

Camphill Scotland Research Report No. 1

**The Comparative Standing of the Camphill Communities in
Scotland in the Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate**

The Camphill Scotland Research Group

July 2012

Rationale and Background

The Camphill Scotland Research Group was formed in 2009 in order to enhance the engagement of the Camphill Communities in Scotland with research, as conductors of research, as commissioners of research and as the subjects for research (see www.camphillscotland.org.uk). The Camphill Scotland Research Group also engages in abstracting research relevant to the Camphill Communities. Stephen Baron was appointed Research Facilitator in 2010 (see www.camphillscotland.org.uk/)

This Research Report represents the first substantive research project of the Camphill Scotland Research Group. Its focus is on the comparative standing of the Camphill Communities in terms of the Quality Gradings attributed by the Care Inspectorate as a result of its Inspections, announced and unannounced, of care providers in Scotland. The attribution of numeric gradings was introduced by (what is now known as) the Care Inspectorate in April 2008 to supplement previous narrative systems. The research intended, in a second phase, to use these gradings, together with data on comparative costs, to develop statistical models of value for money.

These Quality Gradings were chosen as the focus for research on four grounds:

- As moves both to the marketisation of social care and the personalisation of services and budgets develop so the importance of value for money becomes foregrounded. Essential to any calculus of value for money is the assessment of the quality of services being offered at any particular price
- The Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate are one assessment of the quality of services, independent in that it is not tied to any particular provider's organisation or perspective
- The Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate produce assessments across the social care sector thus enabling comparisons to be made between different providers and groups of providers
- The Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate provide the public language by which the media, commissioners, carers and concerned others may form views about the quality of particular services.

As such the Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate are highly consequential in the perception and management of the social care sector. However the four reasons above must be qualified with cautions as the basis for research:

- The pressure for value for money depends on their being reliable accountancy procedures which enable the comparison of like with like in terms of costs. Manifestly this was not the case when comparing the costs of in-house local authority provision with that of externally contracted agencies as the Audit Commission has consistently reported. For example http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/local/2010/nr_100902_children_residential.pdf www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/local/.../nr_120510_hew_costs.rtf Similarly in a recent Court case over the placement of O, an autistic child, at the Camphill School Aberdeen the cost of the Camphill placement was clearly specified (up to £156, 000 pa for a 40 week placement with waking night cover) while the comparative cost claimed by Edinburgh City Council of their

own provision was £19,759 (being the marginal costs of providing of taxi transport and one teaching assistant) (see <http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/opinions/2011CSIH13.html>). These are fundamental technical problems with the public data (a lack of both reliability and validity). The current research could not overcome these in order to model value for money statistically and so this aspect of the intended research was curtailed.

- The Quality Criteria by which the Care Inspectorate assess provision for different client groups, by different providers, are necessarily generic. As such they are susceptible to two limitations as research tools; first they cannot, and do not, claim to assess quality in the particular terms in which the providers are seeking to deliver quality and may thus misunderstand (and misclassify) any particular provision; secondly, and more concerning, the use of generic criteria may shade over into an universalising claim that the only acceptable definition of quality is that which is immanent in the generic criteria. These are problems with the validity of the data.
- It follows from the above that the comparison of Care Inspectorate Quality Gradings across client groups and across providers with different models of care is limited to the generic and that no research claims can be made in terms of the specific aspects of quality of any one provider.
- While the Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate provide the public currency of quality discourses they must be treated with caution as reliable and valid research data. We have been unable to find evidence of the Care Inspectorate conducting reliability and validity studies of research quality. It follows from the above that public claims about comparative quality of provision based on Care Inspectorate data must recognise the limits of such data.

Research Design

This initial study of Camphill’s standing in the Quality Gradings of the Care Inspectorate focussed on the 25 registrations which the 12 Scottish Communities have with the Inspectorate, as defined by the relevant legislation. This legislation (The Regulation of Care (Scotland) Act 2001) defines 15 types of service which must be registered and the Camphill Communities in Scotland offer, between them, seven of these types of service. Any one Community may have multiple registrations as their activity crosses boundaries between these legally defined types of service. The frequency distribution of registrations of the Camphill Communities is:

Table 1: Camphill Registrations with the Care Inspectorate

Type of Service	Number of Camphill Registrations
Care Home Adults	10
Support Services without Care at Home	5
Housing Support Services	3
Support Services with Care at Home	3
School Care Accommodation Services	2
Care Home Services Children	1
Day Care of Children	1

In order to enable statistical comparisons with the services of these types in the care sector as a whole a random sample with replacement was drawn from the population of services, stratified by type of service, on the website of the Care Inspectorate in the second week of September 2011. A power calculation to determine sample size was not possible as the variability in the underlying distribution could not be confidently established. A random sample with replacement at a ratio of 10:1 with Camphill registrations by type of service was generated by the random numbers function in Microsoft Excel applied to the alphabetic listing of services by type on the website of the Care Inspectorate. This resulted in 250 cases in the sample with nine cases appearing twice and one case appearing thrice in the sample. One Camphill registration appeared in the random sample. The Camphill registrations were the population (i.e. all) of such registrations.

Each service sampled was classified by its 'Organisational Type' in the following categories:

- Camphill Community
- Other Intentional Community
- Other Charity
- Local Authority
- Commercial
- Other/Unknown

These data were drawn from the websites or other public documents of the services concerned and their claims to organisational type were taken at face value (e.g. if a service claimed to be a charity this was accepted and the SC number was not checked with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator). As there was only one Other Intentional Community this was classified along with the other Charities while there was one provider for whom it was not possible to establish their Organisational Type and which was thus excluded from the analysis.

This exercise resulted in a random sample with the following organisational characteristics:

Table 2: Organizational Characteristics of the Random Sample

Type of Organization	Number	
Charities	106	
Other Intentional Communities	1	107
Local Authorities	73	
Commercial	69	
Other/Unknown	1	

The Quality Grading data collected for all cases were the latest four Quality Grades as recorded on the Care Inspectorate website in September 2011. These Gradings were for in terms of four Quality Criteria: Care and Support; Environment; Staffing; Management and Leadership A fifth Quality Criterion, Quality of Information, appears yet to be operationalized while the Environment criteria was not assessed for all Housing Support Services, 32 out of 33 the Support with Care at Home services and another 3 services sampled. All Services were assessed as to the Quality of Care and Support, while Staffing and Leadership and Management were not assessed in three cases each. The various underlying Quality Statements for each Quality

Criterion were not analyzed as their use in Inspections was highly variable and it was not possible to extract usable data.

The age of the rankings was recorded and analyzed in order to control for the possibility that rankings were a function of their age, e.g. that Services had learnt how to deal with the ranking system over time thus making more recent rankings higher than older ones or that there had been a change in ranking procedures as the system bedded in.

In order to assess any possible relationship between the age of a ranking and the grade attributed a scatterplot of age against grade was inspected and showed no sign of linearity. Person's Correlation was calculated for each Quality Grading with a minimum of $r = .22$ (Staffing and Environment) and a maximum of $r = .27$. All of these coefficients were smaller than that which we would expect under the random hypothesis for a sample of 250 namely $r = .3$. This analysis suggests that there is no evidence of an age effect on Quality Gradings attributed.

Research Findings

The hypothesis tested in this study was that 'Camphill Communities provide better quality services than other providers'. Being a directional hypothesis one tailed tests were used throughout and, being an exploratory study, a critical region of 5% was adopted.

The Care Inspectorate uses a ranking system where:

Table 3: Care Inspectorate Grading System

Descriptor	Grade
Unsatisfactory	1
Weak	2
Adequate	3
Good	4
Very Good	5
Excellent	6

The distributions of all Quality Grades on all Quality Criteria were analysed and found to approximate well to the normal distribution. The distribution of mean rankings was as follows:

Table 4: Mean Grade Rankings by Organizational Type and Care Inspectorate Quality Criteria

Organisation	Care	Environment	Staffing	Management
Camphill	5.12	4.95	5.08	4.96
Charities	4.75	4.58	4.53	4.42
Local Authority	4.66	4.37	4.25	4.26
Commercial	4.33	3.98	4.34	4.21
Statistically Significant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Two preliminary conclusions may be drawn from this analysis. Firstly, Camphill has the highest mean grading on all four Quality Criteria. Secondly, with the exception of Local Authorities and Commercial gradings in Staffing (italicized) there is a consistent gradient from Camphill to Charities to Local Authorities to Commercial organizations. 95% Confidence Intervals were calculated for all the sample means (i.e. for Charities, Local Authority and Commercial). Substituting the Upper Bound for each of these Organisational Types sampled does not alter the conclusion that Camphill has the highest mean grading across all four Quality Criteria, giving substantial support to this conclusion.

In order to assess whether the differences in the overall distributions on all four Quality Criteria are statistically significant a One Way Analysis of Variance was conducted on each with the following results:

Quality Criterion	df	F	Significance
Care & Support	4	5.19	<.000
Environment	3	9.05	<.000
Staffing		10.65	<.000
Management & Leadership	3	7.27	<.000

.These results suggest that there are significant differences in terms of Organisational Type on each of the Quality Criteria

These preliminary findings need to be explored further. In particular Camphill is a Charity and so its high standing in the gradings may simply be part of a wider ‘charity sector’ effect. The relative standing of Charities on all four Quality Criteria were tested against both Local Authorities and Commercial service providers using one tailed t tests. Charities were significantly different from Commercial providers on all four criteria and from Local Authorities only in terms of Staffing. Table 5 shows the results of these t tests:

Table 5: T Tests of the differences between means of Charities and of Local Authorities and of Commercial Providers all Quality Criteria.

Quality Criterion	Local Authorities Providers			Commercial Providers		
	t	df	One tailed significance	t	df	One tailed significance
Care & Support	.92	177	.18	3.13	173	.001
Environment	1.60	129	.55	3.73	119	<.000
Staffing	2.85	176	.0025	1.73	171	.043
Management & Leadership	1.48	176	.71	1.78	171	.038

In order to explore the possibility of the high standing of Camphill being simply part of a Charity effect further, the Camphill mean gradings were tested against the mean

gradings of the Charities in the random sample. The differences in mean gradings between Camphill and other Charities in terms of Care and Support was not significant whereas the differences in terms of Environment, of Staffing and of Management were significant as Table 6 shows:

Table 6: T Tests of the differences between means of Camphill and of Other Charities, all Quality Criteria.

Quality Criterion	t	Df	One tailed significance
Care & Support	2.41	130	.08
Environment	1.70	86	.046
Staffing	3.899	129	<.000
Management & Leadership	3.345	129	<.000

Similarly the Camphill mean gradings were tested against the mean gradings of the Local Authorities and of the Commercial providers in the random sample. In all of these tests Camphill gradings were statistically significantly higher than those of Local Authority and of Commercial providers.

So far ‘Camphill’ has been treated as one entity and has been compared with the relevant services in the care sector as a whole. If the analysis is broken down into the different registration categories defined by legislation then a more varied picture emerges. These analyses must be treated with considerable caution as breaking the sample down into registration categories produces low numbers in some cells: for example in the Care Home Services (Children) and Day Care of Children categories one case is 9% of the total. Producing more robust results at the registration category level would require extending the Random Sample significantly and lies beyond the scope of this study.

In all 18 instances where it was possible to perform the calculation the mean grading of Camphill was higher than that of the random sample in the particular Type of Service. Such apparent differences cannot be relied upon as being systematic differences without statistical testing. The following Table shows, by type of Service, where Camphill is graded statistically significantly more highly than the random sample. As this analysis is indicative only full details of the statistics are not given

Table 7: Statistical Significance of Differences of Means between Camphill and All Other Providers by Type of Service and Care Inspectorate Quality Criteria:

Type of Service	Care and Support	Environment	Staffing	Management & Leadership
Care Home Adults	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Support Services without Care at Home	No	No	No	No
Housing Support Services	No	Not assessed	Yes	No
Support Services with Care at Home	No	Not assessed	No	No
School Care Accommodation Services	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Care Home Services Children N=1	T test not valid			
Day Care of Children N=1	T test not valid			

Conclusions

The data analyzed to date suggest, within the limitations stressed above, the following conclusions:

- 1) That Camphill as an entity can claim to be better on all four Care Inspectorate Quality Criteria than the Scottish Care sector as a whole across the relevant Type of Service registration categories;
- 2) Such differences are part of a wider pattern in which Charities outperform Commercial service providers on all criteria and Local Authorities in terms of Staffing;
- 3) Camphill outperforms Local Authorities and Commercial providers on all four criteria;
- 4) Camphill as a whole can claim to be outstanding in Scotland in its own right in terms of the Environment provided, the Quality of Staffing and the Quality of Management and Leadership;
- 5) Evidence for Camphill being graded more highly than other services in any particular Type of Service registration category is at best patchy with Care Home (Adults) being most highly graded category, being more highly rated than cognate services in general and also more highly than such charities on three of the four criteria.

As was highlighted above this research has taken as its data the Quality Criteria defined, and the Quality Gradings attributed, by the Care Inspectorate. The limitations of such a generic approach were noted. The implication of these are that Camphill, and other providers, should carefully consider the reliability and validity of the Care Inspectorate's procedures for assessing their practices and the possibility of supplementing them with procedures more closely aligned to their particular provision.