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**Community Justice Social Work – Self-Evaluation Framework**

Within the National Strategy for Community Justice: Delivery Plan, the Scottish Government has established a priority action to “ensure that those given community sentences are supervised and supported appropriately to protect the public, promote desistence from offending and enable rehabilitation by delivering high quality, consistently available, trauma-informed services and programmes” (Priority Action 5).

The purpose of this self-evaluation tool is to support you in considering the extent to which your service is able to measure and report on the performance, quality and outcomes of the justice services you provide to people on community based sentences.

There are two parts to this evaluation. In the first part, you are asked to consider your current approach to performance management, quality assurance and the measurement of outcomes. This is informed by our Quality Indicator 6.4 – Performance Management and Quality Assurance which has been adapted from [A guide to self-evaluation for community justice in Scotland](https://www.careinspectorate.com/images/documents/7234/A%20self-evaluation%20guide%20to%20support%20quality%20improvement%20for%20community%20justice%20in%20Scotland%20NOVEMBER%2023.pdf).

The second part looks at wider questions about the organisational capabilities and drivers that are supporting your performance management and quality assurance activity. It also helps to identify the barriers and what may be getting in the way of efficient, effective and responsive service delivery.

Self-evaluation for improvement is based on three questions:

* How are we doing?
* How do we know?
* What are we going to do next?

We have designed this framework to help you answer these three, high level questions. To help focus your thinking there are a series of prompt questions for each section to help you establish a baseline for your service. You may find it helpful to start with these questions to provide a structure for your thinking as you consider your overall rating for each element. The questions will also help you identify specific strengths or areas for improvement.

The [Guide to self-evaluation for community justice in Scotland](https://www.careinspectorate.com/images/documents/7234/A%20self-evaluation%20guide%20to%20support%20quality%20improvement%20for%20community%20justice%20in%20Scotland%20NOVEMBER%2023.pdf) notes that ‘Self-evaluation can only be as reliable as the evidence supporting it” (p7). Therefore, for each question, you are asked to indicate the evidence that supports your rating. You are encouraged to be specific about the data sources and documents that would support your rating, and to consider a range of qualitative and quantitative sources. If you don’t have available evidence that’s okay. Don’t work to (re)create it – just note it as an area for improvement.

Within each section we have also included a specific question about the tools and systems you are using to support your measurement of performance, quality and outcomes. These may include nationally developed tools like the CJSW report audit tool, or the Care Inspectorate’s file reading template. They may also include locally developed tools, or systems and processes that have been developed externally, such as Outcome Star. We would be grateful if you can provide details of any tools or systems that you are using to allow us to map practice nationally. The information you provide will be aggregated and shared with the SWS Justice standing Committee to inform the work and priorities of the SWS sub-group for Performance and Quality Assurance.

Throughout this form, a four point rating scale is used. Broadly the terms used should be interpreted as follows:

* Not at all – work on this area has not commenced, or there is a gap in relation to this area of work. This is a clear area for improvement.
* Partially – some key elements are in place, but there are gaps and areas which require further work to ensure systems and processes work.
* Mostly – most of the key elements are in place. There are minor areas for improvement, but overall, systems and processes work well.
* Fully – systems and processes are working well. While there are aspirations to continually improve, there are no significant gaps.

The data you share via this self-evaluation will be used to inform a thematic report. No data will be attributed to individual local authorities. Details on how we use information you share with us can be found in our privacy notice.

**LOCAL AUTHORITY AREA:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**PART 1 – PERFORMANCE, QUALITY AND OUTCOMES**

|  |
| --- |
| **1a MEASURING PERFORMANCE** |

**How effectively are you able to measure the performance of your service in delivering support and supervision for people on community sentences?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent can you demonstrate the following:** | | **Rating** | | | | | **What is the evidence for this rating?** | | | |
| Not at all | Partially | | Mostly | Fully |
| We have a clear and comprehensive performance management framework | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | |
| We have a set of clearly articulated KPIs relating to our core functions | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | |
| We have processes and tools in place to ensure we routinely gather and collate data regarding our core functions | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | |
| We are able to evidence improvement initiatives informed by performance data | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | |
| **Overall Rating** | Not at all | | | Partially | | | | Mostly | Fully | |
|  | | |  | | | |  |  | |
| **Provide a rationale for your overall rating and reference any sources of evidence not covered in the questions above:** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Please provide details about any specific tools or systems you are using to gather, analyse or report performance data:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Tool (with description if required)** | | | | | | | | | | **Local/National/External** |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **1b QUALITY ASSURANCE** | | | | | | | | | | |

**How effectively are you measuring the quality of work you undertake to support and supervise people on community sentences?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent can you demonstrate the following:** | | **Rating** | | | | | **What is the evidence for this rating?** | | | | |
| Not at all | Partially | | Mostly | Fully |
| We have a clear and comprehensive quality assurance framework | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We have a set of clearly articulated quality measures relating to our core functions | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We have processes and tools in place to ensure we routinely gather and collate data regarding the quality of our work | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We are able to evidence improvement initiatives informed by quality assurance data | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| **Overall Rating** | Not at all | | | Partially | | | | Mostly | | Fully | |
|  | | |  | | | |  | |  | |
| **Provide a rationale for your overall rating and reference any sources of evidence not covered in the questions above:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Please provide details about any specific tools or systems you are using to support quality assurance activity:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Tool (with description if required)** | | | | | | | | | **Local/National/External** | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **1c MEASURING OUTCOMES** |

**How effectively are you measuring the difference your delivery of community sentences is making to people on community sentences?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent can you demonstrate the following:** | | **Rating** | | | | | **What is the evidence for this rating?** | | | | |
| Not at all | Partially | | Mostly | Fully |
| We have a set of clearly articulated outcomes measures which reflect local and national priorities. | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We have a set of clearly articulated outcomes measures to capture improved wellbeing and life chances for people who use our services | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We have processes and tools in place to ensure we routinely gather and collate data regarding the difference our services are making. | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| We can evidence improvement activity that has been informed outcome data | |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | |
| **Overall Rating** | Not at all | | | Partially | | | | Mostly | | Fully | |
|  | | |  | | | |  | |  | |
| **Provide a rationale for your overall rating and reference any sources of evidence not covered in the questions above:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Please provide details about any specific tools you are using to supporting the measurement or reporting of outcomes:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Tool (with description if required)** | | | | | | | | | **Local/National/External** | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | |

**PART 2 – ORGANISATIONAL DRIVERS AND CAPABILITIES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent do the following elements support your performance and quality assurance activity?** | **Rating** | | | | **What is the evidence for this rating?** |
| Not at all | Partially | Mostly | Fully |  |
| **A culture of learning and continuous improvement**  Characterised by:   * Reflective practice * Promotion of accountability at all levels * Investment in learning * A focus on involving people who use services * An evidence led approach to change |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Leadership**  Characterised by:   * a focus on performance and quality * ownership over QA processes * modelling a commitment to improvement * actively celebrating strengths and addressing performance issues |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Governance**  Characterised by:   * agreed reporting structures for performance, quality and outcome data * engaged and informed senior leaders * established levels of accountability * data that is integrated into wider planning and performance systems |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge and expertise**  Characterised by:   * staff equipped with necessary skills, knowledge and behaviours * dedicated performance and QA expertise * clearly defined methodologies and metrics to support performance and QA activity |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Resources**  Characterised by:   * capacity to undertake performance and QA activity * Tools in place to support processes * IT systems and technology to support data gathering and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |

**CONCLUSION**

|  |
| --- |
| **Having completed your self-evaluation, what is your current capacity for improvement and what barriers do you see?** |
|  |
| **What are your priority areas for improvement?** (A brief bullet point list will suffice) |
|  |