

## Quality Assurance quarterly review Q1 2016 – 2017: Final Report

### Assessment

31 cases were selected for Quality Assurance (QA) in Quarter 1 and reviews were carried out all of these cases in Sept/Oct 2016.

### Process

All cases were assessed under four areas – process, decision-making, communication and delay, and areas of learning were identified. In addition, examples of best practice were recorded.

### Key Findings

The Q1 findings show that, in the vast majority of cases, the complaints are progressed at all stages in accordance with the standards expected. A recurring issue, however, is that staff are not acknowledging the perceived injustice or the complainant's situation and the impact this has had on them.

**RED** – must dos/remember; **AMBER** – to be aware of and **GREEN** – good/best practice.

Issues picked up as follows (i.e. a 'No' scored in one or more of the questions in the following sections for each case):

Process	3
Communication	18
Decision-Making	5
Delay	1

#### RED

- N/A

#### AMBER

- Remember to acknowledge the complainant's situation and the impact this has had on them.
- Remember to acknowledge the perceived injustice.
- Remember to refer outcomes sought in final decision.
- In one case, we initially incorrectly informed the complainant that the decision to remove them from the practice list was a discretionary decision which could not be looked at.
- In one case, there was a delay in recognising that the complainant would require large font responses.

#### GREEN

We found good practice or exemplary service in a variety of ways:

- Good examples of proportionality guidance being used.
- In one case, we identified excellent handling from start to finish, including early identification that the case should be fast-tracked. The complaint's reviewer's investigation was probing and thorough and the decision is clear, succinct and powerful, leading to significant changes and redress for the complainant.
- In one case, we found excellent examples of the complaints reviewer asking probing questions and not taking the initial responses from the organisation being complained about at face value.
- In one case staff spotted at entry point that the complainant required large font responses.
- In another case, we found an example of a complaints reviewer asking probing questions and not taking responses at face value.

## Conclusions

The evidence shows that the standard of investigation is high and our findings are impactful.

A recurring finding in this, and previous QA, is that the outcomes sought and perceived injustice are not reflected in the decision letters. The decision letter template was amended last year to prompt staff to address this and managers have been asked to remind staff about this. The next quarter QA will assess whether this has made an impact.

All comments and examples will be fed back to individuals by their line manager as part of the performance management process. This summary of key findings will be made available to all teams, managers and the Senior Management team, and is also presented at the quarterly Service Improvement Group meeting.

## Recommendations & actions

	<b>Recommendation</b>
1	All individual issues to be fed back to complaints reviewers by managers, as well as highlighting to complaints reviewers areas of good practice picked up in QA.