Archwilydd Cyffredinol Cymru
Auditor General for Wales

WALES AUDIT OFFICE
SWYDDFA ARCHWILIO CYMRU

Caerphilly Council Data Quality Review 2015-16

Feedback

Sara-Jane Byrne – Performance Audit Lead
Phil Morgan – Performance Auditor

November 2015

What was the purpose of the Review?

- The review assessed the robustness of the Council's arrangements to check that performance data is accurately captured, calculated and reported in a timely manner.

- We examined the corporate arrangements and their application through testing the following six performance indicators (PIs):

  - **SCC025:** Percentage of appropriate statutory visits

  - **SCC037:** The average external qualifications point score for 16 year old looked after children, in any local authority maintained learning setting

  - **THS012:** The percentage of principal roads, non-principal (B) roads and non-principal C roads that are in overall poor condition

  - **Local:** The number of homes brought up to WHQS as recorded on annual return to Welsh Government

  - **Local:** Number of homes compliant with WHQs in respect of external elements or Number of homes compliant in terms of internal elements

  - **Local:** Percentage of cases who have had their risk of homelessness prevented by assistance to remain in their existing accommodation

Overall Findings

- The Council has further improved its data quality assurance arrangements, resulting in increasingly robust data quality in services measured both by national and local indicators.

- The Council is now in a better position to strengthen how it uses performance information to improve services.

Corporate Arrangements - Strengths

➢ Performance calendar in place with dates for data collection, data submission, self-assessment, CMT performance reports etc.

➢ Standardised CMT scorecard for Directorate performance reports

➢ PI owners are all provided with relevant statutory PI guidance

➢ Guidance and support is given on developing definitions for local PIs

➢ A range of general and tailored training opportunities provided by the corporate performance team for PI owners

Corporate Arrangements – Strengths (2)

➢ Accountability is being embedded in Directorates rather than performance data being owned in the centre

➢ A number of standard data collection and assessment forms used by the corporate centre to monitor data quality

➢ Corporate approach to risk assessing national and local PIs

➢ Target setting guidance is in place, although it is not prescriptive

➢ Good approach to addressing under-performance by putting in place remedial action

Specific PIs – Findings

- Across the six indicators checked there were no major issues of accuracy or process, indicating that corporate arrangements are effective.

- Definitions of PIs (national and local) are well understood by PI owners

- Increased focus on automated/mechanised approach to data collection – away from manual processes

- PI owners able to confidently and clearly demonstrate software and have worked hard to develop systems and processes to collate and analyse the necessary data to meet indicator definitions.

Specific PIs – Findings

- Changes in performance (good and bad) from 2013-14 to 2014-15 understood and explained well by PI owners

- Good examples of data wrongly added to databases found and deleted during the year, showing the impact of audits and checks carried out within the services

- Clear knowledge, and understanding, of corporate data quality processes

Proposals for further strengthening Data Quality Arrangements (1)

➢ Escalating cases of late or non completion of standard, corporate forms and returns (e.g. working papers) to ensure compliance

➢ Consider the development of more meaningful local PIs to help assess outcomes

➢ Minimising, where possible, the number of PIs where more than one software system is used by services to collect and analyse data – a situation that poses a potential risk to the accuracy of the data.

Proposals for further strengthening Data Quality Arrangements (2)

➢ Ensuring that relevant managers are clearer about how they can use their data to improve performance

➢ Focussing more, with corporate support, on local PI definitions to ensure that software systems are designed in a way to collect relevant data as accurately as possible

➢ Developing a more consistent approach, within service areas, to quality checking the work of officers responsible for data input