it to be able to monitor organisational performance in order to provide the right level of challenge and support.

9.0 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS AND NEXT STEPS

Board members are asked to consider the following key discussion questions:

1. Whether the proposed outline structure of the success measures – reporting against each of the new strategic objectives – is helpful or whether an alternative structure is required.
2. The relative merits of each KPI / MM, noting that a more focused number is required than the 23 presented here
3. Whether additional measures are required to capture our strategic scrutiny and improvement activities, including around the link inspector role.
4. Whether the overall approach provides assurance the Board about the success of the Care Inspectorate across a range of activities.
5. What the appropriate target should in respect of each KPI.
6. How financial indicators can be reported in quarterly success reports.
7. Whether the proposed changes to quarterly success reports at section 3.0 are desirable, or if other changes are necessary.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 -** Possible new success reporting measures for 2016/17 - Proposas
Appendix 2 - Summary of performance reporting measures for 2015/16

Version: 3.0	Status: <i>Final</i>	Date: 17/06/2016
--------------	----------------------	------------------