

Quality Indicator 6.4 – Performance management and quality assurance

Key factors - Extent to which:	Very Good Illustration	Weak Illustration
Performance management ensures high standards of service delivery	<p>We have developed and make effective use of a performance management framework. This includes measures which help us to gauge our progress in relation to national outcomes and local priorities. Reliable systems and processes are embedded across our service which enable us to generate, analyse and collate the required performance information. Our processes capture a range of performance information. This includes quantitative data about service delivery as well as qualitative data about people's experience of support and supervision, and the difference it is making.</p> <p>We can show that transparent reporting arrangements provide timely and reliable information. The data gathered is considered by senior leaders and used to measure the performance of our service and to influence continuous improvement within the service. It also supports wider local partnership improvement activity. Performance which falls below expectations is quickly identified and action is taken to correct this.</p> <p>Both aspirational and realistic targets for performance are set and trend data is regularly reviewed. We use data to ensure that strong performance is sustained over time. Where performance dips below expectations, corrective action is taken to achieve goals. We are not content to meet minimum standards, and continually strive to improve the quality of our work.</p>	<p>The scrutiny of performance is not robust or consistent. We do not have a coherent framework or schedule for performance management and reporting. We have not yet articulated performance measures based on locally determined priorities. The systems and processes for gathering performance data are limited, inefficient or inconsistently applied which affects the quality and reliability of information.</p> <p>The outcomes and indicators we do measure are not clearly or consistently reported and are not being used to set priorities and targets. There are gaps in our reporting and the rationale for not reporting on certain indicators is not clear. Performance reporting does not provide the level of detail needed to identify trends or inconsistencies in practice. Staff are therefore unable to use performance data to identify where improvement is needed and make changes.</p> <p>We cannot consistently demonstrate that we are meeting performance targets which limits our ability to confidently identify areas for improvement.</p> <p>Improvements are delivered in some areas of practice, but these are not informed by performance data. We are not sufficiently challenged to perform better by making targets more ambitious and do not have the data to evaluate whether targets remain appropriate.</p>

	<p>Improvements are made across all areas of our justice social work service using a planned and progressive approach. We make effective use of the resulting data to baseline performance, drive improvement and gauge progress against local and national outcomes.</p>	
<p>Quality assurance arrangements enable staff at every level to take responsibility for the quality of service</p>	<p>Processes are in place for the routine quality assurance of practice across the service. Our quality measures capture the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the delivery of core functions, including service user experiences of support and supervision.</p> <p>We draw on a range of tools and processes to gather both qualitative and quantitative data about the quality of our service delivery and the difference it is making. Robust reporting arrangements allow senior leaders to monitor the quality of practice over time. When variability in the quality of work is identified, effective solutions are put in place to remedy this. Our quality assurance systems are used to encourage a high standard and consistency of work by all staff.</p> <p>We can evidence a learning culture based on self-evaluation and collective learning and reflection. Managers and staff make effective use of quality assurance data to inform continuous improvement. We provide staff with high-quality, reflective supervision that supports, challenges and quality assures practice and decision-making. Together, these underpin our efforts to drive continuous improvement and ensure staff understand what they need to do to improve the quality of their work.</p>	<p>There are significant gaps in our quality assurance processes. Tools to support quality assurance activity are underdeveloped and processes are not routinely or consistently applied.</p> <p>We do not review the quality of all of our core functions, and we have not yet developed mechanisms to gather service users views about the quality of our service delivery. Consequently, we do not have a clear sense about our targets for improvement.</p> <p>Senior leadership oversight of the quality of practice is lacking and reporting mechanisms are not sufficiently well established. Staff believe that assuring the quality of the service is a management task and do not feel connected to quality assurance, self-evaluation, and improvement activities. The importance of quality assurance is not routinely discussed in supervision and there are limited forums focussed on improving standards of practice.</p>

Possible evidence to consider:

- Quality assurance framework
- Performance management framework
- Quality assurance tools
- Outcome measures and associated tools
- Data sets and how they are used within the organisation
- Data reports from a range of multi-agency groups
- Processes and procedures for quality assurance
- QA and performance training resources
- Reports to and from quality assurance/oversight groups
- Case records
- Supervision records
- Serious Incident Report processes and submissions
- Performance appraisals
- Team plans
- Annual reports