

Scottish Social Services Council

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

A G E N D A

1. Apologies
2. Minutes previous meetings
 - a) LASWS 24.6.14 – accuracy
 - b) MHOS 7.10.13 - accuracy
3. Minutes previous meeting
 - a) LASWS 24.6.14 – matters arising
 - b) MHOS 7.10.13 – matters arising
4. Creation of Local Authority Data Providers Group
5. MHO data collection and submission (see paper)
6. Findings of LASWS collection survey (see paper)
7. Quality assurance of administrative data (see paper)
8. December 2014 census
9. Services to be delivered by HSCPs (see paper)
10. Evaluation of SSSC workforce data site (see paper)
11. AOB
12. DONM

SCOTTISH SOCIAL SERVICES COUNCIL

**DRAFT MINUTES OF LOCAL AUTHORITY WORKFORCE DATA PROVIDERS
GROUP MEETING**

Wednesday 12th November 2014, 1.30 – 3.30pm

Millennium Hotel, George Square, Glasgow

<p>1. Attendance and apologies</p>	<p>Attendees</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Mike Docherty (Chair)</td><td>SSSC</td></tr> <tr><td>James Arnold</td><td>SSSC</td></tr> <tr><td>Phil McNicol</td><td>SSSC</td></tr> <tr><td>Susan Kinnear</td><td>SSSC</td></tr> <tr><td>Julie Wilson</td><td>South Lanarkshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Leeann McAvoy</td><td>Glasgow City</td></tr> <tr><td>Brenda Tulloch</td><td>Aberdeenshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Alison McCann</td><td>Aberdeenshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Donna Neilson</td><td>East Ayrshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Shona Shirkie</td><td>North Lanarkshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Louise McNally</td><td>North Lanarkshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Shabida Naeem</td><td>Dundee City</td></tr> <tr><td>Ann McCann</td><td>Renfrewshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Andrew Brown</td><td>Renfrewshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Shona Hutchinson</td><td>Aberdeenshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Karen Wilson</td><td>Stirling</td></tr> <tr><td>Carol Slessor</td><td>Aberdeen City</td></tr> <tr><td>Janette McKie</td><td>East Renfrewshire CHCP</td></tr> <tr><td>Matthew Dunn</td><td>Midlothian</td></tr> <tr><td>Suzanne Robertson</td><td>Fife</td></tr> <tr><td>Yvonne Dobbie</td><td>Fife</td></tr> <tr><td>Kathleen Kennedy</td><td>Inverclyde CHCP</td></tr> <tr><td>Susan Frodsham</td><td>East Dunbartonshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Andrea Connolly</td><td>Inverclyde CHCP</td></tr> </table> <p>Apologies</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Alison Ramsay</td><td>Perth & Kinross</td></tr> <tr><td>Bob Lesley</td><td>Renfrewshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Duncan Lavelle</td><td>North Ayrshire</td></tr> <tr><td>Jan Farrell</td><td>Perth & Kinross</td></tr> </table>	Mike Docherty (Chair)	SSSC	James Arnold	SSSC	Phil McNicol	SSSC	Susan Kinnear	SSSC	Julie Wilson	South Lanarkshire	Leeann McAvoy	Glasgow City	Brenda Tulloch	Aberdeenshire	Alison McCann	Aberdeenshire	Donna Neilson	East Ayrshire	Shona Shirkie	North Lanarkshire	Louise McNally	North Lanarkshire	Shabida Naeem	Dundee City	Ann McCann	Renfrewshire	Andrew Brown	Renfrewshire	Shona Hutchinson	Aberdeenshire	Karen Wilson	Stirling	Carol Slessor	Aberdeen City	Janette McKie	East Renfrewshire CHCP	Matthew Dunn	Midlothian	Suzanne Robertson	Fife	Yvonne Dobbie	Fife	Kathleen Kennedy	Inverclyde CHCP	Susan Frodsham	East Dunbartonshire	Andrea Connolly	Inverclyde CHCP	Alison Ramsay	Perth & Kinross	Bob Lesley	Renfrewshire	Duncan Lavelle	North Ayrshire	Jan Farrell	Perth & Kinross	
Mike Docherty (Chair)	SSSC																																																									
James Arnold	SSSC																																																									
Phil McNicol	SSSC																																																									
Susan Kinnear	SSSC																																																									
Julie Wilson	South Lanarkshire																																																									
Leeann McAvoy	Glasgow City																																																									
Brenda Tulloch	Aberdeenshire																																																									
Alison McCann	Aberdeenshire																																																									
Donna Neilson	East Ayrshire																																																									
Shona Shirkie	North Lanarkshire																																																									
Louise McNally	North Lanarkshire																																																									
Shabida Naeem	Dundee City																																																									
Ann McCann	Renfrewshire																																																									
Andrew Brown	Renfrewshire																																																									
Shona Hutchinson	Aberdeenshire																																																									
Karen Wilson	Stirling																																																									
Carol Slessor	Aberdeen City																																																									
Janette McKie	East Renfrewshire CHCP																																																									
Matthew Dunn	Midlothian																																																									
Suzanne Robertson	Fife																																																									
Yvonne Dobbie	Fife																																																									
Kathleen Kennedy	Inverclyde CHCP																																																									
Susan Frodsham	East Dunbartonshire																																																									
Andrea Connolly	Inverclyde CHCP																																																									
Alison Ramsay	Perth & Kinross																																																									
Bob Lesley	Renfrewshire																																																									
Duncan Lavelle	North Ayrshire																																																									
Jan Farrell	Perth & Kinross																																																									
<p>2. Previous minutes - accuracy</p>	<p>a) LASWS No points of accuracy were raised. b) MHO No points of accuracy were raised.</p>																																																									
<p>3. Previous minutes – matters arising</p>	<p>a) LASWS No matters arose. b) MHO No matters arose.</p>																																																									
<p>4. Creation of Local Authority Data Providers</p>	<p>MD laid out the proposal for merging the LASWS and MHO census survey groups to form a single Local Authority Data Providers Group that covers both surveys. All agreed that</p>																																																									

Group	this was sensible.	
5. MHO data collection and submission	<p>It was noted that in the two LAs that didn't have any queries on their 2013 MHO data, the LASWS and MHO contacts sat down together to ensure everything added up. PMcN encouraged all LAs to take a similar approach to the 2014 data collection exercise, as some 2013 data quality issues were due to a lack of communication between LASWS and MHO contacts.</p> <p>2013 collection: Overall there were 71 queries to 30 LAs.</p> <p>Total Staffing Hours: It was clarified that this should only take into account time spent on sourcing and checking the MHO data.</p> <p>A definitional issue regarding whether the headcount is people or posts was raised. There may be some interpretation issues when a staff member holds more than one MHO post in the same authority. It was clarified that LASWS is a count of people in posts, not just people.</p> <p>MHO numbers in specialist and non-specialist teams sometimes did not add up to the Summary totals. There was also some confusion about where to allocate duty rota MHOs.</p> <p>Trainees: PMcN noted that LAs should cross check the Table 7 total with the Summary trainees total.</p> <p>Leavers: Five authorities had fewer leavers than expected from their drop in headcount from 2012 to 2013. It was clarified that an MHO who drops MHO duties but still remains a social worker in the same post is regarded as an MHO leaver (but not a LASWS leaver). Such leavers should be included in the MHO data tab, but not in the LASWS leavers tab.</p> <p>It was revealed that zero-hours/casual MHOs were not counted in the 2013 headcount if they hadn't worked in the week of the census. It was further revealed that in general people on ZHCs were excluded from the LASWS Staff tab if they had not worked in the week of the census. PMcN confirmed that MHOs must be counted if they have worked at any point within the 12 months prior to the census date, and that zero hours/casual MHOs should be included, provided that their contract is active on the census date. If the contract of a ZHC/casual MHO ceases during the 12 months prior to the census date, the MHO should be recorded as a leaver (see also item 8 below).</p> <p>Stirling, Clackmannanshire and Falkirk share MHOs – this can therefore create confusion when calculating leavers.</p> <p>The SSSC will consider the leavers issues and present some</p>	<p>LAs</p> <p>WIT</p>

	guidance for this.	
6. Findings of LASWS data collection survey	<p>Mike spoke to his paper which presented summaries of responses from local authorities about the provision of certain data items in the LASWS data collection exercise. The paper provides a useful clarification of how/whether these variables are collected and reveals the extent of varying practice amongst local authority data providers. In one or two cases, there seems to be a discrepancy between what authorities told us in their response, and their actual data recording practice (e.g. start date in post/organisation).</p> <p>It was agreed that the Country of Birth data item would be dropped from the census.</p> <p>Some authorities asked for clarification on category 02 (Flexitime (<i>flexible working hours</i>)) of Main Nature of Working Hours Pattern. It was pointed out that a worker could be on flexitime and also do a four-and-a-half day week (09), or compressed working (13) etc. The WIT undertook to review this category.</p> <p>MD said that the next step will involve approaching individual authorities to further clarify their recording practice, and the Workforce Intelligence Team (WIT) will then consider how best to address these disparate recording issues.</p>	<p>WIT</p> <p>WIT</p> <p>WIT</p>
7. Quality Assurance of Administrative Data	<p>MD described the role of the UK Statistics Authority (UKSA) to regulate statistical publications and ensure compliance with the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. The SSSC is a producer of Official Statistics (e.g. the Workforce Data Report) and National Statistics (e.g. the MHO Report). Recently the UKSA has found that certain published statistics fall short of the rigorous requirements of the Code of Practice (e.g. Crime statistics in England), and has de-designated them as National Statistics.</p> <p>Administrative data is data recorded primarily for operational and service provision purposes which is also then used to create statistics. The UKSA has undertaken a consultation exercise with a view to publishing official guidance on how to quality assure (QA) administrative data that underpins Official/National Statistics. The consultation closed at the end of September 2014 and the SSSC will meet with the Care Inspectorate in December to consider the implications of the final published QA guidance.</p> <p>This affects Scottish local authorities as the LASWS data is administrative data which is used to produce the Workforce Data Report and the MHO Report. In 2015 the SSSC will contact local authorities regarding their quality assurance procedures.</p>	

	<p>It was commented that data entered at the outset of a worker's employment with an authority is unlikely to be checked later – for example, if the wrong date of birth is entered when a person starts, it is unlikely to be checked and corrected later. However, in some authorities, audits of HR systems are carried out.</p> <p>MD concluded by saying that the WIT will be in touch with authorities in due course to take this task forward.</p>	WIT
<p>8. December 2014 census</p>	<p>The following dates were agreed:</p> <p>LASWS census date: Monday 1st December 2014 Data submission deadline: Friday 13th March 2015</p> <p>If an authority's data submission is not received within two weeks of the deadline (i.e. by Friday 27th March 2015), senior managers in that authority will be approached.</p> <p>PMcN and JA stated that the Instructions for Completion of Census Data document has been updated and enhanced – for example, it now contains guidance on the completion of the MHO data tab of the Excel workbook.</p> <p>It was confirmed that all staff with a contract which is active on the census date should be included in the Staff tab of the census data workbook. Staff who had an active contract with the authority on the 2013 census date, and who left post during the year up to 1st December 2014 should be included in the Leavers tab.</p> <p>It was commented that there should be an Absence sub-category of "short-term sickness absence" in data item Employee status, in view of the fact that we have added the proviso of "3 months or more" to code O2A "Long-term sickness absence". The WIT undertook to address this issue. Some authorities requested clarification of the distinction between "Fixed term" and "Temporary" in data item Contract type. The WIT undertook to provide this clarification.</p> <p>It was agreed that the screen shots in Part 4 of the Instructions for Completion document will be retained as they are useful. Furthermore, they will be provided in old and new formats as different authorities have different versions of Microsoft Excel.</p> <p>Starters/Leavers Tool: some authorities reported that this tool is useful only after it has been "tweaked". No authority can use it as it stands. Notwithstanding this, it was agreed that the tool should be kept, and that work will be done to make it more useful as it stands – e.g. to allow the tool to be applied before anonymisation of the data.</p> <p>The WIT undertook to improve the tool in due course, but</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WIT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WIT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WIT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WIT</p>

	not in time for the 2014 census.	
9. Services to be delivered by HSCPs	<p>MD emphasised the importance of effective engagement by the SSSC with the forthcoming Health & Social Care Partnerships (HSCPs). The WIT's recent survey of the expected deployment of local authority staff from April 2015 shows that about a third of authorities haven't yet made up their minds about how certain key services will be delivered. It also shows that about a third of authorities do not expect to place their Children's services or Adoption & Fostering services with their HSCP.</p> <p>It seems likely that the current LASWS/MHO data contacts will largely remain. However, answers are required to some key questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will be the boundaries of the LASWS survey after April 2015? • What collaboration will be necessary between SSSC and NHS Scotland's ISD to achieve comprehensive and useful workforce information and intelligence in relation to HSCPs? <p>MD undertook to keep the group informed of developments in this area.</p>	MD
10. Evaluation of SSSC data website	<p>MD spoke to his paper summarising responses to the data site stakeholders survey carried out during the summer. He stated that a meeting with MTC, the site developers, would be held to discuss and agree developments to the site in line with stakeholders' wishes, as far as budgetary constraints will allow. However, at the moment there are no plans to improve the currency (up-to-dateness) of our workforce data, as this would require a major re-design of the SSSC and CI data collection processes and agreement from around 14,000 stakeholders.</p> <p>The WIT undertook to keep the group informed of developments in this regard.</p>	WIT
11. AOB	<p>East Dunbartonshire asked which department in local authorities tends to be responsible for completing the LASWS return. After consulting round the table, it turned out that in most authorities it is the HR department's responsibility. However, in two authorities it is the responsibility of the social services themselves, in two others it is the Social Work HR team, in another the Health & Social Care Performance team, in another the Quality & Development team and in another the Training department.</p>	
12. DONM	To be decided.	

Scottish Social Services Council

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

Item 5

MHO Data Collection & Submission – areas for improvement

Below is a list of areas which need to be considered/addressed in terms of improving the quality/completeness of the MHO data submitted for the 2014 census:

1) Overwriting the pre-set formulae in the MHO data tab:

The pre-set formulae in the MHO data tab draw data into the tab from other parts of the LASWS data workbook. More details about exactly what data is sourced in this way and from where are contained in the Appendix to this paper "MHO Data Quality Assurance Report – 2013" and in the draft "LASWS Return 2014 – Instructions for Completion" document.

Authorities should only overwrite these formulae **if there is a good reason to do so** – e.g. if the MHO data contact can clearly see that the sourced data is incorrect, and there isn't time to rectify the relevant data in other LASWS data tabs before the return submission date. Where formulae are overwritten by directly entered numerical data, a note should be provided alongside that section of the MHO return to explain why.

2) 2013 MHO data submissions which were free of errors:

Two authorities (Aberdeen City and East Dunbartonshire) submitted MHO data for 2013 which was free of errors – what can we learn from these authorities to improve data quality?

3) Definitional issues:

Is it clear what staff to include in the MHO data return? For example, do authorities include satellite MHOs in their return? How do authorities deal with MHOs who relinquish some MHO duties – in other words, how many duties does an MHO have to relinquish before they stop being an MHO?

4) Trainees

The headcount of trainees in the Overall Summary, the total number in Table 7 and the number of records flagged "2" in the MHO column of the LASWS Staff tab should all be the same.

5) Specialist and Non-specialist teams

Headcount/WTE data for Specialist and Non-specialist Teams (tables 2 & 3) must add up to the Overall Summary totals, and WTE data in both tables must be the total WTE for those staff, not just the proportion that they spend on MHO work.

6) Staffing hours

The "staffing hours" figure should be the amount of time actually spent sourcing and compiling the data, and should not include "dead" time waiting for colleagues to respond with figures. Please provide your best estimate to the nearest hour for this figure.

7) Leavers

The total number of leavers recorded in Table 8 should equal the number of leaver records flagged as "Yes" in the "MHO Post?" column in the LASWS Leavers tab. Also, if an authority shows a net drop in headcount between 2013 and 2014, the total number of leavers should be the same as or more than that difference.

Phil McNicol
Data Analyst
SSSC
October 2014

Appendix 1

MHO Data Quality Assurance report – 2013

1) Integration of MHO data return into LASWS data return

2013 was the first year that the MHO data return was integrated into the LASWS data return. This was done by introducing a new MHO tab containing the MHO data tables into the LASWS data return workbook, and populating some of those tables with counts of MHO-flagged records drawn from other tabs in the workbook. Although the provision of MHO data at an individual staff member level will undoubtedly be advantageous in the long-run, the integration provided some challenges for the 2013 data quality assurance process.

The following data in the MHO tab of the LASWS workbook should be drawn from other tabs in the workbook:

- Overall summary (practising MHOs and trainees, headcount & WTE)
- Age, gender and ethnicity
- Total leavers (but not the breakdown by reason for leaving)
- Unavailable MHOs

This year's MHO data QA involved not only the usual logic and sanity checks within the boundaries of this year's and last year's MHO data, but also the read-across between the MHO-flagged LASWS data records and the numeric data contained in the MHO section of the LASWS return. There were many instances of mismatch between numeric data in the MHO data tab and counts of corresponding records in the Staff, Vacancies and Leavers tabs of the LASWS return across the 30 authorities for which queries were necessary. In quite a few instances, authorities had overwritten the data sourcing formulae in the MHO tab with numeric values. The reasons for this are not always clear; perhaps the MHO data provider was dubious about the robustness of the MHO records contained in the other tabs, or perhaps it was simply a mistake.

Here is a summary of queries to authorities involving a mismatch between records in LASWS tabs and numeric data in the MHO tab:

LASWS tab	No. of queries
Staff	8
Vacancies	1
Leavers	9
Total	18

2) MHO data queries analysis

The data for two authorities was free of errors and no queries were necessary. At the other end of the spectrum, two authorities failed to provide any MHO data in their initial LASWS submission. Three authorities submitted their LASWS return with most of the MHO data missing. In total, there were 71 queries made to 30 authorities about gaps and anomalies in the 2013 MHO data. These queries were made after all feasible rectification of the data by the SSSC data analyst. The following tables present those queries by query type, by return section and by authority:

Summary of Queries about 2013 MHO data returns: by query type

Query	No. of authorities
Staffing hours missing	13
Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals (headcount, WTE or both)	12
Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab	9
Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab	6
Leavers shortfall	5
Most MHO data initially missing	3
Missing WTE data from Tables 2 and/or 3	3
All MHO data initially missing	2
Table 6b total exceeds summary total	2
Mismatch between Tables 6a & 6b	2
Table 3 "Average hours/week" gives total hours, instead of per person	2
Staffing hours wrongly keyed	1
Table 3 initially blank	1
Mismatch between vacancies in Part 9a and Vacancies tab	1
Incorrect WTE data in Table 4	1
Ethnicity recording issue because of transposition of Ethnic group categories	1
Incorrect data in Table 6b	1
Table 3 "Average hours/week" entry formatted strangely	1
Mismatch between Staff tab, overall summary, trainees and unavailable MHOs	1
Entry in Table 6a exceeds summary total	1
Overall total overstated (incorrectly includes an unavailable MHO)	1
Wrongful distribution of MHOs between Tables 2, 3 & 4	1
Mismatch between WTE data in Staff tab and in overall summary and Table 2	1

Summary of Queries about 2013 MHO data returns: by return section

Query	No. of authorities
Staffing hours	14
Overall Summary	1
Tables 1a & 1b: Gender, age, ethnicity	1
Tables 2 & 3: Specialist/non-specialist teams	19
Table 4: Exclusive MHOs	1
Table 5: Rota duty	0
Tables 6a & 6b: MHO work	6
Table 7: Trainees	6
Table 8: Leavers	14
Part 9A: Unfilled exclusive MHO vacancies	1
Part 9B: Unavailable MHOs	0
Part 9C: MHO shortfalls	0
Part 9D: Particular client group shortfalls	0
Queries which span two or more return sections	8

It can be clearly seen that the sections with the greatest numbers of errors are:

a) Specialist/non-specialist teams: 12 out of 19 queries were because Tables 2 & 3 totals failed to add up to the summary total. In addition, one authority provided no WTE data for either table, and one authority provided no WTE data for Table 3. For the report, the missing WTE data was imputed. It became clear through correspondence with authorities that some of them think that the WTE figures required for these tables relate only to time spent on MHO work, and they claim that the large fluctuations in that time make WTE data impossible to calculate. In fact the full contracted WTE is required.

b) Staffing hours: 13 out of 14 queries were about missing data; the remaining one was about an inflated number through miskeying. Furthermore, the variability in staffing hours across authorities together with correspondence with some authorities revealed that the understanding of how to calculate them is far from consistent.

c) Leavers: about two-thirds of the 14 queries related to a mismatch between the numbers in Table 8 and the LASWS leavers tab. The rest were about a shortfall in the number of leavers in relation to the drop in headcount from last year to this

Summary of Queries about 2013 MHO data returns – full list by authority

Authority	Queries
Aberdeen City	None
Aberdeenshire	All MHO data initially missing; Table 6b total exceeds summary total
Angus	Staffing hours missing; Most MHO data initially missing; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
Argyll and Bute	Mismatch between Tables 6a & 6b; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary headcount total; Missing WTE data from Tables 2 & 3
Clackmannanshire	Staffing hours missing; Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab
Dumfries and Galloway	Staffing hours wrongly keyed; Leavers shortfall; Table 3 initially blank; Table 3 "Average hours/week" gives total hours, instead of per person; Mismatch between vacancies in Part 9a and Vacancies tab
Dundee City	Staffing hours missing; No WTE data for Table 3
East Ayrshire	Staffing hours missing; Incorrect WTE data in Table 4

Authority	Queries
East Dunbartonshire	None
East Lothian	Leavers shortfall
East Renfrewshire	Staffing hours missing; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
Edinburgh City	All MHO data initially missing
Falkirk	Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary WTE total; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
Fife	Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Ethnicity recording issue because of transposition of Ethnic group categories
Glasgow City	Leavers shortfall; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
Highland	Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Incorrect data in Table 6b
Inverclyde	Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals
Midlothian	Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab
Moray	Staffing hours missing; Most MHO data initially missing; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary WTE total

Authority	Queries
North Ayrshire	Staffing hours missing; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
North Lanarkshire	Staffing hours missing; Leavers shortfall; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Table 6b total exceeds summary total
Orkney Islands	Staffing hours missing; Most MHO data initially missing
Perth and Kinross	Staffing hours missing; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary WTE total; Table 3 "Average hours/week" entry formatted strangely; Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab
Renfrewshire	Staffing hours missing; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab
Scottish Borders	Staffing hours missing; Tables 2 & 3 don't add up to summary totals; Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab
Shetland Islands	Table 3 "Average hours/week" gives total hours, instead of per person
South Ayrshire	Mismatch between Staff tab, overall summary, trainees and unavailable MHOs; Entry in Table 6a exceeds summary total; Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab

Authority	Queries
South Lanarkshire	Staffing hours missing; Mismatch between Tables 6a & 6b
Stirling	Overall total overstated (incorrectly includes an unavailable MHO); Wrongful distribution of MHOs between Tables 2, 3 & 4; WTE data for Tables 2 & 3 not available
West Dunbartonshire	Mismatch between trainees in overall summary, Table 7 and Staff tab
West Lothian	Leavers shortfall; Mismatch between WTE data in Staff tab and in overall summary and Table 2
Western Isles	Mismatch between leavers in Table 8 and Leavers tab

Scottish Social Services Council

Meeting of

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

Item 6

Findings from LASWS Collection survey

Summaries of responses from local authorities to the questions about the data provided in the LASWS are set out below. By the end of October responses had been received from all 32 local authorities in Scotland. This paper is the initial feedback on the survey findings. It is currently also intended to contact authorities individually about the findings.

Vacancies

There appears to have been a move away from the concept of an “establishment” for calculating the number of social work posts that an authority should have. As table 1 shows just over half still use the establishment method.

Table 1: Local authority use of “establishment” for calculating number of posts/vacancies

	Does the local authority use an “establishment” figure for posts to calculate vacancies?
Yes	18
No	13
Don't know	1

Table 2 shows that at least 27 of the authorities calculate vacancies using the concept of whole or full-time equivalent posts. We will be in touch with those authorities that are currently unsure about what they do and those that do not submit, to clarify the reasons for this.

Table 2: Calculation of vacancies

	Does the local authority use calculate vacancies in WTEs or posts?
WTEs	26
Posts	1
Both	1
Don't provide either	2
Don't know	2

Ethnicity, country of birth and migrant workers

Data on the ethnicity of staff is gathered by all local authorities. However just under half do not use the current Scottish Government classification system (table 3). Only a quarter of local authorities said that they record the country of birth (table 4) of their employees and just over a third whether someone is a migrant worker (table 5).

I think the latter response may be based on a misunderstanding as there are legal obligations on employers who employ migrant workers which include keeping records of who they are. We will clarify this further with the respondents who indicated no records are kept.

Table 3: Ethnicity classification

	Does your local authority use the Scottish Government's current ethnicity classification?
Yes	18
No	14
Don't know	0

Table 4: County of birth

	Does your local authority record the country of birth of its staff?
Yes	8
No	24
Don't know	0

Table 5: Migrant workers

	Does your local authority record whether staff are migrant workers?
Yes	12
No	18
Don't know	2

Start dates and postcodes

While all authorities record the date at which an individual joined the organisation (table 7) only two-thirds keep track of them starting in particular posts (table 6). Only 5 authorities can't currently provide the full postcode location of staff (table 8). We will seek clarification from those 5 authorities about timescales for moving towards full postcode location information.

Table 6: Start date in post

	Does your local authority record the start date in post of staff?
Yes	22
No	10
Don't know	0

Table 7: Start date in organisation

	Does your local authority record the start date in the organisation for staff?
Yes	32
No	0
Don't know	0

Table 8: Postcode location

	Is your authority able to provide the postcode location of all staff?
Yes	27
No	5
Don't know	0

Conclusion

Given the issues raised at the LASWS Group meeting in June this year it was important to clarify practice amongst our data providers in relation to a number of variables. This has helpfully allowed us to gather information on the extent of differing practices between the local authority data providers.

Following reporting of these findings to the local authority data providers group in November, it is our intention to go back to local authorities individually to obtain clarification in relation to some of the matters set out above. Once that has been done the SSSC's Workforce Intelligence team will report back to the Data Providers Group and others on the implications of this for future data collections and publications.

Mike Docherty
Intelligence Manager
SSSC
October 2014

Scottish Social Services Council

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

Item 7

Quality assurance of administrative data

Introduction

This paper is intended to update local authority representatives about the latest guidance from the UK Statistics Authority (UKSA) on the quality assurance of certain types of data that underpin our annual workforce data and MHO publications. We are particularly interested in authorities' views on the quality assurance of this data.

Administrative data

In July this year the UKSA published a draft guidance document on the quality assurance of administrative data. The UKSA published this as a consultation document and following their analysis of responses they will issue a final version later this year.

In referring to "administrative data" UKSA state that, "Administrative data are a by-product of administrative systems developed primarily for operational purposes.". They are the data that organisations develop as part of the day to day running of their services. It is this type of data that we get from local authorities each year as part of the LASWS survey.

It was concerns about the quality of such data that led the UKSA to remove the "National Statistics" status from the annual Crime Statistics for England in January this year. Due to these problems UKSA issued the draft guidance as they are concerned that much administrative data is not properly quality assured by those who create it or those who use it for Official and National Statistics publications.

Both in terms of UKSA advice on good practice and maintaining our status as an Official and National Statistics producer we need to ensure that we put appropriate processes in place to check and quality assure such data. A key element of this work will be engaging with our data providers in local authorities as well as the Care Inspectorate to ensure that the data underpinning our annual workforce data and MHO reports has been adequately quality assured.

Next steps

An initial meeting has been held with the Care Inspectorate) to explore a joint way forward with respect to the annual workforce data report. In relation to the collection of data from local authorities this will be discussed with local authority representatives in November with a view to planning the best way to take this work forward.

Mike Docherty
Intelligence Manager
SSSC
October 2014

Scottish Social Services Council

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

Item 9

Survey of Local Authorities: services to be delivered by HSCPs

Since the last meeting of the Group we have undertaken a small-scale survey of all Scottish local authorities (LAs) to ask where and in what way their staff are expected to be deployed from April 2015 when the new Health & Social Care Partnerships (HSCPs) become operational. Responses were received from all 32 local authorities.

The table below sets out the responses received in relation to the 7 services or staff groups that were specifically asked about.

Table 1: Services to be delivered by HSCPs

	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know
Social Work services to older people	20	1	0	11
Social Work services to other adults	20	1	0	11
Criminal Justice social work services	10	7	0	15
Mental Health Officers	18	2	1	11
Children's Social Work services	8	10	0	14
Central & Strategic social work staff	10	4	2	16
Adoption & Fostering services	8	10	0	14

As can be seen at least one-third of those authorities which responded were not able to advise on the likely services that will be delivered by their HSCP. However, from the response received it does seem clear that there will be some variation across Scotland with at least one-third of children's social work and adoption and fostering services not being delivered by the HSCP.

These changes seem certain to have an impact on the December 2015 local authority social work services survey. Work will be particularly required in the coming 12 months to ensure that measures are in place to continue gathering the required data on the local authority social work services workforce. A key element of that work will be clarifying definitions of which workers should be included within the survey. Moves in recent years to sharing services within and between authorities have in some cases moved groups of staff (e.g. some central and strategic staff) outwith the survey. This is beginning to create disparities between local authorities in terms of what is reported. The restructuring currently underway provides an opportunity to look afresh at what data is required.

Mike Docherty
Intelligence Manager
SSSC
October 2014

Scottish Social Services Council

Local Authority Workforce Data Providers Group

12th November 2014

Item 10

Stakeholders' evaluation of data website

A total of 28 people responded to the survey of stakeholders. This was a relatively disappointing response which may have been partly affected by the school holiday period during which the survey ran.

The table below sets out the variety of issues raised by respondents along with comments from me on possible solutions (including whether the work could be done in-house or would require external input).

Table 1: Issues/concerns and possible actions

No.	Issue	Possible solution	In house action	External action
1	Visibility of "Help" option	Review placing of this and identify possible changes.		Implementation will require input from consultants
2	Lack of info on SSSC and WI team	Expand "About us" to include info on SSSC and WIT.	Write up text and upload.	
3	Need easy to find glossary of terms	Review this and identify possible terms and location for glossary.	May be possible to do this within existing data site structure.	Some restructuring of the data site may be needed.
4	Compare data - usefulness	Review guidance – show how to compare across years.	Yes should be possible for us to develop and upload additional guidance on this.	
5	Compare data – more comparisons	Increase from 3 to 6 options.	Not feasible in-house as will require a restructuring of the data site.	Consultants scope and cost.
6	Interactive visualisation – separate LA and HB data	Revise data set and increase functionality of site.	In-house can produce a revised data set but will also need a restructuring of the	Consultants scope cost.

			site to include separate HB and LA data.	
7	News – wider info. available	Update news section weekly.	Yes this could be done in-house.	
8	Other SSSC data sets available	Qualifications and registration data held by SSSC published online.	Could be done as publications within the Publications section.	Or create new sections for such data.
9	Other workforce data	Create links to previous sectoral reports produced by SG.		Probably best done via a separate links section, or section for other useful sites/reports etc.
10	Non-proprietary software.	Publish pdfs as html. And Excel files as CSV.	Create the alternatives and upload them.	
11	New data items on; absence; pay; and workforce activity; recruitment and retention; unpaid carers data.	Review quality of absence data for publication. Pay and activity data not collected. Produce report on stability index. Provide link to Census site and unpaid carers data.	Consider including absence data tables along with WD report. Provide links to info on pay in sector where available. Produce item on activity data. Upload stability index report.	New section on quality and limits of the data and/or a Links section.
12	Data quality information	Currently covered in reports. Need separate coverage on site re. IV and Data by Area sections. A separate QA section would also support the QA work required on administrative data.	Could upload text to IV and Data by Area sections and/or into a separate QA section of the site.	New section on the quality of the data to be created by consultants.
13	Currency of data	To improve the currency of the data by anything more than a two-three months would be a major national exercise as it	We may over time be able to bring forward the publication of the workforce data and MHO reports to	NHS workforce data is available much more timeously. Difficult to see how social

		involves the SSSC, the CI and 14,000+ care services. This would require to be a clearly led, well-resourced long-term national project.	around June each year but the data will still be 6 months old at that point and not revised for a further 12 months.	services workforce data could be produced within similar timescales without a very significant investment of resources both for those collecting and analysing the data (and the systems they use) as well as the c.3,000 employers (14,000+ services) who provide it.
--	--	---	--	--

Next steps

We currently plan to have discussions next month with MTC, who were the site’s developers, with a view to having as many of the changes as possible implemented within this financial year.

Mike Docherty
Intelligence Manager
SSSC
October 2014